GISELLA GRUBER:	Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to all. Welcome to the fourth webinar of the new At-Large capacity building program 2020 on the topic of new gTLD rounds and subsequent procedures on Monday the 3rd of August at 13:00 UTC. The webinar today will last for 90 minutes. Our presenter is Justine Chew. She'll be briefly introduced by our moderator, Hadia, after my introduction.

We will not be doing a roll call as this is a webinar. However, we are taking attendance and it will be noted on the Wiki agenda page for this meeting.

We have French and Spanish interpretation on our call today. A kind reminder to please state your name every time you speak to allow for the interpreters to identify you on the other language channels as well as for transcription purposes. We also have real-time transcription on today's call. The link is on the Wiki page, and I have also now added it to the Zoom chat.

It is also very important to speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation. All lines will be muted during the presentation and opened for questions and answer at the end of the presentation. If you are in the Zoom room, please raise your hand and the moderator will make note of the speaking queue, or if you do type your question in the chat, we have put the format of how to ask a question in the Zoom chat as well. We will keep track of all the questions and during the Q&A session, we will bring up the questions, or please do raise your hand to ask them over the audio channel. If you're only on the phone bridge, please speak up and you will be added to the speaking queue.

With no further ado, I will hand the floor over to our moderator, Hadia Elminiawi, co-chair of the At-Large Capacity Building Webinars Team. Over to you, Hadia. Thank you very much for your attention.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Gisella. Welcome all to the fourth webinar of the 2020 At-Large capacity building program, and happy Eid to all those who are celebrating.

Our webinar today is an introduction to the topic of the new gTLD rounds and subsequent procedures. However, our guest speaker will also attempt to touch on the end user connection to select a subtopic for which policy development is taking place within the GNSO new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP working group.

Our guest speaker and presenter is Justine Chew, an active member of the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP working group since 2016, At-Large liaison for the working group since 2018, and At-Large regional member for Work Track 5 on geographic names.

Justine makes regular presentations to the Consolidated Policy Working Group about the subsequent procedures-s and is a regular speaker about At-Large positions and suggested reforms in relation to the next new gTLD application round.

Justine is a member of the At-Large Advisory Committee representing the Asian, Australian and pacific islands region.

Today's webinar will attempt to answer for two questions: how does the new gTLD program affect end users, what are subsequent

procedures, why should subsequent procedures matter to end users, and what is next with subsequent procedures?

With this, I wish you all a useful and pleasant webinar and hand it over to Justine to begin. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Hadia. Welcome, everyone. Firstly, I'd like to thank the organizers for inviting me to speak to you today on the topic of new gTLD rounds and subsequent procedures.

I trust many of you, especially those of you who regularly attend the weekly At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group calls, will appreciate the fact that this topic is a very wide one. And given that my presentation today is limited to just 30 minutes, I will only attempt to cover this topic at a very high level. So please do consider this as a SubPro 101 presentation.

I will start by giving a brief history of the new gTLD program and then provide suggested answers to four key questions that you see on the screen. and of the four key questions, I imagine the one on why should subsequent procedures matter to end users would generate the most interest. And you can see my avatar there will support me virtually.

Okay, so we know that some generic top-level domain names—or gTLD for short—existed before ICANN's incorporation in 1998. The very familiar ones, .com, .edu, .gov, .org and a few others, are what are generally known as legacy TLDs.

After ICANN was established, there were two small rounds of expansion to the domain name system, namely the trial round in year 2000 and subsequently the sponsored TLD round in 2003. Both of these were in fact limited in nature and some would even say that both involved sponsored TLDs. For clarity, a sponsored TLD is a specialized top-level domain that has a sponsor representing a specific community served by that domain.

Full-fledged community-driven policy development on gTLDs only really commenced in late 2005 and over the course of about 22 months, built up what became known as the ICANN new gTLD program.

Now, I'm sure you've heard repeatedly reference to the 2012 round in associating with the new gTLD program. Well, that's because the program was effectively launched through the 2012 round of applications for new gTLDs.

This program launch was preceded by publication of the final applicant guidebook, and this applicant guidebook actually went through several iterations resulting from community input to its drafting, as well as implementation by ICANN Org.

What's interesting to note is that ultimately, this final applicant guidebook digressed somewhat from GNSO 2007 consensus policy. And this is why in some instances, you will hear [inaudible] to harmonize the 2007 consensus policy with the 2012 round implementation.

Further, as the community discovered, issues did crop up during the 2012 application round for which rules or any guidance of any sort to

resolving them were either not thought of or were not able to be incorporated at the time the final applicant guidebook was approved.

A classic example of such an issue is the community priority evaluation. We all know that the detailed guidelines for the CPE were only introduced in 2013, well after the application submission period had closed.

One of the key questions I hope to answer is how does the new gTLD program impact end users. Well, it's my opinion that much of the use of the Internet is still dependent on the utilization of domain names. Uses such as websites, e-mail, ecommerce platform. The examples I offer here aren't exhaustive, obviously, and I'm sure that you all can think of other examples of how you use the Internet and by extension, domain names.

I also don't have to remind you that ICANN's core business is to manage the domain name system, and in fact, by design, the stated aim of the new gTLD program is to enable expansion of the domain name system by introducing unlimited generic top-level domain names or extensions both in ascii and internationalized domain name forms to enhance innovation, competition and consumer choice, with safeguards in place to help support the secure, stable and resilient domain name system.

I think it's inevitable that depending on which interest group you see yourself in, you will hold certain aspects of this aim as more important than other aspects. In focusing on the end users perspective, I view the program as a framework for ultimately determining who gets which applied for string to operate as a TLD, subject obviously to applicable

terms and conditions, and in many cases, that operation allows for the registration and use of second-level domain names.

And I believe all of this in turn drives end users' access to and trust of domain name use when they're surfing the web, consuming information, chatting online, making reservations, etc. Therefore, it is important for end users to be able with some amount of choice and a whole lot of trust to reach operators and service providers, to access services and mediums offered by those operators or service providers, meaning those who park themselves behind domain names, whether at the top level or second level and so forth.

So, what are subsequent procedures? You can consider them as the rules and procedures that will govern the next round of applications for new gTLDs. Drilling down a little bit more, subsequent procedures will help determine what strings can be applied for, who can apply, how they can apply, what fees are applicable over and above any basic application fee, what terms and conditions are to apply, and if there are additional requirements for certain types of gTLDs, just to name a few general aspects.

You can also look at subsequent procedures as an update to the rules of the 2012 round which attempts to address, by way of consensus policy, issues that cropped up, any deficiencies in terms of achieving policy goals from the last round, lacunae or gaps, and also unintended consequences that were identified from the 2012 round.

What should be noted, however, is that in general, subsequent procedures will not apply to legacy TLDs, country code TLDs, delegated

new gTLDs, or those 2012 round applications which remain unresolved until today.

This topic has obviously gained a bit more attention in recent ICANN meetings, probably because its policy development process is concluding soon. But it has been a long winding road leading to completion, over four years' worth of work, in fact. And as a reminder, the subsequent procedures policy development process is managed by GNSO, the Generic Names Supporting Organization—the GNSO council to be accurate—hence it follows GNSO operating rules.

And here is how the subsequent procedures policy development process was initiated along with the establishment of its PDP working group with four working tracks initially.

In the course of the PDP working group's work, there were two requests for community comment, and a Work Track 5 on geographic names was also subsequently constituted as the fifth subgroup of the PDP working group with co-leads from the ALAC, ccNSO, the GAC, and GNSO.

And from here on, I'm just going to skip over many milestones and focus on the ones that involve some concrete output, namely the reports that have been produces so far as you can see on the screen, and moving on to the draft final report that's due out about mid-this month, and the final report which will then wrap up the work of the PDP working group by year end.

When you look at the breadth of the PDP working group's work scope for which it has to come up with consensus policy, you'd likely appreciate why it's taken over four years. The 40 topics you see here

cover pre-application issues and activities, through to application submission and processing, culminating in contracting to post-delegation matters. And of course, not forgetting the most visible areas to the community, which are application evaluation, dispute resolution, and string contention resolution.

Now, if you recall how I saw the new gTLD program impact end users, then along those same lines, you would likely appreciate why subsequent procedures- should matter to end users. Through the input of At-Large and the ALAC, we want to help ensure that subsequent procedures will facilitate the realization of these wants, as you see on the screen.

This list obviously isn't exhaustive, but it does highlight the key outcomes that we believe would benefit end users. Let me just touch on a few of these. So things like competition, consumer choice, opportunities for new entrants to the domain name market, trustworthy TLDs and operators, also registrars and registries, more internationalized domain names, effective ways to hold registry operators accountable for commitments that they make, and down to the importance of metrics to understand the impact of various aspects of the program and the program as a whole.

Conversely, among other things, we don't want TLDs that are operated against public interest or that facilitate abuse of the domain name system. We don't want TLDs that are confusingly similar to end users, TLDs that don't resolve in an expected manner, we don't want there to be no safeguards for highly sensitive strings used as TLDs, or gaming of the system to exploit loopholes or for parties to gain benefits solely

through the application process, and especially those who are intent on disposing the TLDs for profit without actually attempting to operate the TLDs themselves. And again, this list is likely not exhaustive either.

Now, because of time limitations, I will try to get into a little bit more specifics as to how end user wants and don't wants arise in subsequent procedures, but just by taking a cursory look at the selected topics.

Now, as mentioned earlier, it is important to us that there be comprehensive metrics in place to measure the success or failure of various program components as well as to measure the overall impact the program plays in fostering consumer choice, trust and competition. After all, if it is established that continuing to allow the expansion of the DNS does not in fact add positive impact, then why should expansion be allowed, and why should there be continuing subsequent procedures?

In any case, there should be ongoing opportunity for refining the subsequent procedures after the next round, of course, assuming the next round takes place. This is to enable continual fixing of deficiencies, minimizing—if not removing—lacunae, and mitigating unintended consequences.

In the interim, a predictability framework must enable gaps to be addressed by balancing the interests of all stakeholders, and not simply in favor of certain parties, least of all, applicants.

It is important for any commitments offered by or extracted from applicants to be effectively impossible. Highly sensitive TLDs must have the necessary minimum safeguards to curb abuse. And in order to keep registries accountable, there must be an easy way to effectively monitor

all commitments to address any violations of those commitments, and an awareness on how to do both.

Also, expanding the DNS is rendered meaningless if adoption of universal acceptance remains low, so we need to definitely measure this. ICANN and contracted parties need to invest in making themselves UA ready to be able to communicate with users of IDN e-mail accounts, to introduce IDNs, which is internationalized domain names, as well as accept IDN second-level domain name registrations.

The next applicant guidebook must obviously be complete, provide maximum clarity, and be accessible not only in format but also language. There must be sufificent and effective communication about the program to reach out to aspiring new potential applicants. Information of an opportunity to apply for a new gTLD and what support there is for them to do so.

All this must be done well in advance of the opening of the next application round. We need to look at how to expand the pool of potential applicants beyond the usual suspects, and especially beyond portfolio applicants.

At-Large continues to be strong advocates for the applicant support program, which has to be purposefully geared towards supporting less well-resourced applicants intended to benefit a target group. Not only does that mean financial support but also nonfinancial support, and provided beyond just the application process. The rules most prevent gaming and limit applicant support to truthfully deserving applicants.

The protection of geographic name strings remains an area of major debate within the community, and key to which is the question of what actually constitutes a geographic name. As it is, we're not likely to see much change to the policy on ICANN's definition of geographic names, and per the applicant guidebook, what will be unavailable versus what will be available, whether under some preventive protection or not.

Within At-Large, there also remains concern with the treatment of selected strings, in particular, names with geographic meaning to communities, that there ought to be better ways to allow government or community input, especially to prevent or mitigate against misuse of strings which are names with geographic meaning.

Encouraging more internationalized domain names—or IDNs for short—would be key to connecting to a large part of the next billion end users to the Internet, and that should be done in a manner conducive to registry operators who willingly invest in their ability to offer IDNs and IDN variants.

Now, in terms of dispute resolution, in general, concerns with a string are typically handled either during the application process, which means pre-delegation, or after it has been delegated as a TLD, which means post-delegation.

While applications are still being evaluated, we not only need a representative way to monitor problematic applications for strings that are meaningful and/or sensitive to communities and end users, but also to express our concerns and provide input on why. And we need a way

that allows us to do all of that without having to jump over unreasonable roadblocks.

The mechanism put in place must provide us with a clear standing to easily present our objections to problematic applications, and also to appeal against any objections that may be erroneously dismissed.

Now, in the case of where an objection is successful and the applicant is allowed to proceed subject to the incorporation of a registry commitment into its registry agreement, there is a post-delegation dispute resolution procedure called the public interest commitment dispute resolution procedure, or PICDRP for short, which allows for complaints that a registry may be violating its commitments.

But how well known is this PICDRP? Is it really accessible to anyone who believes a violation has occurred? I'll leave that up to you to decide.

Now, as mentioned before, we see the importance of enabling new entrants as a good way of increasing competition and improving consumer choice. While community applications are meant to support this goal, it isn't meant to favor economic groupings over any other groups, particularly those that are of grass roots, cultural, linguistic or minority in nature. These are legitimate communities and should be afforded true equal opportunity to prevail in the community priority evaluation in the event the applied for string falls into a contention set.

Now, any auction of last resort for resolving the contention set should be fair to all applicants in such contention sets, especially to smaller single TLD applicants who may lack the resources to win an auction as compared to, obviously, larger, wealthier applicants with deep pockets.

Well, private resolution alternatives, including private auctions, meaning those that take place away from the purview of ICANN, may be a passible area where applicants could engage in conduct designed only to benefit themselves. An example would be parties applying for popular strings but have no intention of operating registries for those strings and they're applying with the hope of participating in private resolution resulting in them getting paid to withdraw their applications.

Now, we don't know if this will happen in the next round, but it is reasonable, I think, to believe that it might. Even if such conduct is not disallowed in the next round, we really need to be able to collect data on such incidences in order to help determine whether decisive intervention is needed.

So, what happens next, or what happens with SubPro hereon? Well, we can expect the draft final report of the subsequent procedures PDP working group to be released for public comment by mid-August. This draft report will contain the recommendations of the working group that the community can comment on. And after the working group considers the public comments received, a final report will be issued, and this will wind up its work.

Thereon, the final report goes to the GNSO council for adoption, and if adopted, it then goes to the ICANN board for consideration. And if it's approved by the board, then it's forwarded to ICANN Org for implementation and that would be where an Implementation Review Team enters the picture to support that process. And only after implementation, which could take some time, would there be any consideration of a new round of applications for new gTLDs.

And with that, I thank you for paying attention. So now I will hand it to staff to run the pop quiz. We've got a string of questions that test your comprehension or your attention that you provided so far in listening to my presentation.

I suppose I should read the question out for folks. People are voting, so I may not read out the question and just let people put in their answers.

GISELLA GRUBER: Justine, I think if we could read them out—I'm happy to read them out, or if you do—just so the interpreters can provide the interpretation on the other channels. I believe they're already doing that. And for those on the audio bridge also, even though they can't participate, they can maybe just hear the questions out of interest. That would be great. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, fair points, thank you, Gisella. So I will read out the pop quiz question number one while people are putting in their answers. the question is, how many unlimited or open new gTLD application rounds has ICANN conducted so far? You're meant to pick an answer out of five choices. A is none, b is one, C is two, D, three, and E, four. And if staff could let me know when we want to—okay. Right, so the answer is B, one. And for those of you who got that right, well done.

The second question is, which supporting organization or advisory committee manages the subsequent procedures policy development process? Is it A, ALAC, the At-Large Advisory Committee, B, ASO, the

Address Supporting Organization, C, ccNSO, Country Code Name Supporting Organization, D, GAC, Government Advisory Committee, or E, GNSO, Generic Name Supporting Organization? Okay, well, I can see that most of you got that right, the answer is E, GNSO.

Question three is, what is or are the stated aims of the new gTLD program? A, enabling open expansion of the domain name system, B, enhancing innovation, competition and consumer choice in the domain name space, C, safeguarding and supporting a secure, stable and resilient domain name system, D, all of the above, or E, none of the above? Okay, about 74% of the people who answered got it right, the answer is D, all of the above. Probably a bit of a trick question here.

Question four, in general, subsequent procedures will not apply to which of the following? A, legacy top-level domains, B, country code top-level domains, C, already delegated top-level domains, D, unresolved 2012 round applications, or E, all of the above? The answer is E, all of the above. And about 84% of you got it right.

Moving on to pop quiz question five, the subsequent procedures Work Track 5 is often described as cross-community, but only because it has nominated co-leads from which groups with strong interest in geographic terms as domain names at the top level? Is it A, ALAC and GAC only, B, ccNSO and GNSO only, C, ASO and GNSO only, D, ALAC, ccNSO, GAC and GNSO, or is it E, ALAC, GAC, RSSAC and SSAC? Okay, well, the high majority of you all got it right: the answer is D, ALAC, ccNSO, GAC and GNSO. 94% got it right.

The last question is, which of the following topics or areas are out of scope for the subsequent procedures PDP working group? Now, this is a dual, multiple choice kind of question, so listen carefully. I'm going to read out six answers and the actual selection would be a combination of the answers that I'm going to read out. The first one is, appeals against limited public interest objections. Two is community priority evaluation. Three, fee refunds. Four, geographic names as top-level domains, five, requests for reconsideration, and six, treatment of .corp, .home and .mail as top-level domains.

The answers that are available to you are combinations, you choose from either A, B, C, D or E, which I'm going to read out now. A is one only, which is only appeals against limited public objections. B would be two, three and four, which are community priority evaluation, fee refunds and geographic names as top-level domains. C is five and six only, which are requests for reconsideration and treatment of .corp, .home and .mail as top-level domains. D is all of the above and E is none of the above.

Okay, unfortunately, I see that the poll has a little bit of a problem because it actually doesn't show the options that you're supposed to select. It shows the list of the available elements that I read out earlier. So you're actually supposed to choose between A, B, C, D or E. So we hit a little bit of a snag. I was trying to be a little bit adventurous here, but I'm going to take it that we are unable to fix the poll, so perhaps I should just give you the answer. The actual answer is C, five and six only, which is requests for reconsideration and treatment of .corp, .home and .mail as top-level domains.

That's the last of the pop quiz questions. Thanks for playing. And I suppose we can move swiftly on to Q&A.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Justine, for this very informative and interesting and engaging presentation. We have six questions. The first one comes from Alfredo and it says, "How does the DNS and new gTLD program contrast with the use of social media in ecommerce online business? Does the trust concern have a really high impact in the end user knowledge when seeking services?"

JUSTINE CHEW: If I understand your question correctly, Alfredo—thanks for it, by the way—social media in itself doesn't necessarily depend on domain names. Maybe they do, but in terms of when I'm thinking of Facebook and Twitter, you do have a main home domain name like Facebook.com, but in terms of domain names, it is more about end users surfing the web for information, for doing all sorts of transactions online. And as you say, in ecommerce, in online business.

In terms of the trust concern, yes, I would expect that end users, if they were to key in a particular domain name, then they would expect to find a website or a web application or a community that is trustworthy, that actually is the operator of that domain name and is not a party that is trying to commit phishing or fraud and that sort of undesired activities that harm end users at the end of the day. I hope that provides some indication of an answer, and if I haven't been clear, then by all means, please put in a supplementary question to the chat, Alfredo. Thanks.

GISELLA GRUBER: I believe we're on the second question from Mikhail Anisimov, "Which new gTLD could affect security and stability of the Internet, and how could they do it?" Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Which new gTLD? Well, that is a tough question to answer, but in terms of introduction of new gTLDs and how they might affect the security and stability of the domain name system or the root server, is that there has to be a measured rate of introduction. We can't simply introduce thousands of new gTLDs into the root at one go, because we actually don't know what is the impact of doing that.

So instead of security, stability of the root server and the DNS, there has to be a way of measuring and certifying that the rate of introduction would not cause harm to the DNS per se. And this is obviously a technical expertise and someone like the SSAC would have done research, and even RSSAC would have done research, they would have recommended a safe rate of introduction. Thanks.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I will go on with the following question, which is again from Alfredo, and it says, "Does the 'why it matters to end users' imply that an education program for the public end users will be in place? Who will be responsible for the education component of the consumer choice?" So Alfredo is mainly addressing the education problem of end users, or issue of end users.

JUSTINE CHEW: That's also a very tricky question. In terms of who's responsible for the end users, I actually don't know. I don't believe there is a specific party that's responsible for educating end users. We know who is responsible for educating applicants, and also, the ICANN community at large, but in terms of end users, I suppose the At-Large and the ALAC being the representative home of end users, that possibly could fall into our lap. I'll leave it at that. Thanks.

GISELLA GRUBER: We'll go on to a question which was actually just before Alfredo's, from Bill Jouris, which I will read out. The question is, the internationalization of domain names would result in lots of new glyphs being available. Domain names will be allowed, if they can be distinguished from existing ones, but the definition IDN is using for variants is extremely narrow. Basically, if a trained linguist—that is, not a normal user—can tell the difference, it's not a variant. How does that square with the maintaining security?" Over to you, Justine. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: That's a very good question, Bill. I have to admit I don't have a very good answer for you. In terms of the subsequent procedures moving forward, there is something which also took place in the 2012 round, which is the string similarity evaluation, but in terms of string similarity evaluation, it is a visual test. So the evaluation that takes place looks at whether something is visually confusing or two particular strings are visually confusing to an end user, and therefore would pose problems.

So in terms of whether one or the other would be allowed, then it's really a matter of things like whether there's an objection to one or the other, or whether there should be some policy recommendation that would disallow one over the other.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Justine. I hope that that has answered the question, Bill. I will now go on to the fifth question we have from Amrita Choudhury. "Has any existing gTLD affected the security and stability of the Internet? Any such example?" Over to you, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Not that I'm aware of, Amrita. But even with being an active member in the subsequent procedures working group, I don't say—and I have a very long history yin terms of the actual implementation of the program and before that, but based on my short time in ICANN, I haven't come across any incidences.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Justine. Our last question—although we do have a few in the chat, but I'll come back to that—is from Nadira Alaraj. The question is, how many new delegated gTLD were a success from the first round?

JUSTINE CHEW: From the first round, Nadira, I'm assuming you're talking about the 2012 round, and I don't have a number off the top of my head. I know there were about 1930 applications in the 2012 round that were submitted,

and in terms of how many are delegated, I really don't have the number off the top of my head because there are still some in the system which are unresolved. Yeah, I'll have to look it up and come back to you on the stat, but as time moves on, there are still new ones being delegated to the root. So it's not a fixed number per se.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Justine. We did have a few questions in the chat that weren't actually formulated as questions, and one of them was form Fouad Bajwa. I was wondering, Fouad, whether you would like to take the floor on the audio and come up with your question? Thank you.

FOUAD BAJWA: Yeah, hello. Justine, wonderful presentation. My question is, has there been—you mentioned a few moments ago about the possible risks associated with suddenly opening up the domain name system to so many new gTLDs. So from that perspective, I know there was an NCAP study in the past, a draft was released in February. But has there been a more concrete study which has a score card which analyzes what happened in the past and what things should sort of be mitigated at the moment as we open up for the next round?

So sort of a risk analysis which has a score card. I don't think that exists, right? Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Fouad, for your question. I don't know if there's a specific study. I'm only aware of recommendations out of SSAC and RSSAC, and they talk about a rate of introduction, not quantum numbers, per se.

The thing is with the 2012 round, the rate of introduction to the new gTLD was subject to how many applications ICANN Org and the evaluators could handle at any one time. And I believe there was a policy that says that they could only manage 1000 a year or something to that effect.

So, managing 1000 application evaluations a year doesn't mean that all 1000 will be introduced to the root, so we never got to a point, I think, that was really testing the root server per se. And again, as I said, the technical people in the ICANN community, they prefer to talk about rate of introduction rather than actual numbers, per se.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I can see one more question in the chat that's not put in the form of a question. It says, when is the new gTLD round going to begin? I don't know if you addressed that.

JUSTINE CHEW: I tried to, in my last slide, but I can try to answer it. The answer is actually I don't know. It's not up to me, per se. We do know that the final report with the recommendations for subsequent procedures will be ready by end of the year at the latest. And as I tried to explain in my last slide, after that, that has to go through a process so it has to go to GNSO council for adoption. That obviously would take time because

GNSO has to obviously look at it and debate it and make a consensus call for it, whether to accept it as is or not.

They may not accept it. I really don't know. They may have issues with certain aspects of the report and decide that they need to look into it further. And even if it gets past GNSO council, then it still has to go to the ICANN board for approval and that's another level of scrutiny. So ICANN board could accept the entire report in its entirety, or they may have certain issues or concerns about different aspects of the report and they could well send them back to GNSO council for a question, for an answer, or for a suggestion for them to deal with. So all those could possibly take time, and we don't know how long or how complicated that process is going to be.

And after we get through that process, then we have to go into implementation mode, and that in itself will probably take quite some time, possibly up to maybe a year, even. We don't know. If you look at the past 2012 round as a benchmark, we saw that the policy development process actually happened between December 2005 to around September 2007, and the launch didn't actually happen until first quarter of 2012. So you can make your own assumptions about the timeline for the next round.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Justine, and I see no more written questions, however, if anyone wants to ask Justine more questions, please go ahead. We still do have time. And Justine, thank you so much. That was a very informative presentation, easy to understand and grasp and touching

on all necessary points. And I don't see any hands up. Justine, would you like to teach about a certain topic related to subsequent procedures, maybe for five minutes? Is there any topic that you would like to highlight or elaborate on more?

JUSTINE CHEW: I was trying to keep the time, 30 minutes, so I was trying to compact a lot of things into 30 minutes. There are 40 topics, obviously, and I have to say that At-Large is not necessarily strongly concerned about all of them. It's only interested in a number of them, probably more than half, per se.

I picked out the ones that I thought were interesting and that we had something to tell people about. That's a good question. Let me have a look at the chart again and see if there's any suggestions from the folks in the room as to any particular topic that they wanted to hone in on.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So I don't know if any participants want to know more about any of the topics. Justine has the chart on the screen. Justine, I see no hands up, and actually, this was a great presentation, very interesting. Thank you so much. Thank you all for your attendance and active participation.

And Gisella is putting again in the chat, are there any other questions, or maybe any other related topic that you would like to know more about from Justine? So Justine is our expert here on subsequent procedures and we are very lucky to have her today. We do have an evaluation survey that will be put on screen. Gisella, would we have the surveys

first and then I can talk about our following webinars, or would you like me to talk about our upcoming webinars and then put the survey after?

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you for asking this question. If you could kindly go ahead with the next webinars while we just get the survey ready. And if we could ask people to please stay on the call to complete the survey shortly after Hadia's informative presentation. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Gisella. I'm going to briefly talk about our upcoming webinars. Our next webinar will be held on Monday, September 7th, and it will be about DNS over https and DNS over TLS. The following webinar will be in October, and it will be about ATRT3 outcomes in the context of At-Large and continuous improvement. Our November webinar will be about the DNS and the Internet of Things. We look forward to seeing you all at our upcoming webinars, and I hand it back to Gisella for the survey questions. Maybe while the survey questions are still being prepared, we still have Justine with us. Again, she's our expert on subsequent procedures. She's available to answer any of your questions. Please take this opportunity and ask her about any related topics that you might have in mind. She still has [the screen] of the topics. So if you would like to learn about any of them, please go ahead and ask Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Or if you're shy, you can send me an e-mail, or better still, come and join us at our weekly At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group calls that take place every Wednesday night—or night for me anyway. Yeah, so if you want to get involved in the CPWG, please contact At-Large staff for details.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I have a question here about, are all topics going to be included in the final report, or are some topics not going to be addressed?

JUSTINE CHEW: The these are the 40 topics that will have a section in the draft final report. The only two that stand out as peculiar or extraordinary would be the geographic names topic, which has its own final report out of the Work Track 5 working group, and the second-level RPMs which probably is not necessarily going to feature very highly in the report because that's being dealt with by the rights protection mechanism PDP working group, which is a different GNSO working group on that particular area.

But he rest of it would have some form of commentary or recommendations or even implementation guidance that would feature in the draft final report.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you for that. And we have a question from Adam Peake. He says, does At-Large have any particular concerns about geo names beyond what you've already mentioned? Especially as it's a topic At-Large co-chairs.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. I believe Javier is on the call, and he's the ALAC co-lead. So I wonder if he wants to take up answering this question. If not, then I can always take a stab at it.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I'm not sure that he is still here. He was with us on the call. Let me check. Yeah, I think Javier left, so yeah, just go ahead, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. No worries. In terms of the Work Track 5 final report on geo names, a lot of the recommendations align with At-Large's positions, except for maybe a couple. I think we would have liked to see a little bit of movement in terms of considering the importance of non-AGB terms, non-applicant guidebook terms, which are strings that have geographic meaning but they're not geographic names according to ICANN's definition as provided for in the AGB.

In terms of the protection of those names, there is no full consensus within At-Large. Some folks think that we should have preventative protection, some folks think that it's good enough to have curative protection.

So there isn't a full consensus on certain positions, but we are working towards some input that digresses from what the Work Track 5 report says, and I am loath to speak a little bit more about it, because we are still trying to affirm the consensus position through our weekly calls within the Consolidated Policy Working Group.

But in terms of what's going to be not available, like the country and territory names, I don't think we have an issue with that. In terms of capital cities requiring preventive protection, that's fine with us. The point about it being in all languages, that's also one thing that we support. Obviously, what I'm talking about is the geographic names that are protected and not available as well.

What else was there? In terms of noncapital city names, this is probably where At-Large's position diverges, because as I said, some folks think that curative protection, so [meaning to say that] objections or GAC advice or GAC early warning would be enough to raise concerns about any particular noncapital city strings that have been applied for.

But there are also folks that would like to see greater protection, better protection for noncapital city names as well, especially if those noncapital city names are of cities with a certain size and population. And we think that should actually be subject to preventive protection as well. I hope that has given you an answer, Adam. Okay, great. You're welcome.

I'm not seeing any more hands up or questions per se. Gisella, did you want to take over? Or I see Marita's hand up. I'm sorry, who's chairing? Hadia?

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Justine. Apologies for this, I'm just checking whether Hadia is online. But as Marita has her hand up, we will hand it over to Marita. Marita, please take the floor.

MARITA MOLL:	Thank you. I just wanted to add a little bit to Justine's talk about the feelings around At-Large about the geo names issue. One thing that I thought I'd point out that I think Justine did say—she didn't say it while I was online—is that the situation right now is that applicants can apply for a city name, and they can have that name as long as they don't use it as a city name.

So you can apply for Kingston for example. Kingston is a bad example, I think it's a capital city. Toronto. And you can use it to promote a beer company. The only time that an applicant gets into trouble is if they're wanting to use it as a city name. And as long as they don't say they're going to use it as a city name, then anybody can buy that.

There are a number of us around the table who think that there should be some notifications to cities to let them know that someone is applying for this name, and if it's no problem, then it's no problem. But often, we could see certain situations in which this can happen and the cities could lose their names without really knowing that this was happening.

Maybe I've put it a little awkwardly. Justine, you're probably better at explaining this. But this is one part of the geo names agenda that we are hoping to add a little bit of color in there asking whether or not—should it not be possible for cities to be notified if their name was coming up. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:	Thank you, Marita. Yeah, I tried to not allude to it too much when I was answering Adam's question, probably trying to keep it to a high level, I guess. And this is something that we will be discussing still on the Consolidated Policy Working Group call this week just to refresh and reaffirm the discussion that took place last week on capital city names and also this notification system as an option for supporting certain parties in terms of notifying them when certain strings with geographic meaning are being applied for in the next round.
GISELLA GRUBER:	Thank you, Justine. Hadia, are you going to take over? We now have the webinar survey poll up on the screen. Not hearing from Hadia, I will read through the poll questions which we have up. Thank you, Claudia.

The first question is, how did you learn about this webinar? Please choose one of the following options. Twitter, Facebook, At-Large mailing list, At-Large calendar, Skype, colleague, or other.

We will give another few seconds for this poll to be answered. We have 12 of 54 people having voted, 22%. Please do cast your votes as these surveys allow us to improve on our At-Large capacity building webinars as we build them throughout the year. And Hadia kindly presented on the following topics to be expected between now and the end of the year.

We can now go on to the second question: what region are you living in now? The options are Africa, Asia, Australia and the Pacific Islands, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean islands, North America. I see

that the majority of people have now voted. I will just run through the questions.

The third question, how do you feel about the timing of the webinar today? Please note the timing is 13:00 and not 14:00 UTC, but I do see that the large majority find this timing just right.

The fourth question, did the webinar duration allow sufficient time for the questions? A wonderful 100% yes.

The fifth question, "The presentation was interesting." The options, strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree.

Question six, "I learned something from this webinar." The options, strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree.

And the last question for the survey is, "I would like to participate in other At-Large webinars." Strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, and the last option, strongly disagree.

We have come to the end of the poll. And fortunately, we'll have many of you joining us on our next webinar. All the details will be posted on the At-Large calendar as well as sent out on all the various mailing lists. If you do have any questions, please do contact At-Large staff at our e-mail address. I will hand it back to Hadia for the final word. Thank you very much, and thank you so much, Justine, for your wonderful presentation. Hadia, over to you. Are you online?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes, I am. Thank you, Gisella. Thank you, Justine, for this great presentation. Thank you all for your attendance and active participation. And a big thank you to staff and our interpreters for making these webinars possible. Looking forward to seeing you all in our future webinars. With that, we say goodbye and see you in future webinars.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you very much, Hadia. The webinar has now been adjourned. We will now stop the recording. If you would kindly disconnect your lines from the audio.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]