

Avri Doria:

Okay since we hit the hour, since we have at least one person who will have to leave soon, I will basically start. I assume we have the checkpoint in the recording for the transcript. Okay first thing before doing the roll call is to quickly go through the agenda. The primary item on the agenda today is to go through the work that Dev has been doing which is really quite an incredible amount of work and see if we can finalize it as a draft to send to the RALOs for commentary. It's important to get this going.

That's really the main agenda item, that's agenda Item 3. Then there will be a brief update on application support, it will be really brief because there is almost no update. Then there is update on gTLD issues, Cintra will bring up anything that has come up in the last week that's worth this groups notice. Again I've only given it five minutes. I don't think we are quite at that point yet. Look at any action items not yet covered.

And then any other business. Is there anything else that anyone thinks should be added to this agenda at this point? Okay in which case I think we can go to the roll call. Hearing no changes to the agenda can I ask somebody to do the roll call of the meeting please?

Nathalie Peregrine:

Of course Avri. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, this is the new gTLD call on Monday 23 January 2012. On the call today we have Avri Doria, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Hong Xue, Cintra Sooknanan, Alan Greenberg, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, and Rafik Dammak. We have apologies from Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Yaovi Atohou, Tijani Ben Jemaa, and Carlos Aguirre. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, and myself Nathalie Peregrine. I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes, thank you and over to you Avri.

- 
- Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Is Cintra on the call at the moment since Cintra has been taking notes and such? I see in the chat that she may be having difficulty. Is she actually on the call at this point?
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: According to the chat it doesn't look so.
- Avri Doria: That's why and since I'm going to hand things over to you to speak, it's just that Heidi will take notes until she arrives. Okay thank you Heidi. Dev, I hand it over to you. I certainly have not had time to look at the newest documents you sent out, so please take us through them as I said in the agenda review, my hope is that we can get to the point where at the end of this discussion of saying "Yes this is ready to go out to the RALOs for further comment" or "No the following needs to be done to it before it is." So please go ahead.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Avri. I relistened to the conference call last week and I took note of the various comments made, and I've started redrafting the At-Large ALAC process for considering and making objections to the new gTLD application. I've posted in it the agenda but I've also posted it to the Adobe Connect chat, the PDFs so you can open then up on your Adobe Reader and have it full screen.
- Some of the changes I've done was to well put some timing onto the process, introduced the concept of a new gTLD review group which will oversee the process of essentially maintaining the information flow regarding the gTLD applications and comments receipt during the 60-day application comment period window. On the first page, what we see here this is before the start of the application comment period, the notice is sent to all RALOs for participants to join this At-Large new gTLD review group. And I put a question mark.
- I suggested at least two persons from each RALO and one from the ALAC, from the region. But perhaps it needs to be more persons, comments are welcomed. And again before the start of the
-

---

application comment period, the review group works together and holds a meeting together to review its operating procedures, trying to emphasize what was mentioned before that we have to hit the ground running because you can't wait until the application comment period starts and then try to figure out what are we doing, how do we do it and so forth. Are you all hearing me because I'm seeing some comments?

Avri Doria: Yes, I'm hearing. I haven't seen anybody raise their hands yet.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay.

Avri Doria: But so people should raise their hands if they have a question and then ask.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay so continuing, at the start of the application comment period, well ICANN is then posting the public portions of the gTLD applications, considered complete and ready for evaluation at the ICANN website. And on that same date the gTLD review group will - this basically notifies all the RALOs that the application comment period has started.

Now within Week 1 of the application comment period, the review group shares that information from the ICANN website is imported into our At-Large New gTLD Applications Dashboard. And this is the concept I was having to look at to try to automate as much as possible the comments received. I can go through the new gTLD Applications Dashboard now if you like?

Avri Doria: Yes, that would be okay. I have one question before you start, is this work linked to the work that's being done for the GAC or is this something independently that you have done?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: This is something independently that I've done. I have -

Avri Doria: Okay thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: I didn't have any communication with Olivier or got any correspondence regarding GAC procedure.

---

Avri Doria: Okay thank you I just wanted to confirm that.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Sure, okay so if you open up the PDF of the Dashboard, it will essentially be like four columns. The first column the 'gTLD Applied for Strength' and I just put some examples, and hopefully I'm not infringing on someone's application there. And each of those gTLD Applied for Strengths will be hyperlinked to the formal application on ICANN's website. Then there is an At-Large Wiki page on the gTLD Applied for Strength and the idea is that it's going to use Confluence Wiki to track the comments received on a gTLD application.

Just to walk through the idea, the idea is that a Wiki page is only created when the first comment is received. This will eliminate a person going to the Wiki page and just seeing 500 pages and maybe a lot of them will be empty. That's what the second column is attempting to say. Then the third and fourth columns will track the number of comments on that Wiki page for the evaluation panel's consideration or the number of comments received on objection grounds.

So the idea being is that we will have a comment period where persons can submit comments on the evaluation panel's consideration and comments on objections grounds. And I was thinking it should be two separate Wiki pages just so that after the 60-day period well you won't then have to consider the evaluation panel's consideration anymore. We can then just focus on the Wiki pages for the objection grounds to possibly continue to develop an application advice.

Okay and the idea behind these numbers is that it also automatically gets the number of comments from the Wiki page. And it can then be sorted so that those applications that are receiving the most comments will then go to the top of the list and therefore either raise the curiosity to see what the comments are on this application and also to see whether persons will then also see there have been no comments on these strings should there be one?

---

Avri Doria: I have a question, and anyone else please raise your hands if you have one. Okay looking at these last two columns, if I understand you correctly, there shouldn't be any comments with no number in them normally ?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Correct.

Avri Doria: Because there wouldn't be a row if there wasn't at least one comment. Is that a correct assumption?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Correct assumption yes.

Avri Doria: Okay great. The other question I have is and I don't think this one is for you - there is obviously a certain amount of scripting to be done or what have you to make this thing automatically count and automatically sort. I guess it's a question to staff on how that happens, how does this happen? Is it easier if it's the same thing GAC is doing? If it's not the same thing GAC is doing then how does something like this get done?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay I can answer the second question.

Avri Doria: Okay great.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay well with regards to the second question, possibly this is why this Dashboard could be implemented not necessarily using a spreadsheet but actually using Confluence itself. I was submitting comments to the ICANN Public Comments Wiki which is considering using the Confluence Wiki for dealing with public comments. Instead of just sending an email, you would actually post to the Confluence Wiki and you will see the discussion and respond to the threads within that Wiki page.

And I've noted that when I looked at the testing on one page they were able to track the number of submissions sent by the author. I'm thinking there may be some Confluence plugins that would be able to track the number of comments on Wiki page.

- 
- Avri Doria: Okay so that sounds like we have an action item at some point to basically do further research on that. But I'm assuming that this doesn't negate further review of the plan, it's just that perhaps a note needs to be made on it that further investigation is necessary on what you just said, Confluence plugins, et cetera just so that we don't forget it.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Sure.
- Avri Doria: Okay thanks I don't have a question. Heidi has her hand up.
- Heidi Ullrich: Yes hi Avri, thank you. Dev this is really interesting. I'm just wondering if there could be some time saved, effort saved by working with relevant staff as well as the GAC and Olivier on using the same system that the GAC is developing currently.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Certainly yes.
- Heidi Ullrich: My understanding is that they are now - staff is in the testing period for the one that the GAC is working on and that they are intending a roll out in a test in Costa Rica. And my understanding also is that we could contact either Kurt Pritz or Michael Salazar to add the At-Large types of information that you would like to have. This would be an opportune time.
- Avri Doria: Great can you help me set that up or should I approach one of them directly and arrange for a meeting when Dev and such can talk to them?
- Heidi Ullrich: I think that Olivier is already in touch with the relative people in the GAC. Let me go ahead and let him know that this group would like to work with the GAC and with staff on developing this; we can make that an action item if you would like.
- Avri Doria: Yes, please do. Thank you. I see that we have three people in the queue now, Andrew, Hong and Alan. Andrew please go ahead.
- Andrew Mack: Okay thanks Avri. Just a quick thought or suggestion, I think this is moving in the direction of the Wiki makes a lot of sense. But I
-

---

know for a lot of people who are less Wiki familiar and/or people who are less involved in the conversation on a day to day basis, they may find it much easier and a little less intimidating to still have the ability to send an email. I would suggest that we keep that option open.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: I can respond to that one, Page 2 of that process describes a method for the review working group to actually keep track of and update that Wiki page. It was taken into account, yes.

Andrew Mack: It will require that they're not - for people who are not so much up to date, they might find it intimidating trying to figure out where they should plug in. This just gives them the option to still participate.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay.

Avri Doria: Hong please the floor is yours.

Hong Xue: Okay thank you. I guess Dev's revised procedure or draft is very thoughtful and extremely clear -- congratulation for him. And I fully agree with Avri and Heidi on the issue to interact with GAC to sort of integrate their status with [inaudible 00:17:09] certain obligations to make them available to the At-Large community. I guess that would be extremely valuable. What I want to add on is that there is another party who can also raise objection on the ground of community based application and limited partnering interests.

There is independent objector even though we don't know who the objector will be. But I guess it would be useful to link up to that office. Of course we don't know what kind of procedure or operation that office will be operating. But I guess it would be useful to [inaudible 00:17:49]. This is comment one. Comment

---

two is that I've reviewed this procedure very carefully and especially the Dashboard Dev is presenting to us. What I can see is that according to the Column 3 and Column 4 they're actually very much two different processes.

The Column 3 showed the comments for evaluation panel's reconsideration and Column 4 is actually comments on objection grounds. I agree with Alan, he said last time and last call that even though there are two different processes, there is absolutely reasonable to link them up because it will all be within the realm of At-Large process. I agree with that. Probably we need to show the two processes in the title of this draft to let the At-Large community; the RALOs understand this is not only for objections, not merely for objections but also for the evaluation panel's consideration.

Otherwise it could very much overlook this part of comments; I believe there are only four objections. Because I see it is actually listed as objection procedure. [Inaudible 00:19:25] thoughtful draft. It is comment two and comment three. I'm going to go back to my old point last time; I agree I look at your flowchart. I like it very much. But I see for the objection procedure it's saying that this is a single procedure that's going to be applied to both community based and limited public interest, is my understanding, correct?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well finish and I will respond.

Hong Xue: Okay sure. To my understanding, of course we can do this but perhaps the community based objection could be in a little bit different nature comparing with limited public interest. Of course this is unique to first of all identify the community and a community should submit the willingness to object a certain string has been applied for the new gTLD, this additional add-on layer to the process. But generally in conclusion I very much like the draft. You have my full support. Back to you Avri, thank you.



---

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Did you want to make a couple of comments on that Dev before I went on to other questions?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay yes, very quickly. Thanks Hong for the comments. With regards to the second comment, yes during the first phase of it, within the first 60 days of the application comment period I just think that it will be too overwhelming to even try to draft possible objections at this time.

My thinking is that if you focus on the 60 days to look at the comments only and then after the 60 day comment period we can then review what the other has been posted by the GAC for example, what has been posted in the public comments and so forth and what has already been posted as comments for the objection grounds and then look to see if that could be fully developed into a proper objection, properly worded objection for ALAC to consider to file.

That was the thinking behind this. In regards to the third question, well the third comment I should say regarding whether who has standing to object regarding the community objections, objecting on community grounds. This was discussed in the last calla and I think the action item was to seek clarification, that this working group seeks clarification from ALAC as to whether ALAC has the standing to object to applications on community grounds. That question is still to be answered. That's it.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you first a number of questions and they may be things that were covered and I missed. I apologize ahead of time if they are. They will be quick, number one, Column 3 that's the number of comments received by on the ICANN comment site?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: No.

Alan Greenberg: Or ours?

- 
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: No on our Wiki page.
- Alan Greenberg: Okay yes.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes the idea is that the Wiki page which is on the second column, that's scanned and then the counts of comments on the evaluation panel's consideration and the number of comments on objection grounds. That is somehow automated.
- Alan Greenberg: Okay how do you imagine or how do you envision these Wiki pages being created and what is going to be on them? Is it going to be a summary of sort of just the string? Or is it a summary of the application or?
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well how I envisioned it to be -
- Alan Greenberg: We're eventually thousands of these.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Correct but that's why we're not creating all of them at the same time. If you notice, for those that do have any comments at all, the Dashboard will have a link possibly to say want to submit comment on whatever on this particular string, when the first comment is received by the review working group, which I've tried to describe on the second page, then the Wiki page is created. There would either be literally only if a comment is received on any gTLD application then a Wiki page is opened up.
- Alan Greenberg: So as a possible commenter I'm going to have to look at the ICANN page, note what the string is and then go to the At-Large Wiki and say I want to create a comment on this string?
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes and the first column would have a link to the formal application that's on the ICANN website wherever that may be.
- Alan Greenberg: So we're not going to try to index all of them, just have the user go there themselves.
-

- 
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well on the first column you will have the entire list because of the gTLD applications and then only the second, third and fourth columns are filled when we start adding comments.
- Alan Greenberg: Okay that wasn't clear, okay.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay sorry yes.
- Alan Greenberg: The table will have a thousand entries or whatever in it but presumably the ones with comments will be at the top or something like that?
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: That's right. The idea is that those that have comments and it's counted, it then rises to the top. And that's the idea. And I question to consider was of course having a thousand well should we have a thousand entries on it? Or should we try to segment it in some way? Because scrolling up and down would be I think -
- Alan Greenberg: Are we going to try to put on this Dashboard anything to support the process of deciding whether At-Large will make a formal comment, not comments into us, but are we going to make a comment.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Correct, yes the idea will be that at the end of the fourth week, remember it's eight weeks for the comment period. At the end of the fourth week ALAC will then or this working group tasked could review the comments and then decide okay let's synthesize a comment similar to the public comment.
- Alan Greenberg: Okay we may want columns to track that process also.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Good point.
- Alan Greenberg: If nothing else we know what's doing and other people can see what is the comment we submitted on this string.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes so probably a fifth column to say 'Status' of comment being drafted or -
-

- 
- Alan Greenberg: Yes.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: That could work.
- Alan Greenberg: And possibly the same thing for objection process in the period after that. Okay thank you.
- Avri Doria: Thank you, Cheryl you're next.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Avri. I just wanted to obviously say great work as well as the others have, thank you Dev. But I also want to give you time to get through the next week. The only reason I put my hand up was just to pick up on what Andrew Mack said about the familiarity and comfort zone using Wikis. I think two things are going to happen here.
- First of all if we keep our heads based in this very much being an At-Large process they're probably more familiar than many other parts of the ICANN and wider community, so I'm not overly concerned there. But I would want to make sure and we might need to pick this up as a note to the flowchart Dev that any announce going out to the list and that is our copy of the list, the one that goes on our master Wiki agent reference to Column 1, obviously also has a monitored email address that allows - because we're not opening up lists for discussion here but -
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Absolutely, yes.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We certainly should have a monitored by someone. It may as well be - it can go the group, it can go to the review team email address so that a simple I don't like .dog and here is why because I represent the dog community and therefore blah, blah, blah. And so that will allow another way of capturing and of course it's ALAC and I think most of the regions practice now, it's certainly ALAC's practice that anything received to an email list or in this case an email box gets copied across as a bonafide comment to the relevant Wiki page anyway.
-

---

I think we can capture that but I do think we do need to make the note that that source of input is sort of standard operational procedure on the amounts and push out information. That's the sort of thing that staff and Silvia, working with the regions would be handling quite directly. The other things is of course we're all going to get a whole lot more used to Wikis and Wiki works as the normal public comments interface for ICANN becomes Wikis. Again we will get more in the next round after that and I'm less concerned about thousands on the list when we know the maximum will be 500 in any given batch.

We can therefore be fairly confident that we will be handling them in the batch size. Should a list of 3,000 names come in, we can already sort to Batch A, B, C, D in that column [inaudible 00:29:27] system as well. I think that will also help when you've got commented on and live links going to the top of the pile and you only have a maximum remembering under normal circumstances they would be in alphabetical order or whatever.

We could probably superimpose a by batch as well which should [inaudible 00:29:46] them down a little bit, thank you.

Avri Doria:

Thank you Cheryl. I have Alan on the list next. I have one question for you myself and this is for Cheryl I think. How is it that you're certain that we will only be doing comments and objections on a per batch basis?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

I'm sure we would be taking comments on all of them but we only need to process the 60 days will only go live on batch sizes.

Avri Doria:

Okay I guess I missed seeing where that was written but thank you. Do you have a reference for that? Or I will put that on the list of things that we need to confirm because -

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

We probably need to have that confirmed but as I understood if 3,000 names are going to be on the close of a round infinite number, close as possible inserted number, if 3,000 names happen

---

to come in or if 750 names come in, it will be capped up [inaudible 00:30:58].

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Yes Dev are you trying to say something or is that Alan?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes I do. Actually regarding what Cheryl was saying, yes indeed but not creating email lists for every single gTLD application. That's why we're doing it on the Wiki. And on the second page of that process I do try to describe a process whereby the review working group basically is responsible for maintaining and updating the Wiki from comments received by the RALO list or during if they attend a RALO monthly call and there are some comments made they should be taking note of that and putting that into the comments on the Wiki itself and also if they're receiving it by our direct email. That's the intention.

We've gone through the batching process and Cheryl you're right it is only going to be 500 at any given time. It may be 1,000+ applications but then it will be released in batches of 500. I'm not sure of the timing of how the batches will be released though, that's the only concern. And then what potentially could happen is that they might have overlapping 500 batches which well -

Avri Doria: Okay well.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: [Inaudible 00:32:24].

Avri Doria: It just sounds like something we should get facts on and come back to as opposed to speculating at this point.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay.

Avri Doria: So probably should be put down in our action items is get clear understanding on how batching will work with the comment and objections schedule. Alan?

- 
- Alan Greenberg: My hand was raised on the same subject because I asked the question last meeting and both Avri and Dev were absolutely positive that the 60 day comment period starts the day that the application names are announced, essentially immediately after close of the application round.
- And batching - assuming there is going to be batching, that's going to take ICANN a fair amount of time to establish how the batches are divided because it's not a trivial process because of overlapping names and potential ones that compete with each other. That process is going to take a while. I will just reiterate what you just said, we need to verify because there is a very big difference and if the comment period starts the day the application round closes which I'm not an expert on this but several people were sure that's the case, that can't correspond to batches.
- Avri Doria: I will take it on myself as my action item and others can do it too, to get that one. The folks in the knowledge base question and answering for the new gTLD program are used to seeing emails from me asking all sorts of questions.
- Alan Greenberg: That's fine.
- Avri Doria: I will just file another question.
- Alan Greenberg: I would have thought this would have been clear in the guidebook but maybe it isn't thank you.
- Avri Doria: Yes, the more you read the guidebook the more questions one can come up with.
- Alan Greenberg: The only logical thing is what Cheryl described and what we're thinking it is now but that isn't what everyone thought it was last time. That's why I'm concerned.
- Avri Doria: It's not what I think it is, so that's why I'm taking it on myself and the application of logic to this process is often a very scary thing to try and do. Okay Dev did you want to keep taking us through this?
-

---

I think it's important that we keep working through your plan. I think we've covered very well your Dashboard and some of the issues and if you would like, go back to the process.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Sure so if you're going back to the process flowchart, I've talked about how the gTLD review group would ensure that the information from the ICANN new gTLD Application Results website is imported into the application's Dashboard. And then the review group then posts updates to the RALO lists that the Dashboard is available and you can now track comments and from there also click on the applications and review them directly. That's what happens in the first week of the application comment period. But if not I would say like four days from the start.

On the second page which is Figure 2, this is trying to describe up to week four of the application comment period. At the beginning of each week, the working group posts the status update of all the changes to the Dashboard. For example, number of comments received on which gTLD applications to the At-Large and RALO list. Now does the review group receive or see comments about any gTLD application for the evaluation panel's consideration or on objection grounds.

Well I put some notes here about the evaluation panel's strength similarity, et cetera and if the objection grounds, which is limited public interest and community. And then so the comments can be received by the review group either directly from the ALS RALO ALAC members via direct email or seen on the RALO mailing list or noted during a RALO ALAC call. If it does receive any comments, does the gTLD application have a Wiki page created?

If so then the ALAC can then post and add a comment directly on that Wiki page. If not, the review group then creates the Wiki page for the very first time and then places the comment on the Wiki page crediting the source and the author of the comment. And also within that week if there are any RALO meetings, the review group members - and this is why it's important then to have



---

membership from all of the RALOs in that review group - will then attend those meetings to give the updates of the comments and then note any discussions and then updates the relevant gTLD Wiki pages and creates new ones if need be.

And then essentially just repeat that process until it's the end of the week. And then at the end of Week 4, after the application comment period if there are no, start back again, post the status update of changes and repeat until Week 4. And that was what I was able to draft. I have the ideas pretty much mapped out in my mind as to how it will continue. But this is essentially the process.

And the matter for developing objection statement to be considered by the ALAC follows the logic from the first version just using the Wiki to look at the objection comments, then from that deciding to create a working group to draft the objection statement for RALO consideration and so forth. So that's it I think.

Avri Doria:

Okay thanks. I guess one thing is we're not quite ready to send something out to the RALOs for review until you've been - and this is an amazing amount of work that you have done in the last two weeks - so I guess one thing that still needs to be done before it's ready to send to the RALOs is the completion of the process. Is that a correct assumption?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Yes, I guess, yes. But what's described on the first two pages is the essence of it though. There is essentially going to be an At-Large working group that will be charting the comments and updating the Wiki comments pages for any gTLD application. And then the ALAC could then review those comment pages in one location and then decide how it wants to process it or whether it's the new this working group that will be looking to draft comments or synthesize one comment based on the comments received.

Avri Doria:

Yes, I definitely understand that. It just needs to be there for people to -

- 
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes.
- Avri Doria: The other thing is once we do put this out for the RALOs how long a comment period do we need to give it? I don't know the norm within RALO commenting cycles.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well you always have to respond within the public comment period of 30 days, it's a very short time typically that RALOs have to respond anyhow. Even when a draft comment is published for all the RALOs to review and then RALO comments are received and then a final statement is readied for ALAC to then vote on.
- Avri Doria: In this case I don't think we're going for vote in terms of - and I'm talking about us putting the plan that you've been creating out to review for the RALOs. That would be a 30 day. I'm just trying to gauge that -
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Oh, I see well I could be wrong. I think we have enough time to have this process submitted. I imagine this timing will be just before Costa Rica. I think I can push hard and get the rest of this flowchart submitted this week or by Monday, the beginning of next week. And then we can then issue it to the RALOs for comments.
- Avri Doria: Right, that was my question. Heidi what is our deadline for the 'You must have documents published by this date to be discussed at Costa Rica' date? Is that February 3?
- Heidi Ullrich: No I believe it's 15 days out. Let me see if I can get that information.
- Avri Doria: Okay so basically we should make sure that whatever that date is that's a date we can meet for releasing this. And then I guess we would schedule the comment period to - the 30 day comment period would probably be after the Costa Rica meeting which would probably be a fine thing. Any comments, yes Alan I see a hand, please?
-

- 
- Alan Greenberg: No comment on that. Going back to the previous discussion of timing, I just went into the applicant guidebook and it's very clear. It says that ICANN will post the full list within two weeks of the close of the deadline and the 60 day comment period open then. And the roughly seven month objection period opens then. And batching is going to be based on a secondary timestamp which that process will only start after the close of the deadline and we don't know what it is yet.
- Avri Doria: Right.
- Alan Greenberg: So the current wording seems to be very clear. This is all in Sections 1.1.2.2 up to 1.1.2.6, it's very clear that the whole thing is done in one fell swoop. They may change that, but that's what it says today.
- Avri Doria: That had been my impression. That's why I was so certain last week. But with Cheryl being certain it was otherwise I figured I had to go back and check.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Avri the batches won't be running consecutively. The batches will be handled in a one, two, three, four order within that seven month period.
- Alan Greenberg: Say that again.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: There is no point in batching, the sift and sort into batches has to occur and then they need to be managed in that order. Now it might all start in that seven months but there is anything that is clearly problematic or clearly needs more work is not going to be start at the same time as others, as things like just waiting to see what the public [inaudible 00:44:34].
- Alan Greenberg: That may be the case for the evaluation -
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: [Inaudible 00:44:37] later but they can't all - all the batches can't run in sequence.
-

- 
- Avri Doria: I think the question that's coming up is, yes of course you're right they will evaluate them in the sequential batch methodology. But will the comment period and objection period be any different for them? And that's the question that needs to be confirmed and others.
- Alan Greenberg: The applicant guidebook is clear. Now it may be stupid and it maybe they need to change it but at this point it's very clear that all of the comments and all of the objections may be raised years potentially ahead of the actual evaluation process for any given application, as it's written today.
- Avri Doria: Right it's kind of like [inaudible 00:45:27] studies reading the applicant guidebook. I will go and see what confirmation I can get. Okay -
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If there was years then the spect [inaudible 00:45:42] of secondary pseudo comment periods come up and that would be something very difficult to handle I would've thought.
- Avri Doria: I - yes. I was going to say at this point I would like to defer this particular conversation until we gather a bit more information. Alan your hand is still up?
- Alan Greenberg: Oh no, sorry down.
- Avri Doria: Okay thank you. I noticed that the document deadline for Costa Rica is 17 February. We still have time. But because we need to get this objection process reviewed and approved, reviewed, revised and approved, I would prefer not to wait if possible until the 17 February to get it out. And if we can get it out for review in the next week or two, I think that would be great. I think the other thing that needs to be added to it and I can start drafting this today and sort of take a little bit of the burden off you, is just a cover sheet that sort of says what this is.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Right.
-

---

Avri Doria: And also talks about the parallel processes going on in terms of finding out about Dashboard creation, methodologies and what's going on in the GAC, et cetera. If you want, I can help get a draft up of that cover note out in the next week also. Perhaps at the next meeting we can sort of say this thing is ready to ship out to the RALOs. I know I'm pushing on it but I see May 1 coming up real soon now and we don't have that much time.

Forgive me for pushing but I will do some help also. Anyone else wish to comment on this work and again I appreciate - I want to express my appreciation for the work being done because this is a major chunk of effort. Anyone else have any other comments. Okay thank you Dev.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Sure.

Avri Doria: Moving on in the agenda, the next thing as I said was the update on the Applicant Support Program. It's been a week since I have heard anything. I expected follow-up. I sent email off yesterday to Kurt and Chris saying "Hey I expected follow-up on where we were going next in this process." And I'm still waiting to hear. I don't know if any of the rest of you on the subteams have heard anything?

Alan Greenberg: No, nothing.

Avri Doria: Alright so I will push on that. Basically at one point I had said of course take a little bit of time to figure it out, I will be patient. But they've crossed that time limit so now I'm going to start pestering them until I get an answer. Anything else to add on that, as I say, I don't have anything. Okay the next thing was an update on our third chartered work item.

Cintra is going to give an update on anything. And as I told Cintra if in a week nothing special has happened that needs to be reported on, then that's the report. But Cintra is here.

---

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you Avri. I just ask staff to take notes please, thank you Heidi. Well there is nothing really to report on this segment of the agenda except to say that I came across an article which was written by Alexa Rod and it's quite [inaudible 00:49:57] it's [inaudible 00:50:00] let me just copy the link for you. And just to summarize her article she talks a bit about with the large number of new gTLDs coming to the root at the same time, a problem may arise in the user experience through lack of updated procedures and communication timeframes regarding the application software vendors.

Now this [inaudible 00:50:39] deal with the gTLD program right now but I do think it's something that we should look at later on when the applications are approved. She [inaudible 00:50:53] software and application providers who as a result of information of updated procedures are perhaps unwittingly end up blocking a new gTLD.

There is also a comment to this article by [inaudible 00:51:15] and he says he had this problem with the .info as well. he was saying that he lost five years of running [inaudible 00:51:33] working with many vendors to get their systems to accept info being a [inaudible 00:51:39] TLD. And 10 years later the problem still has not gone away. I don't know how the group feels about this or if there are any other issues that you want to raise during this section, thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you, any comments, questions?

Alan Greenberg: I have a very brief one.

Avri Doria: Yes Alan please.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not sure that we can do an awful lot about this. It is going to be interesting however. The concept of three letter TLDs is now over to some extent although as Ram says there are still applications that don't know about four letter ones. The concept of

---

a 25 letter gTLD which may exist is going to be really interesting. I'm just looking for all the fun. And I wonder to what extent people are considering that when they are picking application strings.

Avri Doria: I'm sure many people are and most of the strings you look at in the list that various people are showing are not much longer than museum.

Alan Greenberg: I wonder how many people are still running Internet Explorer which if a URL does not end in something it recognizes it add .com onto it. So we're going to see you typing something .bank and it will say no you really mean .bank.com. It's going to be fun.

Avri Doria: It is but the internet does adapt. Users do adapt. That's the whole interesting thing about the growth on that. Users and applications do seem to learn new things really quite quickly on the internet, not at all like our parents.

Alan Greenberg: And people also still use 10 year old software.

Avri Doria: And some people are satisfied with it.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Avri Doria: For some people they will never see anything other than clicking on a web interface. Any other hands, any other issues?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: My question is is this something that we should look at as a working group that we should perhaps write a policy document on or speak to any of this within ICANN, the ISOC or something like that? Is there any action that we should be taking with regards to this issue? It is going to happen.

Avri Doria: I would recommend that we start to build a list of these issues on the Wiki and try and talk about it on lists, on Wikis, on other communication media to see if there is further. Certainly I don't see it being something we decide today but I think we should

---

decide to add it to the list. It does seem like an issue that we should at least watch out for.

And if somebody comes up with an idea of what we could suggest or discuss, I think that would be great. Perhaps we can on the Wiki, there is a section for the new gTLD issues, and perhaps we can just start a running list there and also start collecting comments.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Okay.

Avri Doria:

Anything else, we have five minutes left to hour. The next thing is pending action items not covered. If there are no other issues on gTLD, I see no hands, no hands. Okay looking at the action list, I see two items on it; one is At-Large staff to ask GAC support staff for information re GAC automated system for objections. We did talk about that a bit today. We understand that they are building one system and that we are going to try and set a time when a few of us making sure that it includes Dev and other interested folks in such things.

But we can set a meeting to sort of find out what's happening with the GAC on this and to get the notions Dev has been preparing on making sure that those ideas are thrown into the pot too, just to see what can come out. There is an assumption that ICANN staff will probably only build one system, so we should get involved early enough to make sure it includes the things we think we need. Any further comment on that issue? Olivier, yes please?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:

I'm sorry I've just made it on the call now I was on the call prior to this. With regards to the GAC system, I am in touch with the person on the GAC who is dealing with this specifically and a first prototype is being built. We should hear more within the next couple of weeks. I have been told by them that we will be able to then have a look at the system that is developed for the GAC. At the same time I'm planning to get Dev involved to start sharing the work that he has presented today basically, the flowchart and see



---

with ICANN whether this could be integrated in the automated system or what can be integrated in there.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I hope I haven't repeated what's already been said on the call.

Avri Doria: No you haven't. The one thing I would add to one of the things that Dev showed today was not only the map but also a Dashboard as it were that he has conceptually produced and that is something that would definitely. I think getting Dev involved as soon as possible is probably a really good idea.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay anything else further on this action item? No, okay the second thing on the list is At-Large staff in cooperation with Cheryl Langdon-Orr to create a Wiki page for the history of ALAC's gTLD statements, et cetera.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think that's still -

Avri Doria: Because it's hard to get around to creating a Wiki, it just takes work. Okay that will sit on the list for another week.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well hang on, not only did I create the page, I've populated it with a very extensive book of words and we dealt with it like three meetings back.

Avri Doria: Oh okay so I guess I had gotten into thinking that this was - great.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I would be delighted for more -

Avri Doria: Alright we should probably put a walk through or talk through of it on an upcoming meeting once we've sort of gotten rid of the worst work that needed to be done on that. Okay great, so that one gets marked closed. Okay we have got one minute left before the hour, is there any other business of any other sort that came up while this meeting was ongoing? I hear nothing.

Next week's meeting, one of the things we will have on the schedule is looking again at the need for the weekly meeting, while I think we may need another one or two, I think that we are getting to a point where perhaps we can go to a biweekly schedule, I would like to discuss that. Also I'm going to ask staff to help me take a look at our attendance over the last I guess six weeks to determine whether this alternating time has been working and such so that topic will be on next week's meeting.

If you have things to say about it, or think about it, please contribute them to the list to get us going before then. Any last words? In which case, thank you, have a peaceful year of the dragon and any other kinds of years you are starting and have a good week all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thanks Avri.

