

Oliver Crépin-Leblond: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. This is the At-Large new gTLD Review Group. It's the first call of the Review Group. I'm Olivier Crépin-Leblond for those of you who have not heard of me yet. I'm saying this because there are several new faces or some old faces that we haven't seen for a while, so welcome to all of the new faces; welcome to the old faces we haven't seen for a while and we see again and of course, welcome to those people who we see and speak to more often than our families sometimes, but that's another story.

So I wanted to thank all of you to join us on this call and certainly to welcome you all as part of this Review Group which is receiving a very important task of dealing with all of the objections that might be received through the channel of the At-Large Advisory Committee. But we'll start with a roll call and then a few more things after that. So I'll pass the floor over to Gisella who is going to go through the roll call. Gisella?

Gisella Gruber: Welcome today to everyone on today's call. We have Carlton Samuels; Olivier Crépin-Leblond; Rudi Vansnick; Fatimata Seye Sylla; Justine Chew; Dev Anand Teelucksingh; Marcelo Telez; Kenny Huang; Garth Bruen; Dave Kissoondoyal; Seth Reiss; Aziz Hilali and Fouad Bajwa. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich; Matt Ashtiani and myself, Gisella Gruber. Apologies noted today from Adela Danciu. I hope I haven't left anyone off the attendees list.

---

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

---

If you haven't joined us yet on one of these calls, if I could please remind you all to mute it is \*6; to unmute it is \*7 and also if you happen to be on the Audio Bridge and on the Adobe Connect Room, if I could kindly ask you please to mute your computer speakers; also if you would kindly state your name before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you, Olivier.

Oliver Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Gisella and you do this so well. There's just one thing that you've not asked is whether we've missed anyone in our full list of people who are currently present. Have we not spoken your name yet and you're on the call? Anyone? No? Oh, I see Alexander Kondaurov has just arrived as well, so welcome.

When we're so many people on the call, I guess when you have a question or you would like to speak, then you can make use of your Adobe Connect little figurine on the bar at the top. There's a little person with a hand up and you click on this and it will give you a set of options underneath there, including the "raise hand."

So if you put the raised hand as you'll see next to my name, the hand goes up and then the system will automatically put everyone who's raised their hand in the order of first come/first served and it's really easier for the person chairing the meeting to be able to find out who has questions and who had questions first.

The chat of course at the bottom of the screen is also open and sometimes the Chair will be reading from the chat. This call is, as I mentioned earlier, the first call of the Review Group; a very important

---

task which was given to the At-Large Advisory Committee. It's the first time the ALAC is actually given a task that is an operational task. The ALAC itself usually has the function of commenting on processes; on sending comments to the Board to public comment processes, basically commenting on everything and anything that happens at ICANN.

But it is the first time because the fact that we do have very privileged links with the community outside of ICANN and with the internet end user, that the ALAC has the ability to actually be a channel for objections to the new gTLD applications. And so bearing in mind that there will be a lot of new gTLD applications, there might be an undetermined number of objections that might be filed through the At-Large Advisory Committee. So this Review Group is the group that will be shifting through those and finding the merits of the objections or the lack of merit in any objection and then making some sense out of them and passing them on over to the ALAC for voting.

It's a very very important task and it's one which is important because it really has to be undertaken on a worldwide basis and by people who are not conflicted in any way. You might have seen that there are a lot of people that are in ICANN circles, both volunteers, but also contracted parties by their very definition who are conflicted in the working that they do. In fact some people on the Board are conflicted as well and this is the reason why a subset of the Board was created of non-conflicted Board members to take decisions on any gTLD-related matter.

Similarly here the selection process that you all went through was pretty thorough in order to make sure that you – to the best of the

---

knowledge of the At-Large Advisory Committee, but also to the best of the knowledge of your own region – are not conflicted and the pressure is really on your.

If your status changes and at some point you are involved with an application, to actually say it and announce it to everyone else and announce it to the Working Group because it might actually not only hinder your chances of taking full part in the discussions, but also it might weaken the overall ALAC process of being able to file objections.

So I do ask all of you to have consideration for your colleagues in being truthful in telling what your conflicts are or if you do not have conflicts. But thank you to all of you for taking on this task. It's very important. It really is a milestone in the ALAC and it's really great to see so many of you from around the world - all continents are actually represented here.

It's probably going to be a task that will last for quite a while because, as you will have heard, some of the work that... well, some of the applications... the number of applications that have been filed – there appears to have been about 1,500 to 2,000 applications which means that the Board will divide those applications into batches and they might not all be launched at the same time.

The actual evaluation period is also a big unknown, whether that will be extended or not. There's still a lot of question marks, but certainly starting from the 13<sup>th</sup> of this month – which is in two days time – this Review Group will know the size of the task ahead. And I guess we all hope that there will not be any work for this group. We all hope that there will not be any objections.

---

Certainly in a perfect world no one would be objecting to anything and no application would be controversial. Unfortunately, we live in the real world and whilst the bottom-up multi-stakeholder processes are things that work very well on paper, when they actually are applied in the real world, it makes things a little bit more difficult.

And certainly this is going to be a test of the multi-stakeholder model as we have a look at the applications and find out if they are suitable or not and if there are any objections to those and how many objections will be filed *via* our process is another question.

So I think that's a sort of overview of what's happening here. The actual work of the Working Group itself is going to be described as we go on in this call today and we're going to have Dev who's going to speak to us about the actual review of the ALAC procedure to submit public comments and also to submit objections to the new gTLD applications.

Then we'll have some questions and answers... well, questions; not sure about the answers. Hopefully there will be answers. And then we'll have an actual five minutes that Dev will be speaking to us about the operation of the new gTLD Review Group itself and another five minutes on the next steps. I think I've covered pretty much everything here. I wonder whether we should... Heidi, have I covered everything; just asking.

Heidi Ullrich:

This is Heidi. Yes, Olivier, I believe you've covered everything that I would have said as well.

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, right, well thank you. Any comments at this point? Any questions because one thing you will note. We'll often ask questions and comments. This is not a one-way process. You're not in a classroom where you're being taught something and then you're not saying anything and you're also not at an institution based in Geneva that works in a slightly different way, perhaps more top-down than bottom-up. So you're very welcome and encouraged to ask questions and to take fully part of the discussion here. I see Fatimata has put her hand up. So Fatimata, you have the floor.

Fatimata Seye Sylla: Yes, hello everybody. Thank you, Olivier, for this interaction. My question is about the number of applications. We have more than 2,000 applications and I was just reading Alan's writing on my screen saying that we have to deal with all applications regardless of whether an application is (inaudible) in the first part or in the batch. So maybe if that is the case, maybe we have to organize ourselves. I don't know how we can read all the applications and then comment in a very short timeframe.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, thank you, Fatimata.

Fatimata Seye Sylla: So my question is how are we supposed to go about this?

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Yes, thank you, Fatimata. I think that the Working Group itself will have to work this out and that's just my view. I'm the Chair of the ALAC; I'm not the Chair of the Working Group. The interim Chair of this Working Group will be Dev Anand Teelucksingh because he was a key architect of the actual process on this.

And I guess probably one of the first tasks that this Working Group will do is to organize itself and find out, as Alan mentioned, it might be that the comments and objections for all the applications have to be done at the same time regardless of whether the application is in the first, second or third or fourth batch. There is also a question as to whether there might be an extension of time to object or to deal with those.

Certainly some feedback that I have received from the GAC – this is unofficial so far, but some of the feedback is if 1,500 applications have to be looked at and filtered and processed, the GAC will ask for more time to look at these because, as you rightly say, Fatimata, it would be a huge task as well.

But the function of the GAC might be different to the function of this Review Group. The GAC itself would effectively be filing advance warnings as well and would have to consider each and every application. I think that this Review Group here would be looking at those that already have an objection raised against them. I might be wrong and this is something that perhaps someone else might be able to help me on. Alan?

---

Alan Greenberg: No, I was going to comment just on that – that my understanding is this group is there to react to and evaluate comments and requests for objections made by other people. So it is not this group’s responsibility to act as the gatekeeper for all applications.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That’s right, yes.

Alan Greenberg: So if no one has a comment and no one has any objection, then this group has nothing to do. I’m not saying it’s going to be easy. It may be quite onerous based on what the volume is, but we don’t know that at this point.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan. Fatimata, any follow-up question?

Fatimata Seye Sylla: Yes, I want to understand more about what Alan just said. Maybe if you say it again I will understand more about what we’re going to comment because I think I overheard that you said that our comments would be then doing something. Is it right?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I didn’t quite catch that. Sorry, Fatimata, I didn’t quite hear you. What’s going to happen, Fatimata, is this Review Group will be looking at any objections that would be filed *via* the ALAC objection process. So



---

it does not need to look at single application that is made and comment on each one of the applications or to filter all of the applications.

What this Review Group does is to review any, as I said, any objections that would be raised in the community or that would be raised outside the community and that would be channeled through this process.

Fatimata Seye Sylla:                      Okay. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:                Thank you, Fatimata. And so perhaps now it's time for me to pass the baton over to Dev Anand Teelucksingh who will be able to speak to us about the actual procedure itself on submitting the comments and on the filing of objections.

Roman Pelikh:                              Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:                Yes, who is this?

Roman Pelikh:                              Hi, this is Roman. I just wanted to make sure you guys know I'm on the call now.

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Ah, Roman, welcome - Roman Pelikh from IT. Thank you, Roman. You might wish to go on the Adobe Connect as well so you won't be left out because Dev will probably be pointing us over to some diagrams in the course of his introduction. Dev, the floor is yours. Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

Roman Pelikh: I would be happy to, but I'm driving so that would be kind of tough. I'll try to follow as much as I can and answering questions as they come up or if Dev can answer them or [point to the particular links] that would be great.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Roman, thanks for joining us whilst you're driving and I'll take exception whilst you're driving on this occasion, of course, because I wouldn't expect you to be surfing the net as you're driving at the same time, although in some countries that might not be seen very positively by the police. I'll let Dev now take over for me. Dev, you have the floor.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you, Olivier. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. My name is Dev Anand Teelucksingh and I just want to give an overview of the actual procedure by which we can submit comments on and file objections to new gTLD applications. The PDF is linked in the agenda and I posted that in the track so people can open them up in a separate window if they wish. So I just want to try to go through it as briefly as I can, although it's quite detailed.

---

So, June 13 is going to be the reveal date when ICANN is going to publish all of the applications on a new gTLD website and that will start two key activities. That is the application comment process which starts for 60 days from June 13 to August 12 and anyone can submit comments to express any issues to be considered by the evaluation panel that will be conducting the initial evaluation of the new gTLD application and it also starts the objection period.

Now this is where anyone which has grounds to object can submit a formal objection to any of the new gTLD applications and it's approximately seven months to file from June 13 to actually file a formal objection to any of the applications received.

And just to answer quickly with these questions, this document was created with the original in March so tentatively the reveal date was supposed to be on May 2012 but due to the errors in the TAS and the reveal has been delayed and the submission process was delayed and so forth. So now the new dates are June 13 and the end of the application comment period is August 12. So I'm going to now scroll ahead and actually just go to the actual chart itself and then we will just look at the various things of what the new gTLD Review Group is supposed to be doing.

Before the start of the application comment period – we have now completed this task timefully – that is, the Review Group is now holding its meeting to review its operating procedures.

Now within the first week of the application comment period from the 13<sup>th</sup> to the 20<sup>th</sup>, ICANN will be publishing everything on June 13. The Review Group will notify all of the RALOs, the At-Large mailing list that

---

the applications are now public and this marks the start of the application comment period.

Now between Week 0 and Week 1 it was anticipated at the time that the Review Group would have to somehow import all the information regarding gTLD applications into the dashboard. Thankfully – thanks to Roman and the design of the new applications dashboard – this task is no longer really needed. On tomorrow’s call we will actually look at the dashboard and see how we don’t have to import any of the information. All of the information can be accessible from the dashboard.

Carlton Samuels: Do you mean all of the information on the objections or all of the information on the applications?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thanks, Carlton. This is all the information linked to the detail the applications.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. Thank you, sir.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Sure. So from Figure 2 which is up to July 11 of the application comment period, the Review Group is going to be doing several things – receiving the comments from the At-Large either *via* email or indirectly by attending the RALO conference calls and updating comments during those calls; updating the new gTLD Wiki which will also update the gTLD

---

dashboard; giving status updates to the RALOs on which new gTLDs receive comments each week – keeping all of the RALOs informed because again, there’s only a 60-day comment period so you have to keep reminding the RALOs, “There’s only so much time left. Please send your comments,” and so forth. So that’s what happens from week up to July 11.

Just to be clear, just a small question for staff. Is this thing un-synced so people can move this thing around or...?

Matt Ashtiani: Hi, this is Matt. Yes, I do not have it synced.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, so people can zoom in and zoom out and so forth – that’s excellent. So after the end of Week 4...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It’s excellent... Dev, it’s Olivier here. It’s excellent as long you tell them where to zoom in and zoom out. [laughs]

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you. Okay. So we are looking at Figure 2 just to make sure everybody is aware. So one of the key processes that’s happening is that the gTLD Review Group will then be updating the comment pages, hearing the comments on RALO calls and so forth. And this process repeats every week. So in fact, on the figure on the next page - which is Figure 2(a) - this goes into detail as to what that process is.

---

And then if there's a comment, it's then added to the Wiki pages either for the evaluation panel which is for the application comment period or an objection grounds which is for the comments that leads it to the objection grounds which is the seven-month comment period.

And it goes into detail as to how the Wiki pages should be created. The idea is that you only create a Wiki page when somebody submits a comment on either consideration for the evaluation panel or for objection grounds.

So the evaluation panel, just to make sure everybody's aware – there are six evaluation panels. One on string similarity; DNS stability; geographic means; technical and operational capability; financial capability; registry services and community priority.

On the objection grounds there are four objection grounds but we are only looking at two of the objection grounds. They are public interest and community objections. Was there a question there? Sorry.

Carlton Samuels:

Just for clarification, the two objection grounds that we are going to be looking at, Dev, these are objection grounds that have to be clearly stated or can we infer that these are the bases for the objection?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

I'm not sure if I understand that question, Carlton. Sorry about that.

---

Carlton Samuels: There are two objection grounds. We receive objections. Do the objections have to be stating the grounds of the objection or is it required for us to infer the grounds of the objection?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, thank you. Actually, no, the grounds for the objection is actually in the Application Guidebook. In the appendix there's some information where I've extracted the text from the Application Guidebook as to the specific circumstances by which limited public interest applies and community grounds apply.

So when it comes time to actually evaluate these comments – the objection grounds comments – we'll have to look very carefully at the two specific things in the Application Guidebook because otherwise anything outside of that, it would not pass well - not necessarily not even pass the ALAC, but not even pass the Dispute Resolution Service Provider. The Dispute Resolution Service Provider will deem it not relevant and will withdraw the objection.

So again, Figure 2 here really talks a lot about how the Wiki pages and so forth and again on tomorrow's call we'll actually go into the interactive aspect of the dashboard on tomorrow's call.

On Figure 3 which is Week 5 – and this is going to be like July 11 to July 18 – this is where we have to do probably a lot more effective work. The Review Group will now have to take a conference call during that week and this depends on whether probably we have to do more than one conference call, depending on the number of comments received

---

and decide should a formal comment be drafted for that gTLD application based on the Wiki comments.

And if the answer is yes, then the ad hoc Working Group comprised of members from this group and possibly members of who actually filed the comment put together a comment for either the evaluation panel or an objection grounds. And then what the Review Group also has to do is then, well, update the Wiki to inform people of the decision made and of course, begin working on the draft. So that's Week 5.

Week 6 and Week 7 which is the July 18 to the 25<sup>th</sup> and I think going up to August 1 – and this is now Figure 4 – the draft comments are posted to the Wiki. If anybody has any comments on that, then people can leave comments on the draft comment and that is then updated to produce the final comment by the end of Week 7.

So we're going to Figure 5 which is Week 8 of the application comment period. This is from August 1 to August 8. The follow-up formal comments are now posted on the Wikis and then the ALAC then begins to consider these comments for whether ALAC itself will submit these as formal comments to ICANN as part of the application comment period. And the ALAC Chair will then do a vote typically for five days or maybe have a conference call and vote on what effects have the comments or not.

Now even if the ALAC does decide not to formally submit the comments, ALAC then and RALOs can then submit these comments to the ICANN public comment form independently. So by the end of Week 8 which is August 8, ALAC will be able to submit its comments during that time.



---

So I think I just want to stop there right at this point before I even go on to the objection grounds and ask if anyone has any questions. I see Olivier has raised his hand. Olivier, please go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Dev. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond for the transcript. I just wanted to ask one thing. The diagrams themselves – I'm not sure if everyone has already seen those or not. They can be somehow a little overwhelming. I just wondered whether you'd be open to answering any questions by email later on if anyone has any question on those? Just reading them like this and putting myself in the shoes of someone who hasn't seen them beforehand might be a little overwhelming in one go.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: This is Dev. Absolutely and by all means. We can also do a Skype chat with anyone. I'd be willing to answer any questions on it and walk them through the process again and so forth. Yes, it was detailed and the reason for the detail was to, well, to try to show that because in the Application Guidebook it talked about having a documented procedure, so I'm showing how At-Large and either – it was a bottom-up consensus driven process and so forth and so on, so hence the detail.

And given the strict timing of 60 days and the possibility of looking at 1,500 applications and trying to comment on all those 1,500 applications – whether people be interested in commenting on them or not – hence the detail required for each week. This has to happen. And of course, the ongoing receiving comments from the At-Large, updating

---

the Wiki and so forth. So any other questions or any other thoughts before I move on to Figure 6?

Okay, so at the end of the application comment period, the objection period is still continuing and that's on Figure 6 which is the third and fourth month of the objection period. It's roughly the same process. The Review Group is still now updating everybody about the objection period. It's still updating the Wiki page based on comments received.

And at the end of the fourth month – this will take it into October 13 – so in fact, this is right just before the ICANN Prague meeting. So I'm just going to skip to 6(e) because 6(e) is just essentially again a repeat of what I've just said except receiving the comments on At-Large; updating the gTLD Wiki; giving the status updates to the RALO each week and so forth.

So going to Figure 7 which is the fifth month and this is from October 13 to November 13 – here is where this Review Group will have quite a bit of work to do and this will be much more complex because this is what the objection process requires.

There will be several conference calls. The Review Group will now review the comments submitted for the objection period and then decide whether a formal objection statement should be drafted for that gTLD application. So after reviewing those comments and it's decided that it would be done, then an ad hoc Working Group with members of the Review Group and possibly those persons again who have made substantive comments regarding comments about the objection on the Wiki page will then work to develop an objection statement.

---

Now the objection statement is something like 20 pages or I think it's something like 5,000 words. I have to double-check the Application Guidebook. So it has to be based on a specific format and I imagine the Dispute Resolution Service Provider will have provided the actual forms and so forth to give better guidance regarding the formatting of the objection statement. I think it's 5,000 words maximum, Olivier. So 5,000 words or 20 pages, whichever comes first.

So the Review Group then has to, of course, inform everybody, "Look, comments are going to be drafted and statements are going to be drafted on this gTLD. You can join this ad hoc working group and help draft the objection statement."

And then at the beginning of the sixth month which is going to be in November to December, the ad hoc Working Group would then have posted a draft formal objection statement and then received comments; probably update the draft formal objection statement and then come up with a final formal objection statement by the end of the sixth month. So by the end of December 13, again because this is now six months from June 13, the final formal objection statement should be ready for the RALOs to review.

And that's what happens on the final chart which is the last month from December 13 to January 13. At this point the Review Group doesn't have to do too much; the bulk of the work has been done. The RALOs now vote on the objection statement by whatever process the RALOs choose and once more than three RALOs have voted to send the objection statement, then the ALAC now considers that advice and then decides on whether to vote to whether to accept the advice or not.

---

And if the advice of the ALAC votes yes or accepts the advice and files the objection, then ALAC will then work with ICANN and file the objection to the Dispute Resolution Service Provider. So that concludes the objection process.

I'm seeing some questions on the chat and of course are there any questions otherwise? I think it's 5,000 words in the Guidebook. Any other questions though? Actually, yes, I've just confirmed the objections are limited to 5,000 words or 20 pages, whichever is less and I'll post a link to that information in the chat. Olivier, please go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Yes thank you, Dev. So it's Olivier here for the transcript. The limitation of 5,000 words, so it's a maximum of 5,000 words. Of course, it doesn't mean that any objection that the ALAC would be filing would need to be 5,000 words and I guess this Review Group would have to look at the format that it wishes to adopt to file the objection through.

I gather there might be a case where the objection itself might come from an At-Large structure in already a pre-formatted way and that this Review Group would have to cut down to 5,000 words perhaps. I gather this is all speculative until we see what the list of proposed new gTLDs is and until we start seeing any objections come through, then we won't really know, would we?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

This is Dev. Well, in the link that I posted it gave us some of the objection and the Dispute Resolution process so again, we have two objection grounds which we can possibly apply – the limited public

---

interest, community and what you have to do, you have to contact the Dispute Resolution Service Provider; you have to file the objection in English and you have to file each objection separately meaning you have to pay the individual fees separately. So if the ALAC was to vote on several objections to be filed, then we have to file a separate objection for each one and pay the filing fees for each one.

It also goes into detail for each objection filed; it talks about your name, contact information as the objector; a statement why you believe you meet the standing requirements; a description on the basis for the objection including a statement giving the grounds you are objecting on and a detailed explanation on the validity of the objection and why it should be upheld. And then you can append any copies of any documents that support your objection.

And again, I imagine at the Prague meeting there's going to be some more information as to probably the formatting of this and so forth. There is a meeting with the Dispute Resolution Service Providers during the Prague meeting, so I guess more details are going to be revealed at that point and closer to the end of the objection period. Okay, I think that's... Since nobody else has any other questions...

So in the end just to clarify, the Review Group or the ad hoc Working Group that is going to be drafting the final objection statement – it has to be in the format exactly, ready to submit as-is to the Dispute Resolution Service Provider. So it's a case of actually meeting what the Dispute Resolution Service Provider has set out in its guidelines which is 20 pages or 5,000 words. And then the RALOs then approve that, and once more than three RALOs give that vote to approve to send the

---

objection, then the ALAC votes on that – whether to accept the advice or not. Any other questions; any other thoughts?

I will recommend that everyone read the appendix because that has the excerpts regarding the grounds for objection, be it for public interest and for community objection, but I don't think we have time to actually go into that for this call. Maybe we might have time on another call. Alright, then if nobody has any other thoughts or questions; and again, I'll be happy to answer any of them off list or *via* Skype.

The next thing is the operation of the new gTLD Review Group. Tomorrow we're going to have a conference call again after we look at the actual dashboard and the actual Wiki updating process. After that June 13 will be the actual reveal date.

Now I'm thinking that given the almost repetitive tasks of the Review Group on a daily basis and then on a weekly basis, somebody has to look at the Wiki whenever somebody wants to post a comment on a gTLD application actually go to the Wiki and create it and so forth. We're going to have to think of a way of how the Review Group wants to organize itself to do that.

Do you want to delegate postings on a daily basis? Okay, this person will be in charge of looking at all the comments received on gTLD applications each day or a group of persons each week and that type of thing. So I do have an idea about that but I'll just throw it out to the group for any comments or any initial impressions.

Okay, well since nobody has any initial thoughts, let me just share mine. I'm thinking at the very first thing on June 13 there's going to be a lot of

---

comments, probably unofficial comments being posted on an official chart, probably on the RALO mailing list and so forth. And I think what will have to happen is that the Review Group members from each RALO should be monitoring that and then looking to... well, if there's a comment on a particular gTLD application, then start the process of creating the Wiki page and so forth.

Carlton Samuels:

May I ask a question, Dev. Are we to be responsible for categorizing the objections? There's a difference between me taking a comment and saying, "Well, is this a limited public interest comment or a community comment," and all that. How would the person be required to identify a comment?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

I would now want the Review Group to try to make that judgment call on his or her own. And again I would say what needs to happen is that that Review Group member would have to contact that person and encourage that person, "Hey, focus your comment into one of these categories." Because again, for the evaluation panel there are six areas – string similarity and so forth.

The thing to do is that if somebody says, "I have a comment on the application for blah-blah-blah," then provided it's a substantive comment, you can go ahead and create the page on the Wiki for blah-blah-blah-blah. And then encourage that person, "Okay, I saw your comment but I'm having difficulty placing it in one of these categories.

---

Help me out.” So, Alan, I see your hand. Maybe you have a follow up on it.

Alan Greenberg:

Yeah, on formal objections I don’t believe it’s a matter of encouraging the person submitting the request to us to identify what the grounds are; I think that’s mandatory. If they don’t tell us on what grounds and which objection process they’re referring to, I don’t believe we should be making a judgment call on it. I think they need to tell us on what grounds they’re objecting of the formally defined allowed ones and then this group makes the value judgment on whether their objection has merit enough and is there interest in pursuing it of this group in conjunction with the RALOs and the ALAC obviously.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Indeed. Thanks, Alan. And that’s good for the objection grounds because there’s really only two grounds – limited public interest or community. It’s the other one for the evaluation panels where it might be a little more tricky like string contention or whether the registry... I think I saw the registry what this applicant has for the registry and I don’t think that is approved yet. They are not allocating enough resources or ill-equipped to handle the application or whatever.

Those two types of comments I think would be a little bit more harder. The objection ones are probably more straightforward. If it’s not a limited public interest or community, then it’s not going to be recorded.



---

Alan Greenberg: To follow up, my comment was specifically on formal objections. Comments do not have to be as well focused and this group is going to have an interesting time processing the comments unfortunately.

Carlton Samuels: Well, this is my reason for asking the question because I wanted it to be clear that objections must be identified and tabbed by the person objecting. And our job is to see whether it makes sense or not in our experience, in our collective... I don't know what's going on but a lot of feedback.

That's the thing I wanted to make sure that it is contextualized. If you're making an objection, it must be formal; you must tag it and tell me what is the basis for the objection. If you're making a comment on any other subject – and I don't suppose that we are even set up to do anything but accept that comments are coming in – and maybe make a good faith effort to categorize them.

I think I am more concerned about the formal objections. Quite frankly the comments here and there – I am not thinking that I should be going over the list for them to make it.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, I got you. I see Olivier has his hand up. Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, thank you very much. It's Olivier for the transcript. I've heard what's being said here and I think just as someone who's observing

---

what the group is going to do, you should really try and reduce the amount of work that you have to do yourselves.

And when it comes down to an objection being filed, the weight and the pressure of the objection has to be on the objectors themselves who are filing the objection. So filing an objection without saying on what grounds they're filing the objection is something which would be very unfair on this group to have to choose to shift through. So that's one thing.

With regards to the comments I would tend to say that what Carlton is saying is probably right. Really the objections process is the important part. The comments – yes, those will be filed, I'm sure, but has less of an impact than an objection would have. So I would imagine the majority of the work that this working group will work on are objections.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Actually, Olivier, potentially the comments can be valuable because remember, the independent objector can only file an objection based on the comments received on ICANN's public comment. So I guess the way to look at it is if you see that there's a lot of objections that need to be done, then maybe the thing to do would be to submit the comments with the interest of well, having it on record – (1) – because also the comments are going to be considered by the Dispute Resolution Service Providers in the event of an objection being filed.

Any comments made would be taken into account by the Dispute Resolution Service Provider and (2) the independent objector can then

---

decide, looking at those comments, then decide to act on those comments and file an objection independent of us. So the comments are not, I would say it can be as important as the objection process.

Carlton Samuels:

This is Carlton. Again going back to what Olivier said. I will not wish to put my own spin on a comment into the objection, into any of the processes, whether that is going to the Dispute Resolution people or to the independent objector.

What I would wish to be able to say is that I have seen these comments, they are for your view. But I would never want to make my own judgments on the value of a comment. Now when it comes to the objections, formal objections; that is where I think that is part of the two that we are concerned about – the community and the limited public interest subject areas.

I believe it is incumbent of us to make a determination as to whether or not the formal filed objections we receive have merit and for it to go forward. I believe that is our job. But passing through comments – no. I'm willing to put a comment up and make it go to whatever channel it wishes to go. But I certainly would not be willing to either detract or augment a comment.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Understood. I see Rudy was also agreeing and Olivier was also agreeing with you, Carlton, so good point. Alan, I see your hand up.

---

Alan Greenberg:

I'll be a dissenting voice. It's a bit late for us to be talking about whether we think comments are important or not. There are two parallel processes that we have set up – comments and objections. We happen to have delegated both of them to the same group, but they are two separate things.

Objections are rather onerous things that we said there's a certain process under which ALAC will take an objection that comes in to this group and then forward it onto ICANN as a formal objection. It's a rather onerous thing. We're saying that someone who has probably made a half-million dollar investment should be rejected and that's not something to do frivolously.

Comments, on the other hand, are a far lighter issue, but remember, it's not only ALAC who makes comments. Anyone can make a comment themselves; they don't need to be blessed by us. The comment process we have set up is that if someone believes that a comment has enough import that ALAC and At-Large should support it and make it not purely on behalf of the original commenter, but on behalf of At-Large and that means support from a number of RALOs which is why we have representation from RALOs in this group.

So yes, comments are not quite as onerous as the objection process, but they're a different process and we can't ignore it because they're not as important. It's a bit late; we've already set up the process to do it and if we think that was wrong, I guess ALAC needs to make some real quick decisions.

But we shouldn't confuse them and it's not this group who's going to make an arbitrary decision on whether a comment is being forwarded

---

on behalf of ALAC on behalf of At-Large to ICANN or not, it's the infrastructure, the RALOs and the people on this committee representing the RALOs are going to have to say, "Yes, this is important to us," or, "No, this is one joker who's make a comment to us and they're free to post it themselves, but we don't think we're going to support it." So they're different processes, but we can't ignore one for the other. Thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, thank you, Alan.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Alan, but you're not disagreeing with us. That's exactly what I've said.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Great. I think I'll address this. I know we're going past the hour even though we had started late. I just want to just read a comment that was put into the chat. I believe it was Eduardo that, "Can we divide the 1,500 applications by the number of people in the group and then make each person responsible for that group?"

Well, I suppose that's an interesting approach and I guess we should consider that for tomorrow's call. It's not one I originally thought of, but I guess I have to think about it and the Review Group should think about it.

My thinking, again, was to allocate certain persons to the process each day. And again, it really depends on whether we are really going to see

---

real groundswell of comments or not, or it's just going to be a trickle of comments and not much activity.

So let me see – what was the agenda items? So the next step... cause we do have to wrap up the call. The next steps – the conference call tomorrow – we will go to the dashboard and everybody will see how the dashboard will be set up to summarize the comments from the Wiki, count the number of comments on the Wiki and so forth.

And so looking at the dashboard we can have an at-a-glance look and see how many comments are being received on the objection grounds, for the application comment side... the evaluation panel – sorry – and so forth.

After that, June 13 will be the actual reveal day. I believe all of the IT stuff will have been completed by then. I believe the mailing list has been set up. I'm not sure if the email for the group has been created so that anyone can email the group directly. I'll confirm that with IT staff and At-Large staff before tomorrow's call.

And I think there will be enough time to actually discuss more of the type of how we're going to operate and so forth. My question is this before we close off. Apart from tomorrow's call, should we try to have another call before Prague or... Justine, sorry. Go ahead. You may be muted - \*7 to unmute.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

It's Olivier here. I believe that she should have her microphone on to enable the audio. If she's connected by the Adobe Connect room; she

---

needs to go by the audio in the room. So you just enable it and say, “Yes, go ahead.”

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well, we’re coming up to 10 minutes past the hour. While Justine sorts herself out, anybody have any thoughts about having another conference call next week? Do we think we need to have that? Rudi, go ahead.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, thank you. Rudi here. I think it is important that we have another call just before the Prague meeting. Maybe some of the participants in this group are not going, so it is important that we have a view on how we are going to be organized and we will have a first view already in two days on the number of applications that could have objections or comments as we will see the names popping up. I’m for another call before Prague.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay. I see Eduardo is agreeing we should have a conference call before Prague since it will be after the reveal date. I see approval from Carlton. Justine, any...? And Eduardo also saying thank you. I’ll confirm with At-Large staff whether that will be possible because of course, if we want to try to have another conference call, it will have to be like either on the Monday or the Tuesday at the latest because everybody will be starting to travel by Wednesday onwards. Heidi has read my mind. Thank you. Heidi, please do ahead.

---

Heidi Ullrich: Hi, Dev. This is Heidi for the record. I think how about next Monday at the same time if that works for everyone that's called in. But also just to point out that the Joint Meeting with the New gTLD and the Review Group in Prague will also review one of the operations of this group. Just keep that in mind as well.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, so you think that we probably might be duplicating effort if we were to have another call before the Prague meeting. Let me confirm something. The Prague meeting session for the Review Group – that will have even more participation?

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, of course.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay. Alright, well with that bit of information probably we don't need to have the meeting then. So we are going to have a meeting in Prague. And I believe the agenda items – it will be again more of a summary of the process of the procedure and so forth. Olivier? And I think we do have to wrap up.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, thank you, Dev. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond for the transcript. You're saying there is going to be a meeting of this group in Prague. Of course, for those people who are funded to go to Prague, they will be able to meet face-to-face. There will be remote facilities and remote



---

participation facility of course set up for those people who are not able to travel to Prague. I thought that was important to mention.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes, okay, indeed. So I would think therefore we probably do not need to have another conference call before Prague unless there were some big changes on the reveal day. So we can look at that and decide that tomorrow but I do think we want to bring this to a close because we are going out of time on this. So I hope to see you tomorrow.

Regarding Justine, I'll be happy to work with you off list and I'll show you the dashboard because if you're not able to make it for tomorrow's call. So I'll work with you after this call and we can go to the dashboard before, okay?

Alright, any other business? Olivier, please go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Dev, I was just going to say quickly, as in any working group and review group, the work doesn't normally take place on the phone and during those conference calls the work also can take place using the Wiki, using the email lists, etc.

And so if you're not able to make it to a call, it's always good that in advance you send in an apology – I'm saying this for those people who haven't taken part into any of our processes, but send a note of apology beforehand so we don't wait for you when the call takes place and we know that you're not going to be able to make it to the call.

---

But if you don't send an apology, as you've noticed, we wait five, 10 minutes and then say, "Okay, we'll start without them," not knowing. That's all. Thank you. Back to you, Dev, and you can close the call I guess. Thanks.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes, I think so. Thank you very much for attending the call. I hope to see all of you on tomorrow's call. We'll go to the dashboard and I just want to thank everyone and thanks, Olivier, also for introducing and for all the contributions. If you have any comments or questions, of course, email me and I will see you all tomorrow. And Olivier has raised his hand once more. Okay, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I was just going to add, Dev – it's Olivier for the transcript – you will have noticed that Alan Greenberg is also here. He's the GNSO liaison for the ALAC so I'd like to thank him as well for being here and I guess he will be around also to be able to help us out on some of the procedural things because he is an absolute expert as far as what's happening in the GNSO Council, something which for those of us not being part of the GNSO Council, sometimes it's a little difficult to understand all the process and procedures. So thanks, Alan.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Indeed, thank you, Alan, and your expertise is indeed appreciated. Okay, so I'd like to thank everyone for attending this call and thanks again to the staff as well. So I think that I will see you all tomorrow and this call is ended. Thank you and have a great day.

[End of Transcript]