
Gisella Gruber: The recording is started, thank you Dev.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay. Good morning, good afternoon and good day to everyone. My name is Dev Anand Teelucksingh. I'm the interim Chair of the gTLD Review Group and thanks for attending this second call on short notice. One more day before June 13th the review date and on this call we're going to be looking at how to use the At-Large New gTLD application dashboard. The idea behind the dashboard is to be able for all of us and for At-Large as well actually, to at a glance see how many comments are coming in to the gTLD applications during the application comment period and for the objection period.

And then afterwards we will be doing some more questions and answers if anybody has any question from yesterday's session you can ask those questions during that agenda item. And then we'll look at next steps. Okay? So with that in mind, can I find somebody to do the roll call; Gisella?

Gisella Gruber: Yes with pleasure. On today's call we have Garth Bruen, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Rudi Vansnick, Carlton Samuels, Eduardo Diaz, Marcelo Telez, Seth Reiss, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Avri Doria, Fouad Bajwa, Dave Kissoondoyal, Aziz Hilali, Alexander Kondaurov. We have apologies from Adela Danciu, Fatimata Seye Sylla, Justine Chew and Kenny Huang.

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.

From staff we today we have Heidi Ullrich, Matt Ashtiani, Silvia Vivanco and Roman Pelikh and myself, Gisella Gruber.

If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes, thank you. Over to you Dev.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Gisella. This is just an acknowledgment to Avri Doria who is the Chair of the At-Large New gTLD Working Group, for attending this call. Thanks for attending. So, all of you should have been given a Wiki account at this point so that you all would be able to access the At-Large Wiki. I posted the link to the dashboard in the chat so everybody can now go to visit it in a separate tab.

But what I'm going to do now is I'm going to share the screen and then talk you through how the dashboard is set up and how we can look at comments during the application comment period and for comments during the objection period. And also, see how we can look at the gTLD applications on ICANNs website also from the dashboard.

Okay so, I'm now going to switch to the New gTLD dashboard right now. Typically when you've logged in, what I like to normally do to give more space, I simply collapse the menu on the left and I do that by clicking on this button here. So, as you can see, there are three tables, the number of comments for evaluation panel; the number of comments on objection grounds, and status of the application.

And there's a fourth table underneath, or four sections I should say underneath, and let me start with that first. And this is the gTLD application status. And thanks to Roman from IT staff, obviously this is

showing temporary or sample data for the New gTLD application. And if you look at it you can see that the applications are in the table where you have the applying entity, the country the application is being submitted from, the actual applied for string, the script whether it is in English or in another language, whether it's a community based application or not which is either yes or no, whether the application is for a geographic name, also a yes or no answer, and the final column shows whether the applicant is applying for applicant support, which is also a yes or no type of item.

As you can see if you load the arrows, that means you can sort the columns so you can see what the – you can sort if by any of the columns there. So if you wanted to sort all of the community based applications, by clicking on the arrow by the community based you could sort them. Now the demo here doesn't show the actual links, the actual hyperlink, but perhaps Roman can answer this question. When the applications are formally published would there be a hyperlink to the actual application itself?

Roman Pelikh:

Yeah the final tool will have a little bit of adjustments to the columns and it will link to the actual applications.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Okay. So there most likely will be a hyperlink probably on the first column which will then take you to I imagine a pdf of the application that has been, that will be published on ICANN's website. You can also search for applied for strings under those drop downs here, what you

can search by. You can search by the applying entity, the region, the applied for string, the IDN, whether it's a community based or geographic name, or the batch number. The batch number is referring to – well this won't be ready on June 13th.

As you know the applications are being batched, so that 500 applications will be first looked at, and then other applications will then be grouped according to a system that is currently in progress right now. So that is the gTLD application status, so that's the first thing. Okay let me just now go back to the top of the dashboard now and now you're looking at the number of comments for evaluation panels.

Now if you're logged in you would see that there's a link here that says "Create new discussion forum" for the application on evaluation panels. The idea being that again, as the flowchart showed we're only creating Wiki pages for whenever a comment is first received for an application for the evaluation panels. And the reason why we want to do that is so we don't have like 1500 Wiki pages unless of course there are comments on those 1500 applications.

So this table is an active table, it's also sortable. So you could sort by the number of comments. The idea being that looking at the number of comments, you can see which gTLD application is attracting more attention. So let me just check over to the sample gTLD application for .blahblahblah. I'm now going to click onto it. So now this sample for the .blahblahblah for comment page for the evaluation panels consideration and every one with the evaluation has seven panels, string similarity, DNS stability, geographic names, technical and

operational capability, financial capability, registry services and community priority.

So this Wiki page is only for that evaluation panel. The objection grounds will be kept on a second, well if there are comments on objection grounds, on another Wiki page. Okay. Now the idea behind the Wiki page setup is that the comments are going to be default for every new Wiki page that's created we're going to create six comments one time. The idea being that it will group the discussion under the various evaluation panels, so that the comments can therefore be targeted towards each of those evaluation panels.

So if you just scroll down to each of these things you will see one for string similarity, one for DNS stability, one for geographic names and so on. And the idea being that when somebody from At-Large wants to make a comment they could go to for example the panel of financial capability and submit a comment. So when I save it, as you can see it's not nested under financial capability. So this allows us to better manage the discussion on the Wiki.

And now if we were to go back to the dashboard and you reload the dashboard page you will now see 10 comments under .blahblahblah. So what the review group has to do during the application comment period is to be able to, when if you receive a comment for the first time on any application for the evaluation panels consideration, a Wiki page has to be created. Now, the downside, well I would say this requires a several steps.

You would have to... While a template can be created that will have this part on top. The problem is you have to manually create the

comment sections afterwards, the six of them. The string similarity, DNS stability and so forth. So unfortunately I don't think, unless Roman you can answer this question, there doesn't seem to be a way to automate this aspect of this Wiki page creation or to have it as part of a template. Is that correct Roman? I noticed that this has now been updated to the new confluence Wiki so I don't know if...

Roman Pelikh: Yeah the template only will create the static it won't create dynamic content.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Right, okay. So now I can't see anybody is raising any hands or any questions, but if anybody wants to ask any questions please do so.

Carlton Samuels: Yes this is Carlton, I am raising my hand.

Heidi Ullrich: And Dev we also have Rudi who's raised his hand and the order looks like it's Carlton and Rudi and then we have as Eduardo as well.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay so Carlton, Rudi, Eduardo. Okay Carlton, go ahead.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Dev, this is Carlton Samuels for the record. A lot of work went into this thing. Can I ask again just two things that we separate

out the comments and we highlight the comments that came into community action limited type of public interest; comment related to limited public interest and community action are those that are most important to the At-Large in general and the ALAC in particular. And it would be good if we have those pulled out.

And there's one other thing that I – and this is at the first level. In the first level you said number of comments for evaluation panels. At that level you could have that. And then you have on the second, just below that just have number of comments on objection grounds. The objection grounds are not clear from this portion and maybe if you have a table, just put a small table, a six column table that just kind of lists all the objections, two here, three there, one there whatever, whatever. That would probably in one sense give more information than going through all of these various pages to look at. Because...

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Okay. Well just to say that I'm going to show you how for the Wiki page for the comments on objection grounds, so I tell you what, when I show you that perhaps it would address your concerns. Because the objection grounds comments are not kept on this Wiki page, this is only for the evaluation panel section. So I will show you the second table on the dashboard which talks about the objection grounds, so it's kept separate. That's why we kept it separately because of the importance of the objection grounds. So I will show you that just now and perhaps that will answer your concerns. Okay. Alright, Rudi, go ahead.

Rudi Vansnick: Thanks Dev, Rudi for the transcript. I'm just trying to figure out who is going to do this work first of all. Maybe I'm skipping or skipping something from the information that we gather, but who is going to create these pages and these subtopics that you are talking about and are presenting now; your evaluation panel?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thanks Rudi. It would be the review group itself. This is one of the housekeeping tasks it has to do regarding this process. Towards the end we'll again bring up the discussion as to how we're going to schedule doing this, but it is us, the review group that is going to be doing this. And mind you once you do it the first time for that gTLD application that's it; it will then stay there. So obviously the concern will be if there are lots and lots of comments. If there's lots and lots of comments then we'll have to create lots and lots of Wiki pages, or it could be that there are going to be few comments on this and it would be a very light housekeeping task. But the answer is it is us, the review group itself that is going to be creating the Wiki page whenever the review group receives a comment from At-Large.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you for the explanation. Rudi again, my concern is that it all starts tomorrow and the day after and yet I don't see how we are going to organize ourselves in such a way that we're going to be able to respond to the immediate flow of comments that could come. You never know. If tomorrow we have a tsunami of comments on the applications, we will need to handle this in a structured and organized

way. So I would like to know today how we are going to divide those among ourselves.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: And that's a valid concern so thanks for that, hopefully we can sort that out today. Eduardo...

Heidi Ullrich: Dev after Eduardo we have Carlton again.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay sure. Eduardo?

Eduardo Diaz: Yes I have a question about the draft prototype Wiki and now I see that you're using a real one. The draft is going away right?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes. The draft will go away.

Eduardo Diaz: Yeah that's why I was confused. And I will ask other questions later on. It looks [like] a lot of work has been put in there.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Oh yes. And just to elaborate a little bit more about the commenting on this is that we're not going to allow for anonymous comments on the page. So that if the person does not have a Wiki account who wants to

post the comment, then they will have to send an email and we will have to put the email address, I believe the email address has been set up, so we're going to have to update this template to have the email address included with it. Sorry, Carlton sorry, go ahead.

Carlton Samuels:

Yes Dev, I just wanted to echo what – this is Carlton Samuels for the record. I just wanted to echo Rudi's concern on the workload and the workflow. This is quite likely this down in the mix work I don't much do that. And I really don't want to go back to it. I'm going to very frank and upfront. I really don't want to get back to this. This business of having to create Wiki pages and so on, it's ticky-ticky work as I call it that I really don't want to do.

And it seems to me that there's an easier way to do this. We are really, there's a lot of work that's gone into this and I appreciate it, but the workflow that comes out of this, in my mind, stems from an understanding that we are going to be totally immersed into this process and do every single thing and look at every single one. I just don't have that sense that it is going to be that way or can be that way. That will be a fulltime, fulltime, fulltime job for me, which I don't have the time for.

And I hate to be asked to do something that requires to be fulltime work that I can't afford and do work that is bad from the start. We have to find a way to consolidate comments into the areas that are of interest to us. And to my mind, the areas that are of high interest to us are those objections that are based on limited public interest and community concern. And to the extent that those come up, the others I

want to know about purely for information, but to the extent that those objections are filed and comments under those areas of objections are made, those are the ones that I really want to know about.

And I have to, we have to find a way to consolidate those comments under those two major headings and highlight them for us; because quite frankly, that's where our interest lies and that's where I would wish to spend the time.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Okay well let me go back now to the dashboard and show you the table and the section underneath that which will show the Wiki pages for the comments on a gTLD application on objection grounds. Like the first table it's also sortable, meaning that we can sort by comment or sort by the page name. Just to also highlight something regarding the Wiki, the Wiki also supports internationalized names. So we can use that in the Wiki title for the application.

So to now look at the number of comments on objection grounds, the gTLD "by any other name," I'm going to click on that. So the idea now is here's an objection grounds. So we have two comments sections, one on limited public interest and community grounds. So the idea is that for anyone wanting to make a comment under the public interest, you click on reply and post that comment. Everybody else can see that comment and they can have a conversation on it, whether they agree with this or disagree with it or what have you.

So again we'll have all of this conversation under limited public interest underneath this first one, and then under the community grounds all of

the comments underneath that one. So that way we can, the comments are grouped Carlton. So hopefully this will address your concerns because you can now see all of the comments on community grounds, all of the comments under limited public interest.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, can I ask then for one clarification?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Sure.

Carlton Samuels: Would it be possible for me on the very first page, for me to see a heading that says “comments under objection grounds” and I have a table that says “total comments,” “limited public interest,” “community objection” and see those sorted out on that very first page so the first thing I see is that? Is it possible to do that?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: That’s an interesting challenge there. If we go back to the dashboard and let me refresh it, you would see that by adding a comment there the comments have now been incremented to three. Now to say segment that number of comments to say two of them are limited public interest and one is community...

Carlton Samuels: Yes. It just gives me a quick heads up of what it is that I’m dealing with right there at the front. And if I want to see details I click on the one

that says limited public interest because that's the one that is nearest and dearest to my heart and I want to look at what the detail of that is and I look at those comments. And my job now is to evaluate the comments and say what does this mean for the remit that I have. Is it credible? Is it rational? Does it fit within the parameters that I am supposed to judge? And can I make a rational judgment and say this is in fact supportable and I will add my name to it.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Right, okay. I think to add the segmented thing into limited public interest and under the community grounds, the only way I can think of to do that – and will Roman please join in if you want to add to this – the only to do it would be to create another Wiki page on it and have one for limited public interest and then another one on objection grounds. But then it gets, I would think, in my opinion, it would then get very tedious in terms of the number of Wiki pages that would be needed to look at these things. I don't know Roman, what are your first thoughts about this idea?

Roman Pelikh:

Yeah you're absolutely right. We have to balance the page crawl versus the ability to sort. I mean there is definitely different layers and as you get more granular the more details you need the more overwhelming the management of it is. So this was a compromise to get to the two sections when we looked at what the requirements were. To split it up that was the most convenient way to get this done. So you still have to have the application information together on the specific TLD so you can see all the comments, whether they're in for objections, whatever

the type of objection grounds are or any comments for the evaluation panels; that was the two main categories.

So as Dev said, yes you can go into more details, but then you increase your management overhead with that.

Carlton Samuels:

Well I really want to have less details to begin with. I only want to get the details if and as when I need it. I mean my job is this, I've got to look at some objections principally on two categories. I want to know how many of them that I have to contend with and then I want to know the details by type. And that is a drilldown issue for me and I really don't want to know it before I want to know it because it just seems to me that, especially if you're going to ask us to create Wiki pages to do all of this, there has to be some way for me to consolidate the data and the information that I have.

Because just looking at the page with some numbers telling me something, if I see a request, a string that has objection and it is heavily in community, then I must start thinking well I've got to know more about this community that is making so much objections. If I see a string in which the limited public interest objection is overwhelming then I know of a different animal to deal with. And that is all from those three numbers, it sets my mind up, it frames the issue for me.

So what I want first of all is to know at a quick glance what I'm dealing with. And then to inform myself so that I can make a rational decision, I want to find the details and not before. We've got to find a way to do

this. And if we're not going to do this way it's going to cost a lot of time and effort and that means you're going to get a bad job.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Alright thanks Carlton. This is Dev. I would say that by consolidating all of the comments on objection grounds on one page, you don't have to go hunting around different sections. So I would think that this was the better way to do it because again if you try to break them up into separate Wiki pages for separate things it's going to get very complex very quickly, and then it will be a huge headache actually to manage it. This way we have one Wiki page on objections for a gTLD application. And then on that page you can see all of the comments under limited public interest grounds and the comments under community grounds.

And also one has to keep in mind each objection ground is a separate application that has to be filed. So in other words if there are comment on objection grounds on limited public interest and community grounds, they have to file two applications, or two statements have to be drafted and voted on and for ALAC to then decide whether to accept the advice of the RALOs and so on. And then two applications and two separate objection fees are then paid for.

So I think this way is the better way to do it because then under public interest you can see the number of comments underneath that and then you can also see it under community grounds. I believe we could probably talk, I will talk with Roman after and see if there is another way to do it, but I'm hesitant to try to do something very different at this time.

Carlton Samuels: Rudi has his hand up Dev, just for your information.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Oh sorry, thanks for that because I'm not seeing, when I'm sharing my screen I can't see the AC room, so Rudi please go ahead. I'm sorry about that.

Heidi Ullrich: Yeah sorry Dev I'm doing other things and Skyping so sorry.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: No problem. Rudi please go ahead, so sorry.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Dev, Rudi for the transcript. Well I'm just trying to figure out is this a job we're going to do in two separated processes with that one, which is the process where we create the Wiki page and we drop in the comment that we receive, and then there is the second process, the panel evaluating the comments obtained and responding to them. Is that the process that you see or do you have another idea about that?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay if I understand the question Rudi, again in terms of creating the Wiki page that is one of the housekeeping tasks that we have to do. But once there's a comment on objection grounds that somebody wants to post on, then it's created for the first time. But in terms of the

comments afterwards, unless there were a lot of anonymous comments coming in that – when I say anonymous comments let me rephrase that.

Persons who don't have a Wiki account, I should say, who are not actually replying in the Wiki and making their comments and so forth, then you have to go manually in and add it on behalf of them because the intention here is not to allow anonymous comments because potentially you're going to get overwhelmed and then the comments become a total mess to sort out.

So that is the housekeeping task we have to do to create the page. I'm anticipating once the page is created, by whichever review group member is assigned that task on that particular day or that particular moment, and it's done the first time and that's it. We don't have to go back to it to – how should I put it – fiddle with the Wiki page so to speak. It's just for the very first time it's done and that would be it. So I hope that answers the question. Are there any more questions?

Okay, the final table of the dashboard is where the status of the applications. So the idea will be that – and this is a table that could be manually updated at the end of the day or every other day, this will be a table that is manually created and edited. And it shows like for example .blahblahblah there is a page on comments for the evaluation panel and a page on comments on objection grounds. And then there's a status message, so you can look at a glance as to what stage in the process – so for example during the fourth week or fifth week for example, during the application comment period you could then update the status to say, when the review group would meet and decide okay draft comment being made, first draft posted, final draft approved and so on.

So one of the tasks we have to do, and I'll probably post this to the list later on, is to come up with the actual status messages that will be used for this third status of the application table. Let's see, I think that is essentially it for the dashboard.

Heidi Ullrich: Dev, this is Heidi, we have Eduardo who has his hand raised.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Sure Eduardo, go ahead.

Eduardo Diaz: Yes I am confused here. Going back, you know all these objections, are we going to pick them up manually from somewhere and create Wiki pages, is that's the way it's going to be done or is that going to be happening automatically?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: It's not going to be happening automatically, thanks Eduardo. This is Dev. It's not going to be happening automatically. Once the announcement goes out that somebody wants to make a comment on objection grounds or the evaluation panels then the Wiki pages was created. And again it comes back down to the reason that we're doing this is to is so that we don't have 1500 possible lines, pages created on the outset. And then you have to like have a huge table showing the number of comments on 1500 applications which could be completely empty and become very difficult to sort out.

So the idea is that somebody has to make the request first, somebody emails the group and says I want to make objection grounds for this application and then you create a new discussion forum, they will click this link and put the name of the string, you know dot whatever the gTLD string is, and then the page is then created with that title one time. And then what we'll then do is edit the page and add the comments underneath limited public interest and community grounds.

Rudi Vansnick: This is (inaudible).

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yeah, using the template, yeah. Am just going to cancel it though at this point.

Eduardo Diaz: Are we, this is Eduardo again. Are we going to divide this picking up the objections and putting it into these Wiki pages by group or how are we going to do this?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: I'm not sure if I understand your question. What do you mean by group?

Eduardo Diaz: My question is once somebody objects and Wiki pages are created, who's going to do that?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Who's going to do that? Well I think that brings us up to the question of the workflow and how we are actually going to be working to achieve this. My thinking was let's do a – before I continue on that are there any more questions regarding the dashboard or regarding the Wiki pages so we can on to the next step?

Heidi Ullrich: Dev, Carlton has his hand raised.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay. Okay Carlton, go ahead.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Dev, this is Carlton Samuels for the record. I am still trying to get some clarity on this and not just on the data collection but for my own, how I frame my head to deal with this work. We are going to have these evaluation panels and evaluation panels are going to evaluate all of the applications on those seven grounds.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Correct, and those will be kept on one Wiki page for that application.

Carlton Samuels: Those will be on one Wiki page. I have an interest from the At-Large perspective; we have an interest in taking care of that because of one thing and one thing only in my estimation, the question of equity. So I

want to see what they say or what they do because it is in the At-Large's interest to ensure that people are treated fairly. I have heightened interest in two areas, the limited public interest and the community objection.

ALAC has standing to make objections on two grounds, limited public interest and standing. So anybody from our community could make an objection and it is our responsibility to evaluate those objections to see if they're credible and then officially sanction them. But there are other objections, other persons, for example the GAC, could make objections on those same grounds. And I would want to know about those.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Understood.

Carlton Samuels: Right. And I would want to see – so all of this data gathering for me involves two things, I want to see those objections that are raised from my own community because I have a care to ensure that they're handled, we have a committee to do that; [half of it] to be ALAC, the ALAC makes official objections because the ALAC has standing to make those objections. That's from our community. Then the objections that follow the same exact template that can be raised from outside our own community, I would want to know about those because those may augment or they may decrement the objections I receive from my community. So that's why they're important for me to know.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Right. Okay.

Carlton Samuels: I would wish to know therefore those objections that originate from my community, which is the At-Large, and there is a process by which they come in the funnel and they get out of the funnel on the other end. I would like to have information and data about objection under those same two bundles from other communities. And I want to keep those as separate. Where will I have those on this list?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay. The intention was that for example going back to this gTLD “any other name” as the example, if we note that the GAC has now filed an “early warning” during the 60 day comment period for example on this application, then the review group, this is also the next thing the review group has to do is to be aware of what’s happening on the other spaces. If the independent objectors act by filing an objection, or the GAC itself files and “early warning” and/or the GAC then writes to the Board as – what’s the wording – I think it’s a formal notice, not an objection, it’s a formal notice to the Board.

So obviously that will be updated on the ICANN website and then review group has to then take that into account and update the page accordingly. So then the current status could be saying “receiving comments – note GAC has posted early warning” and probably there would be a link to the GACs website where the warning has been posted or on ICANNs website where it’s been posted or whatever.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, so can I ask a question there? Would it be reasonable for me to say, on this space, “status of applications” that I should see those objections column a little bit more so I could see the origin of the objections?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yeah if it’s coming from the GAC or the independent objector? I would say yes. Again, we don’t know exactly how the formatting of how the GAC is going to do it.

Carlton Samuels: Yes but since I have to get it, since this process actually depends on the review team to go get those pieces of data information I would want to have them recorded in an easy way so that I can make them [edible]. I would like to know the objections from where they come and for whom because I will tell you, if I see an objection from the GAC it is going to have a heightened concern than seeing one from the independent objector for example.

It’s not the way you process data and information, in this context it’s important for me to know that because my processing is going to be driven by some of that, call it purely environmental data, call it meta data, but it is a GAC objection, I am going to think of it in a different light than I think of an independent objector. Much the same way because I know that to make an official objection from the At-Large I have a process that those things have to be seen through before it becomes an official objection.

I would also rank it differently than I would rank an independent objector objection. It's just the way it is. And I want to find a way where I can show that almost immediately.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Alright thanks Carlton. I think I understand what you're saying. The anticipated way to do it would have been to edit the page because the GAC has its own separate process and will probably has its own space to make it on the ICANNs gTLD website. I don't know if Roman could elaborate more on that because he has probably more experience with the GAC and their workflow on this item. Okay? Similarly with the independent objector, I don't know, actually we know very little how the independent objector is going to work.

Is it going to have its own website with its own way of posting or announcing "okay I'm going to file an objection on this gTLD application" or not. And the idea is that we then update the Wiki page here so that when somebody looks at the objection comments, or this one now has a GAC early warning and a link to it, or the independent objector has made comments or an objection and so on. Okay, Roman do you want to add any thoughts or comments to this, although I notice we're running out of time here.

Roman Pelikh:

Well yeah, I mean the GAC is going to have their own process and they're going to manage the early warning space and what they decide to do. There might be some way of filtering what the objections are by using some of the labels. So for examples say...

Rudi Vansnick: Right, we could add a label here, like edit the label. We could say “GAC early warning posted” or “GAC early warning” like that right?

Roman Pelikh: Yeah or for example “limited public interest,” if there is objections or comments made under that for that particular application then you would add the label. And then based on the label you could make a search, so you could potentially pull all the applications that have “limited public interest” as the...

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yeah I think that would probably be the better way to do it as well by editing the label. I don’t know if people were watching the screen, I just created two labels for example. And then what you can do is search the Wiki for “GAC early warning” and all of the applications would then come up that have this label. Carlton that might...sorry.

Heidi Ullrich: Go ahead and finish and then there’s a question from Eduardo I’ll read to you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay great. So then Carlton that way once the review group updates the page it can be searched, it can be found. So if you wanted to then find all of the pages that have “GAC early warning” on it you can then

find it. Or if you want to find independent objector you could then find that as well. Okay, go ahead Heidi.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay this question is from Eduardo – “Can we use the labels to show the data that Carlton wants in the dashboard?”

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well, I think we have to, we can see whether that could be done. I suppose I could work with Roman after the call and see if that can be done.

Roman Pelikh: Yeah the labels are not really the data points, they’re really search terms that are tags. And you can put the tags or labels on the dashboard so you are able to click on them for the search results. So that’s kind of the way it works. The best way to look at the functionality is to look at the Boards Resolution Wiki, how they’re organized by year, by category and all of that done is by labels. But unfortunately that will only be on the application level, it won’t be at the level of the comment. So it’s just going to be for example the “blahblah” TLD will have all these labels, but that doesn’t tell you that there is more comments or less comments or whatnot.

So for example you can’t tell that there is more comments in the limited public interest versus the community objections. You won’t be able to tell that unless you separate that into independent pages, and we already talked about the overhead that will be required to manage that.

Carlton Samuels:

Can I get a close out here? Because I have to get a close out to be on record and to be frank. What this is turning out to be a double time fulltime job, that is my own assessment of what this is turning out to be. And for that you are going to have gaps in performance. So we might as well telegraph it now, you're going to have gaps in performance because the amount of time it will take for you to read through every comment, to find the meta data surrounding each comment, to assess each comment to make a rational determination of its value is going to take fulltime work for seven or so months.

That was not what was envisaged. I will tell you from my own perspective I am interested in those strings that have attracted objections. I know that there are two modes for objections. I also know that there are multiple origins for objections. I would wish to know the origins of the objections and the details for those objections. Similarly I would want to have as much detail from each objection from our own side, from the At-Large because I would have to conflate, it would be prudent for me to conflate the data and information I get from the At-Large with the data and information I get from every other source of objection. And that is my critical path through all of this data.

That in itself is going to take a hell of a lot of time. And the way I see this organized now, if we continue to say we're going to do it this way, I'm afraid we're asking for two fulltime jobs for seven months. I personally cannot afford that. So we have to find a way to get through the objections in a different way. I'm laying my cards out on the table. We just can't afford that.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: This is Dev. I'm thinking that, well first of all, regarding objections and so forth remember we have seven months for the objection period and 60 days during the application comment period and so forth. My – Heidi, I see your hand is raised, go ahead.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay. On the issue of the workload, yeah that's very much understood and we've been aware of it for some time. We would like to suggest that we monitor this through the joint meeting with the New gTLD in Prague and at that point we see how much assistance will be needed, how much work and then staff will work to get some sort of assistance. Now again it might not be policy staff, that needs to be just confirmed. That's where we are with that. So if we could get agreement just to monitor this through the joint meeting in Prague and then we will go forward.

Carlton Samuels: I fully agree with that kind of intervention. I think that is a sensible approach to it and I fully endorse it.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay. And just to confirm when the work of the joint gTLD Working Group and the Review Group meeting is going to be on the Tuesday in Prague, which will be the 26th of June, which is actually just two weeks from now. From 15:00 to 17:00 hours local time and of course there will be remote participation for those who are not there physically in

person in Prague. Let's see, I'm now just going through the comments here unfortunately. I'm sorry I'm not able to see them because once I'm sharing my screen I can't see it.

Regarding next steps, Heidi I'm so sorry, because I know we're running out of time on this, is there any other questions or comments?

Heidi Ullrich: No sorry, I've just not lowered my hand.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay very well. I think I note that people have said they have to go and go on other calls. I'm going to just post something to the list as to how we're going to try and approach this and then see how we're going to – Rudi, please go ahead.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes thank you Dev. Rudi here for the transcript. I'm also concerned like Carlton is concerned, but I'm also concerned about the organizational aspect. We have already people that have had apologies for today's call and yet we have a view on how we could use the Wiki and how we could use the tool to bring in some data. But I think that the most important aspect we have to cover is how are we going to organize ourselves in the sense of who is going to do what, when and where?

Because we are close to the ICANN meetings in Prague, many of you are going to fly into Prague, we'll be disconnected during the whole day and to eventually not work in the evening. So those who are remotely working and available will have a lot of work on the table. That's one of

the reasons why I'm really concerned because I'm trying to set up my planning for the next three to four weeks. It looks like we will need really a very, very good structure and good coordination between ourselves, otherwise this is going to fail.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Okay, thanks Rudi for the concern. I know we're running a little bit out of time on this. Let me just try to take three minutes and try to post a possible suggestion for this and then we'll take it off to the list and of course we can really discuss it in full detail during the Prague meeting and come up with alternate workflows. Mu suggested workflow for now would be to, since we have people, since each of the regions, can't we just simply rotate it on a daily basis. Say three or four persons to two persons look at the number of comments coming in say one day, another day and so forth?

And again a second question, my second concern here, my second question is initially there's going to be like, I think it's going to be a "wait and see" until the actual reveal date happens and looks at all of these 1500 applications and whatnot and so forth. I will talk with Roman and see how we can automate the creation of the Wiki pages in a much better way and maybe I can announce something just before the day after tomorrow.

But I suspect that once we're in Prague we can then have a full discussion as to whether the Wiki pages are working or not working and so forth and then see whether we need additional staff, policy staff needs to be added on to actually help the review group in this role. Okay?

Heidi Ullrich: This is Heidi, Dev it probably won't be policy staff. This is an implementation issue.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Implementation staff, sorry. Thank you. Thanks for that clarification. Alright, I'm going to end the call now since we're now 10 minutes over the call. And again if anybody has any further comments, and I'm grateful for this discussion by the way, I thank everybody for making their comments and questions and so forth. I'm going to end the call. Please email me, you know my email address, or post it to the review group. Okay? So with that I'd like to thank everybody, including the staff, thank you Roman and we'll see each other on the mailing list and we'll definitely have a discussion in Prague.

[End of Transcript]