
AVRI DORIA: I probably should get started. I'm sure other people will drift in as time goes on. I assume recording is already running.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Yes, this is correct.

AVRI DORIA: Okay thank you. It's always good to know that it catches our chat beforehand as well as everything else. Anyway okay, so this is the monthly meeting. We'll start with the review of the agenda, then we'll go to the roll call. Review of work items – the first one is just looking to see if there is anything SARP update. I think last time we asked we were told "real soon now," so I'm wondering if real soon now has come yet. And the next thing is talking about the outreach evaluation and recommendation, and basically going through the overall status, sub-team status, and anything else.

A good chunk of time on At-Large New gTLD rollout issues. I think there's the two new issues that have been raised, some of them have been on the list – the closed generics and the public interest commitments or PICS as they're being called, which are an active item of discussion. So to see whether there's anything this group feels it wants to do collectively on those. Review of any action items from this meeting and any other business.

Now one of the things that was left out, and with Dev having sent apologies that's probably good, but I neglected to put in a review group

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.

update. I don't know if anyone else from the review group is able to give that. I know that we do have some listeners that are very interested in finding out about review group updates. So if anyone is here that is able to give an update – well first, is anyone here that is a member of that group that is able to give an update? Hearing no one volunteering, I'll just ask Dev later to just send this list a quick update of where they are in their process.

And I assume it will be “we are on schedule reviewing and thinking and writing,” etc. But anyhow I will ask for that to be sent to the working group. And could you put that down as an action item please. Anyway, any issues with – oh I see one hand raised. So issues, I was about to ask issues with the agenda. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well thank you Avri, it's Olivier for the transcript. If you wish, I can provide a very short update since I have been following what the review group has been up to, although I'm not a member of the review group.

AVRI DORIA: Okay thank you. I'll put that in then right after the roll call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay thank you. Any other issues, additions to the agenda; any other business to add to the end of the agenda? I'll ask again at the end

assuming we still have time at the end of new “any other business issues come up.” Okay thank you, can someone do the roll call now?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Of course Avri. This is Nathalie. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the New gTLD call on the 11th of February, 2012. On the call today we have Hong Xue, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Avri Doria, Yaovi Atohoun, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Murray McKercher and Alan Greenberg. We have an apology from Dev Anand Teelucksingh. And from staff we have Gisella Gruber, Heidi Ullrich and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I’d like to remind all participants to speak and announce their names before speaking for transcription purposes. I’d like to hand the call over to you Avri, thank you.

AVRI DORIA: This is Avri speaking again. Okay, so the thing we had inserted into the agenda was a quick update on how the review group is doing. So Olivier, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Avri; it’s Olivier for the transcript record. And for the record, I remind everyone I’m not actually part of the review group, but I have been following its work in my capacity as Chair of the ALAC. And in fact, all of the discussions that the working group, the review group has are all public. You can look at all of the archives on the archives of the working groups or the review groups lists, email

discussions. But also you can listen to the recordings and read the transcripts and also attend the call.

In fact a couple of people have attended the recent calls. The most recent one being on Friday, I believe, on the 8th. So that makes it Friday. The discussions at the moment are really being sort of finalized. There are specifically four extensions which the review group is looking at. The first one is .amazon, then there's .nyc, .Patagonia and .health. These are the four that seem to have come out with substantial opposition.

Now the .nyc was actually pushed by Thomas Löwenhaupt who appeared on the review group calls a few times to explain his position. And it appears that there has been a change of mind from Thomas and his organization with regards to .nyc, in that because of the discussion starting in the review group, further discussions that have taken place between Thomas and his group and the City of New York who had applied for .nyc.

So the objection to .nyc has been now taken out, and so there's just .amazon, .Patagonia and health. Dev Anand Teelucksingh, the Chair of the review group has asked all of the members of the review group to provide their points of view on various different points. There's a new gTLD dashboard table which has been published and which basically looks at the different conditions that an objection would be able to go through. And unless the objection satisfies all of the points raised in the dashboard, then the objection would not be carried.

There was supposed to be another new gTLD Review Group call right after this one. Unfortunately due to the amount of work over the

weekend I think it's being pushed over to tomorrow. But everything is on time, and it look as though we might have some objections to .amazon, .Patagonia and .health. But of course this is all subject to the call that will take place tomorrow. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, this is Avri again. Thank you very much, Olivier. I really appreciate that because of the relationship I had to one of the applicants I have remained totally ignorant about what it was doing. It's obvious that I no longer need to be ignorant about what it's doing, but I really appreciate the depth of that report. Does anybody have any questions for Olivier on anything that was said?

I also noticed that Heidi has posted in the chat the dashboard and the review group workspace for anybody that wants to follow up on anything through the publically displayed information. Anybody? Okay, in which case thank you again Olivier, and we'll move on to the next item. I'm not sure we've got anyone to speak on it, but perhaps someone from staff will know what's going on, and that's a SARP update.

Last time, as I said before, we got a review that "it's almost done" I think, and "we can't say anything about anything until it's all done." So I'm wondering if we know anything further at this point. Does anyone, Olivier you still have your hand up. Does that mean you know something about this? Okay, thank you. So is there anyone that can speak – I know nothing about what is going on in the SARP, and I guess, does anyone else know.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Avri, this is Heidi.

AVRI DORIA: Yes Heidi, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, the latest that I know, what I said to you that they are still waiting. But it has been about three or four weeks now, so I can follow up again. They should be just about finished or some news should be imminent.

AVRI DORIA: Okay thank you. So things are pretty much as they were. I had seen Tijani's hand up for a second but it went away. Okay.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, I just wanted to say the same.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you very much. Okay, so we have two points of information and we'll still wait and this will stay on the agenda until we know what's up. Okay, anybody else have anything else to add to the SARP update; any comments, anything? Okay, hearing none, we'll move on. The next one is Outreach Evaluation and Recommendation. This is a fairly major project, and basically was divided into several steps. First one being theory formation, second one being survey, which included outreach and interviews and then a report.

So the main issues that we were in, the main stages were theory formation is well along and should be finalizing. And survey should be well underway in terms of being sure that we can get a survey out, and hopefully follow up on the survey when we're in Beijing. This is just sort of recapping the schedule. And I know that the survey bases itself on the theory formation questions, but I'm sort of hoping that the survey group, and I assume it is because I know Dev has been working on it as well as others, is at least working on its methodology, its plans, its tools.

So I'd like to ask first of all for a review, for an update from Tijani on the first step, the theory formation step. And please Tijani, and I see your hand is up anyway. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Avri. We had already developed or identified the bullet points and it was our duty to build off those points. I started working on it and then I was occupied by other things, and I was planning to finalize the development of these points this weekend. Unfortunately I had a personal urgent case so I was out of Tunis from Friday to now. I just came one hour ago. I apologize but I didn't finish. I have already posted one hour ago what I have done on the Wiki. And I ask the other members of this track to contribute, to help if you want; otherwise, I will continue and I am very sorry for not finishing with this work. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. This is Avri again. I'm wondering if you want to just quickly take us, because you did post it; I'm wondering if you want to quickly

take us through what's in it so that people can hear how the theory formation is formed and perhaps that will inspire them to give you some comments, some contribution while you're finishing it. Would you be willing to sort of walk us through what you have submitted today?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes thank you. There was a lot of bullet points and I (inaudible) with the very high application fees. I developed this point and gave the results of the window of the New gTLD Program, the application, how Africa was very bad in particular. So that was the development of this point because of the very high fees. And I also explained that under the directorship of the community, the Board directed the (inaudible) to form the JAS Working Group, and they said that despite this work and the work of two years on the New gTLD applications for possible support that was received.

So this is the first point I did make. The second point was the [length of appropriate average], and also I began to develop but I didn't finish it, it's only the beginning. And I'm really sorry not to go further than that. thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay thank you. Any comments? A couple of things I think Murray asked on the list where the document has been posted. I misspoke when I said posted. It was sent to the group list. I actually don't know if it's posted yet, and that was my misspeak. But it was sent to the list. I expect that when it is posted it will be posted in the objection process working area on the Wiki, which I'm sure Heidi or someone can paste

into the chat. I probably could to if I wasn't talking and was able to chew gum and speak at the same time, but otherwise I'll paste it in later.

Any questions or comments on that? Okay, not hearing any. I suggest that people find the thing in the email, discuss anything you want to discuss. None of these things should ever be one person's burden, is my hope. And that one person is kind enough to take the lead, to hold the pen as it were. But I'm hoping that we all sort of contribute content to their effort. So please read it, and especially knowing that Tijani is working on it over the next couple of days, please discuss it on the list.

It would be really good to see our list sort of have a constant verbal interesting discussion on the issues that we bring up monthly. Okay, last call on that issue. Okay, the next issue is the survey. And I know that Dev has been working; I know that Heidi has repeatedly told us that "when we know what we want to do, staff is ready, willing and able to help." Is there anybody that is working on that particular effort that can give an update of what's happening on that one yet?

As I said, we have a schedule on that which says we need to do a survey and we need to have the answers, the preliminary answers from that survey in time for us to try and talk to people in Beijing, in an informed way. So, anyone? Okay, if we can add something to the action items, which is for us to get an update from Dev or someone else on that group to the mailing list. To say, and I should probably hold the nagging token on that one. So I don't know if we actually want to call it a nagging token, but that's what I think of it as. Yes please, Yaovi.

YAOVI ATOHOUN:

Yaovi speaking. I just want to comment because during the last call we have been working from document used in the Caribbean region. So I just sent some comments going through that document, and the next step is that maybe I'll contact Dev later. I don't know if that document was sent before the results, so what I was saying in the comment on the Wiki space is that we need to add more questions because now we have the results, part of the results.

And then also the question, we are sending the question to the users, and my personal view is that we should also try to contact the business world. Because as a user, most of the time, users don't know about domain names. We are talking about domain names and we [really are asking people, and so many may be wrong] because the users, they don't care. We can have from a region maybe two or three [systems] that cause a problem. So my point is that are we [to include the business area]? I agree that we can cast from the community people who likely have a string, who are applying for a string, but for the most part the community, the user community, it's not the problem they don't like.

So we should try to see also the business community during that survey. I will try to compact this also to the members of the group and I can continue working on the final document. And also, I think that we should at the end make it available in many languages so that you can get to that from many people. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay thank you very much. Any questions or comment for Yaovi, and thank you for the update; anybody? Okay great. I'm glad to see this

project is moving on. I'd love to see more discussion of it on our list because that would mean that more people were getting involved in it, so thank you. Okay, let me go back to looking at the agenda so I know where I'm going. That's pretty much it for the outreach and evaluation task. Any other last comments on it before I move on?

Okay, moving on to the rollout issues, just to give an update of where we are. At the moment and open on the list we have the pending private generic word application, which coincidentally is now being called the closed TLD problem, or at least is the relative of the closed TLD issue. And then we had a new one which had been stuck on at a recent meeting, which was the additional rights protection mechanisms issue which was being held by Evan and Alan on the extra IPC demands, and the Strawman. And I'm not sure if anything has happened on that one.

So I guess I'd first like to get an update, if I can, on anything that's happening on that one. And then I'd like to go on to the issue of closed generics, followed by public interest comments. And I'm assuming that closed generics and private generic word applications are equivalent issues. So, Evan or Alan, anything to say on the new RPMs; is there anything this group needs to do, has this been taking care of elsewhere in the ALAC; what's up? I see Evan has his hand up and Alan and Hong, so Evan please.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Hi Avri. I'll leave the issue on the Strawman and the other protection stuff for Alan, because I was going to say my peace on the closed generics. Sometime back, I think this was given to me as something to try and churn and to write. I'm still committing to doing something. I

actually think I have a better grasp of things. My intention at this point is to write a document that essentially talks about two slightly different views of closed generics within At-Large.

There is one group of people that believe that it is a bad idea and that we need to do something about it, and there seems to be another group of people that believe that this is a bad idea, but it's either too late to do anything about or that it's simply being considered that was previous practice. So at least in most of what I've been able to find, I don't think I've come across too many people within At-Large that say that private generics are a good thing. The big question is whether or not this is something that is currently actionable by ICANN and/or whether or not it's simply a continuation of allowing second level domains to be closed and privately owned.

So if there's an inconsistency between complaining about the word .beauty being closed off, but that having beauty .com being closed off is perfectly acceptable. So there is some people, and I guess I'd count myself amongst them, that sees the current allowance of closed generics within ICANN to be simply a continuation and escalation of current practice, while there's others within At-Large who strongly believe that there is a difference, ICANN needs to do something about it.

Whether or not ICANN can do something about it at this point without exposing itself to substantial liability from people that applied on good faith is another matter. But I'm interested to get feedback from this group whether or not my segmenting of At-Large sentiment and to those who brought categories is accurate and reasonable. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA: Okay thank you. So I guess I will mark that as closed but watching, in terms of a report having already been sent. And I guess we're still monitoring it, but at this point, we're not in the process of doing anything further. Is that a correct...

ALAN GREENBERG: I think so, and it may well warrant some higher level of monitoring. I've just been fully occupied on other things and haven't turned to that, but I need to at least get back and verify that I'm correct in exactly where the GNSO is.

AVRI DORIA: Okay thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: But I think that was correct. I may be wrong in that there may be a drafting effort or something else going on that I'm not focusing on.

AVRI DORIA: Well you can always let me know and I can always update further and let the list know. Okay thanks. I'm going to have a follow up question for Evan but Hong has her hand up. Thank you.

HONG XUE: Thank you. I agree with Alan that we need to wait and see what will happen with rights protection measures, but it's a really interesting point. I remember in Toronto, Avri and I drafted a very short statement about ICANN's possible intellectual policy with respect to the future

procurement of any services or products. It's interesting to know that the Board is considering this point, well of course we're not the only constituency that raised this issue.

I remember that if I recall that in the minutes of one of the Board meetings at the beginning of this year, I was checking on the website, I cannot find the specific minutes, but there's very positive movement from the Board. So that's something we need to take note. The second point I want to raise is also about this closed-ness, openness of the gTLD strings. But I want to raise this issue from another perspective. That is what are these closed or open things? I went through the base agreement that ICANN is going to conclude when they delegate the string to any registry. So far they're not included in any contractual clause.

So these are basically application commitments. These are something that is currently being researched closely by the Board and at the request of the GAC. So I think this is interesting things to look at. What if an applicant changes commitment? I apply right now, for example .brand, this is a closed one but in the future I want to open it. Can I do this? Do I need approval? And ICANN is now reviewing the contents in the application; this is interesting. To what extent ICANN will reveal these commitments? Will they be subject to compliance? These are very interesting things.

So maybe this is another angle for us to look at. Back to you, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Okay thank you. So just to recap, I'm getting good lines of things here. One of the things that I think you've just done is linked the closed generic topic to the public interest commitment topic in terms of that being the methodology that at the moment the Board and staff seem to be putting out there, for standard applications especially, to be able to A – state their commitments publically; B – allow for third party commentary and action with dispute resolution post the deployment of the gTLD; and also some notions about compliance being able to follow up on these issues. Of course the whole issue of how PICS work is still very open, but I think it was an interesting linkage between the two. Did I get that right Hong or did I go too far?

HONG XUE: Yes. Right. No, that's right.

AVRI DORIA: Okay thank you. Yaovi?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Yaovi speaking. Sorry to [put this up]. I just want to talk about this sort of (inaudible). There is a meeting happening this month from March 5, [4th through 6th given by ICANN], and it will be mainly asked about the domain name industry. So if that sort of document can be ready by the end of this month, I think that we can pick up this and also hear from the participants at that meeting in (inaudible). So if we can start this by the end of the month, it can be distributed to the participants. They are expecting about 100 to 150 participants from Africa and also from ICANN (inaudible) to that meeting (inaudible). Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

It is. I simply wanted to point out that yeah, I guess the whole GAC involvement in this issue I think is mainly what is driving this. Because we've got this stuff in the applications right now that is non-binding and the GAC is, I think, pressuring ICANN to make these things binding. I don't know to what extent ICANN is going to be able to do that, again, without exposing itself to lawsuits or whatever. But I guess anytime ICANN looks, opens its eyes in the morning it gets sued.

The other issue that I think is a very serious concern to At-Large is even should ICANN decide that it wants to put these things in the contract, there is a significant corner of At-Large that essentially believes that compliance is either inept or unwilling to even enforce the existing terms of existing contracts for the existing small number of TLDs. And essentially there would be a serious issue of ICANN not being able to enforce things that it would then insist go into the contract.

So before any of this kind of thing really can be done, ICANN even has to demonstrate it has the capability to enforce these things should it put them in the contract. If ICANN essentially puts things in the contract but refuses or is unable to enforce them, then it's sort of "well what's the point." Anyway, I think this is also a serious issue because as you may be aware there's other corners of ALAC, including the Future Challenges Group, that is trying to tackle the issue of compliance with not, shall we say, very stellar results. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. This is Avri and I stuck my hand up because I wanted to say something more than just throwing in conversation movers. I think one of the things that we're seeing from discussions with Fadi, and this is one of the things that came up in the non-contracted parties house meeting, that A – the compliance department is in the process of being built up and that does take time, but really there's a more serious issue that makes this one a sort of cart and horse issue, I believe.

Is that the way many of the contracts are currently written he doesn't believe, and legal doesn't believe they actually have the good tools to enforce the compliance. So part of looking at ways to add stuff to the contract, like the PIC appendix, which lists commitments, brings in third party accountability to an extent, and resultant compliance, are ways that the Board is looking for, and staff as an implementation issue are looking for making things more compliance susceptible.

Now I don't know that lack of contractual tools is the whole reason, I'm sure it's not, that compliance has been so problematic in many cases. But I do think that that is an ingredient, or at least I'm beginning to understand that that is believed to be an ingredient by those that know contracts in a way I would never know contracts. So I wanted to add that.

Now, going back to some of the other stuff, in terms of the things Evan, that you said you were writing on this issue, on the closed generics issue – and this is separate from the compliance. Is that something that you would look for this group to recommend to ALAC as a statement, or is this one of the statements going directly to ALAC as something that was assigned to an ALAC member to write?

And I'm just trying to understand if we have a role to play in that, and if so, how, when do we do it to meet schedules for comments and all that, even though I know ALAC, as an AC, isn't constrained to the schedule of the Board is going to review something at a certain point it's constrained to a schedule. So I don't know if you have any comment on that?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks Avri. I can give a small; I can give my opinion on that is what I think I'm doing with this. The issue was raised by this working group some time ago and I offered to hold the pen on it. Since then I've been finding it very, very difficult because of a divergence of opinion. My own views on this are well known, however I would not want to put in a statement on behalf of all of At-Large that was simply one point of view of what I've seen to be multiples.

So my challenge at this point is to put together a statement that reflects, there's some diversity, but I think there's also a lot of shared point of views, even amongst those that disagree on some things. In terms of the process, as far as I know, I'm working under the auspices of this working group because this is the one in charge with addressing the issue within ALAC. I imagine at a certain point that I would put forward a draft, that that draft would be vetted within this working group, and then submitted to ALAC for transmittal either as official advice or as a less formal communication from the Chair to other Chairs.

What path that takes is less of interest to me than actually crafting the document itself.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay thank you. I just wanted to make sure. And I have one more question on that if you'll bear with me, is when can we expect such a doc, especially since there is an open comment period on this now. Is it something that we can expect to see? Is it something that we should be planning some means of dealing with before our next meeting? I'm just sort of looking for a clue, thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay. And you're absolutely reasonable to ask for that. I'll give you my answer; it has to do with, right now, my limitation and multitasking when it comes to do with things ICANN. Lately I've been putting almost all of my energy into trying to address the response to the GNSO Consumer Metrics Working Group. That has been taking up a lot of my ICANN related energy. I hope to actually put that to bed within the next couple of days, and will address that later under any other business.

As soon as that is sort of tucked away, which I'm really hoping will be done within the next 48 hours, I would immediately start to put pen to paper, virtual pen to virtual paper in starting to work on this. My goal, at least in the beginning, is to create an open public Google document so that others will be able to look at it while it's taking place. And so early on in the process, if people want to take issue with things that I'm saying or the way that I'm saying them, this is not the idea of going off into a corner and then just going "poof, here is something."

My hope is to go into a very public corner and do something that can be open to scrutiny and suggestions of change right from the very

beginning. So that's my intended way of doing this, so even while it's in formation, the idea being that the document would be open and certainly amenable to changes from others.

AVRI DORIA: Okay thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Did that answer your question?

AVRI DORIA: Yeah it does.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: My goal is to try and have something in this working groups hand within two weeks. But my personal preference is to try and have something done by this weekend.

AVRI DORIA: Okay thank you. Once you have something, I'll definitely look for the list to get on it, in terms of submitting something by the end of the comment period, which I believe they gave us a very short window on with no reply period. We'll either have to call a special meeting or something, but it really is driven by you having submitted something. Having a special meeting in two weeks would give us the ability to have this group discuss it and make a decision to pass it on. Though even if we don't have a meeting, we have used before the sort of 48 or other

number of hours last call on the list for passing something on, so I'm not concerned.

But if it's something we feel needs phone to phone discussion or microphone to microphone discussion, then I will try to schedule a meeting. But I want to have at least a week in advance to try and do that so people have a chance to plan. But at this point, I would tentatively say that we might plan for a meeting in two weeks just to discuss this statement, if that makes sense to people. And a week before that meeting we can confirm it. Yes, who was speaking?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi, just to clarify. Was that a special call to replace the normally scheduled meeting...

AVRI DORIA: Well we're a monthly call.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh, we're monthly, okay.

AVRI DORIA: A monthly call with all the separate projects having calls or meetings when they need to to get things done.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, so a call in two weeks on this topic?

AVRI DORIA: Tentative yes. And of course that's obviously if Evan hasn't had a chance to produce something in time for us to have a meeting, it won't happen. But just so that something is tentatively planned so that if we need to have a discussion – it's also possible that Evan will put out a paper that everybody reads and says "yep, that's good. Nothing to discuss here," in which case then a 48 last call and not a conversation is needed.

So, I think in a week we can look at where we're at and see if we really need it, but I just wanted to put a tentative marker in case.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry Avri, it's Evan. I also just wanted to make it clear to everybody that this is not going to be a tome; that my intention is to try, and in fact the challenge of this is to try and at least sufficiently present the At-Large perspective within two pages or less.

AVRI DORIA: Fantastic, thank you. Okay, so seeing no hands at the moment. I've got markings that the private generic pen, the additional RPMs goes into watch mode. In terms of the PIC, I don't get the impression that we have anything definitive we want to say, although I guess I'll put that down as something that we will continue to watch and monitor. And that one of the things that does interest us in it is it's relation to contractual compliance. And as Hong said in the chat, "if not put in a contract, no way to enforce or make complaint," which is, I think, one of the key points of the PIC.

But I don't get the impression that there's a strong drive in this group for us to say something about it at this point, and I'm not sure. It's a very confusing subject. As someone who's watching it quite closely, it's very confusing knowing where it's going and how it's going to work and what if anything it will affect. Any other comments now on the rollout issues in general, anything anybody wants to add?

Okay, no. So the next thing is review of action items from this meeting. There's the pending one on the status to the SARP. We had one on Dev giving an update to the working group; Olivier gave quite a good one, so I think the only thing for Dev to do would be to look over Olivier's and decide if anything needs to be added, and if so, just to send a brief note to the list either saying "yep that covers it" or "no there's this additional point." Yes Olivier, I see you have your hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Avri; it's Olivier. I just wanted to add one more thing, which is where do we go from now. A little bit like the roadmap. So effectively the review group would then provide its final decisions and positions. These would be forwarded over to the ALAC and the ALAC would then decide whether to carry those decisions forward or not. That's the next steps in the process. And we're giving ourselves ample time to be able to actually have further discussions in the ALAC, so we're effectively really on time for the whole process, if the ALAC is going to submit some objections to any new gTLDs. That's all, thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay thank you very much on that roadmap. And the other action item that needs to be added is that in a week time I need to take a look with Heidi and the rest of the staff on where we are to confirm that special meeting to talk about the closed generics issue paper. Anything else that I forgot on action items that you've all noticed? No?

Okay, going to any other business. Evan made a request during the meeting to discuss the GNSO Consumer Metrics Working Group issue that has been occupying him, and I guess he wanted to ask for some participation in that process, but I'll leave that to him. Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks Avri. I'll make this quick because I really don't want to reopen the whole issue of consumer metrics within this group and this call. But simply this is a request to the Chair and to the working group to allow for the creation of a small working team. I'll explain what I mean. The GNSO had a working group that created a set of metrics in response to the Board call for the community to create a series of metrics that would measure consumer trust, competition, blah, blah, blah. And in response to that, the working group has come out with a set of metrics.

There were a number of metrics that I and other people believe were necessary to help enhance the end user component of things that were left out of that. So the intention is to create a small team to create a set of end user centric metrics to be recommended as a complimentary addition to what the GNSO is putting forward. So, basically to create a new set of metrics, with the intention of presenting them to the meeting in Beijing. So what I'm asking for is essentially the blessing of this working group to create this small working team, which at least at

the very beginning, until handed over, I will Chair, with the expressed intent of creating a set of end user centric metrics to compliment the GNSO ones to be done in time for Beijing. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay. Alan yes, I see your hand up. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just a minor administrative thing, Evan. I suggest you not call it a working team; that's the term we're using in the draft rules of procedure to describe the generic group which could include working group drafting team, sub-teams, subcommittees, whatever. So we should try to avoid using the generic term for a specific one. So pick two other letters.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay, what would you suggest I call it?

AVRI DORIA:

Can I interrupt on this first, before we come up with a name for this nifty new thing? While I think – oh and I see Cheryl has her hand up, so I'll pass it to her quite quickly. What I'm wondering is where does this fall under our charter on this? Surely ALAC can do this, but within our charter on it's not a rollout issue, or is it; it's certainly not the outreach process evaluation; it's not the SARP – so I'm wondering where this sits. So after Cheryl if Alan – Cheryl please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Avri, Cheryl for the record. Yes, absolutely I think this is a very valid question and I suspect the answer is it's not, but others can respond to that. I would have thought, as I said in the chat, that should the ALAC wish to have advice created to send to the Board on this matter with new metrics, it should instruct a work group or other subunit of itself with or without whatever extent to the community involved to do so.

I'm not sure that the tail can wag the dog, but there's also nothing stopping people sitting around putting time and energy into something that may or indeed may not be either desirable or useful. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah thanks. I guess I wanted to add to that. obviously any group of people from this group or anywhere else can get together and work on something, and I encourage people to work with Evan to help him finish his task even if it's not part of this working group. It can get to ALAC in another way. Alan, you still have your hand up and Evan I don't know if you want to respond.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's a new hand.

AVRI DORIA: It's a new hand. That's a hand to respond. I'll sit in both camps. I think this is something that should be chartered out of the ALAC because I think there may well be people who are interested in participating that are not part of this group and will not hear of it and will not be

motivated otherwise. On the other hand, the Consumer Metrics request from the Board was driven by an AOC commitment, which is triggered by the first TLDs being launched, so I think it could logically be construed as a new gTLD issue. But it may well have wider interest and the wider group may be a better place to do it. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thanks. As Chair of this group, if ALAC comes back to me and says “this is your problem because this is a new gTLD issue,” or something, or if even Evan can explain as you did that this really is a rollout issue, than certainly it’s under there. But it may also be a shorter time need that doing all this process makes little sense.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Avri, I can give my rationale. It may not be sufficient and it may not be useful, but at least I’ll explain why I did it this way. And that was essentially when the GNSO created its working group that its scope was specifically dealing with consumer metrics issues as they applied to the gTLD rollout. I certainly have no problem with making that scope not quite so restrained, and so I’m trying in this as a sub-team from here, as not a sub-team from here, as something that’s off in the ether, I simply – my goal is to get a number of people interested in this issue who have agreed on the fact that the GNSO Working Group did not produce all the metrics that were needed, and to come up with something somewhere to have a group of people working on something that the ALAC could then put forward. Whether it’s done here or not is less of an issue to me than the need for it to be done.

AVRI DORIA:

Yep, that's why I put it in the list. I'm not worrying too much, but I do want to leave the opportunity open for the higher officials to give a ruling on it if need be. Because I don't want to get stuck in the middle of is it charter or is it not charter without Olivier getting involved. Okay, we are at 59, we have covered the whole agenda. I have updated the – well I'm actually in the process of updating the rollout list. Any last words from anyone before I call the meeting closed and thank everyone?

Okay, seeing no hands, I thank everyone for joining in. I especially thank those for whom this is a national holiday. And I wish you all a good day, a good week and a great year. Thank you.

[End of Transcript]