
AVRI DORIA:

So I guess this marks the start. I'll review the Agenda. After reviewing the Agenda there'll be a roll. Then we'll go into the Outreach Evaluation Survey. From what I understand that's a paper that's in good shape; near ready. I don't know how many people have read it. I haven't yet. So we'll talk about that.

And there's a questionnaire, which I also understand to be near ready. Then there's... We'll talk about that, and basically, if we're not ready to put out the paper for review and we're not ready to start the questionnaire, then we'll figure out what needs to be done, how we're going to do it, who does it, etc., so that we can get these activities rolling.

Then there's the SARP post-webinar discussion. We had the webinar, but we haven't really talked about it. We need to decide as a group if there's anything further we want to do. And if there's anything further we want to do then we've got to figure out who's going to do it, how it's going to get done, milestones, etc.

Then there's looking at the rollout issues update. It hasn't been touched in a couple of weeks. I'm also looking for someone to help me with that by taking responsibility for monitoring that and so on and seeing where we are, add things, check statuses.

Then there's Any Other Business. Does anybody have Any Other Business at this point that we should add? Let's not all ask... Oh, yes, Evan, please, I see your hand up.

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.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi there Avri, this is Evan. I'm not totally sure if it is appropriate, but I would like to raise the issue of .list domains as AOB.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, I'll put them down, but if this is an issue wouldn't it possibly be a rollout issue that you would want to do something, or is it somehow separate from that?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Well, right now I've been following this a little bit from a distance. There's been advice being given to the Board from outsiders such as Microsoft and the Mozilla Foundation, and insiders such as SSAC. And you'd think the issue would be resolved and it's not. And I'm just a little curious about that and whether... To see if we need to do anything on it.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. I would just as soon put it under the rollout issues, if that were okay with you?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Fine with me.

AVRI DORIA: Then if we come out of it with something to follow up, that's the mechanism that would be used.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. Anything...? But I have put a note of it there so we don't lose it. Any other Any Other Business? Okay. Before we get to the roll call, I do want to say one thing. This is my first meeting back to thinking about ICANN Working Groups in about three weeks, and I have paid very little attention to this group over the last three weeks.

And that's one of the things that's made me realize that I'm very grateful that, for example, Tijani and Yaovi have kept the work going on the outreach evaluation stuff and so on. But I need for people to think about volunteering for other items to keep them rolling.

I have managed to pretty much overextend myself for the next couple of months, so either I'm going to need a bunch of help or I'm going to need to be replaced, if we're going to keep the momentum here going. So, you know... I took on the job, so I want to keep doing it, but I'm really putting out a plea for help, for people to take responsibility for the various items in this, and we can work together.

Having said that – let me go to the roll please. I guess it will be Nathalie. Can you do that for us?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Yes, thank you Avri. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the New gTLD Working Group call on Monday, 3rd of June 2013. On the call today we have Avri Doria, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Yaovi Atohoun, Alan Greenberg and Evan Leibovitch.

We have apologies from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Andrew Mack, Carlton Samuels, Roberto Gaetano, Dev Anand Teelucksingh and Hong Xue. From Staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco and myself Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes.

The transcript and the recording will be available 48 hours after the end of the call, so Staff will therefore be taking Action Items only. Thank you very much and over to you, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you very much. Okay, so now we'll get right to the outreach evaluation. I understand that Tijani, with the help of Andrew and perhaps others have gotten a paper to a good point. I have said, I haven't read it yet but I'd like to give the floor to Tijani. Have you got a document that you want us to be displaying?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Avri, this is Nathalie. I'm uploading it now.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. Tijani, the floor is yours.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Avri. [clears throat] So, as you know, this is work that was started a long time ago. First we defined the bullet points. It was about why, for the first round of the New gTLDs, only very few people from developing countries applied, and why, for the Applicant Support Program, only three applications were received, despite the fact that we had at least 14 applicants to be supported – we had money for that.

And yet we didn't have any more than three. So this was the question and we thought about the question and we defined bullet points, and then Avri asked that we prepare text. This text is now... I don't know if it is displayed now... Yes, it is displayed on the Adobe Connect.

We tried to explain the reasons for this problem. The New gTLD Program was a program for the reach only, unfortunately. It is not only poor applicants; it's also for the communities. The communities couldn't apply. And also there was a small problem for IDNs. We suspected that we would receive more applications in IDN but unfortunately not too much; only 6% applications for an IDN.

So this is the problem. The reasons why we tried to eliminate them – it was first the [inaudible 00:07:37]. Second the outreach – very, very, very big problem. Third the technical competencies and also even legal and other competencies. There was multiple reasons for which we reached this decision. Now – which is very important now – is to see how to [inaudible 00:08:13] to this situation.

And this is the question that we need to address, Avri, now. And if you remember in Baku, the idea of [inaudible 00:08:23] around was launched, and I think we have to think about it seriously, because it may also be one of the remaining solutions for this situation.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. I'm going to ask for comments in a second but I want to just ask a couple of questions myself first. I wanted to first of all understand – do you believe this paper is something that we should put out for wider review and comment and see what people think? And is this something that can go out during the same time that we're doing the questionnaire? Does it need to go out before?

And I guess other questions I would ask people are, have other people reviewed it? Does it need a cover note? In terms of going to the next step, I think you're right – that is the next thing that we need to start talking about, once we get this out and reviewed and get additional comments, and we have the questionnaire to put out and get responses.

But I think you're right – I think we're now in the preparation for getting into what recommendations do we want to make about how to deal with the deficits that are perceived? So I want to open up the floor to anyone that can answer those questions. Tijani, I don't know if you have anything to add along those lines?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, I can tell you Avri that it is a very good thing to [grade? 00:10:03] this document and to make people comment on it. It will be a paper that will be the fruit of the work of the larger people and that will be better, because people will be more committed to work on, to find solution to, and to go to the next steps. This is what I want to say.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. Is this something that we would do a community-wide request for comments on? Is that...? Yes, Yaovi?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Can you hear me?

AVRI DORIA: I can barely hear you.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Is that better please?

AVRI DORIA: Not really.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Hello? Can you hear me?

AVRI DORIA: Barely.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Can you hear me please?

AVRI DORIA: I don't know if he can hear us?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yaovi, we can hear you a little bit.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Okay, merci. Okay, how's that?

AVRI DORIA: That's better.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Okay. Just to ask, is that [paper? 00:11:23] [inaudible 00:11:25], who has completely applied for a New gTLD. So my question was, do we really know why we didn't get [this report? 00:11:44] and then, frankly, I didn't have time to read what it said, but [inaudible 00:11:49] probably [inaudible 00:11:52] the time.

So I'm just trying to tell you that if you have had time to read it, please answer. Maybe you have some comments? Because my point is, if we

don't have a good amount of applications then there's no work for us also, to support these applications. Because [inaudible 00:12:15] is not [inaudible]. We have to ask people to [inaudible 00:12:23]. We have to [read it?] very well. So my question is, if you have comments about this paper, please [inaudible 00:12:34].

But you need to understand – this is why I've asked this question. And what is good is that what we have is [inaudible 00:12:40] something good is in the program; it's up and running and [inaudible 00:12:45]. So this is a comment I want to make. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, thank you. I don't know whether that speaks to a change that needs to be made in this note, or if it's something that you want to add comment on as we go forward. And I wasn't sure I actually heard it all clearly; I was straining to hear. Anyone else wish to comment?

So the question I have then is, people obviously need time – can anybody say that they've read this and they believe it's ready to go? I see no green checks going up, which I assume means that it hasn't been read and it's ready to go. So what I'm going to do, if there's no objection, is after this call sometime, I will start a three-day countdown of, "Please read and comment."

We need to make sure this is online, where someone can see it and read it. Yes, Alan? I'll stop. Do you have something to say?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, just a very quick addition that I think might be worthwhile – the document as it says now; 6% of applications are IDNs. I think a breakdown of the IDN – not a list but a conceptual breakdown – I think is really important. If you exclude Arabic and Chinese, the number of IDN applications becomes almost infinitesimal, and the fact that we did not make virtually any inroads in IDN script, other than Chinese, Arabic, Japanese – I think were the top three – is really telling.

We've put a huge amount of import on IDN scripts for around the world and I was rather surprised that that number was that low, and we may want to highlight that. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, thanks. We may also want to highlight, if we're doing any breakdown on IDNs, that most of them were translations of, or transliterations of incumbent. Or many of them. I don't know what the percentage was but I've heard it spoken about, so that may be worth a breakdown too.

Okay. To continue... If there's no other comments on this note now, what I'm recommending is that once I'm sure that it's online, in a place where people can review it easily, which it may already be... I've just done so little work in the past week that I don't even know that.

But once I've made sure that it is, I'll start a three-day review and comment, at the end of which I'll do a 48-hour last call on it with provisos for restarting clocks if there's any substantive changes, etc. I'll

write up all that, I'll send it to the list because since we're running these meetings monthly I don't want to wait another month before we put this out for wider review.

Am I correct to assume that we'd be putting this out for the [phone rings] normal ICANN comment/reply? And I guess we'd be asking ALAC to put it out for the comment review? Is that a correct assumption or am I thinking wrong? I see no one putting their hand up to contradict me so I'll assume that's the way we're going.

Anything more on this letter before I move on?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Avri it's Alan. This may benefit from an informal review within At-Large before going for the formal public comment. It's just a thought. I'm not adamant, but it has just dawned on me that it may have some value.

AVRI DORIA:

What if we leave that decision to ALAC and in the recommendations say: "We'd like the broadest possible review. If you feel it needs an At-Large review prior to a community review, please feel free.?"

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sure. I have no...

AVRI DORIA:

Is that okay with everyone? To handle Alan's message that way, in the note, once we get through it? And I'll add some of these notes at the top of this so that it's clear. Okay. I see Tijani agreeing, Yaovi agreeing. Great. And Evan, cool, I guess everyone agrees. Murray didn't put up his hand, but anyway.

Okay, so moving on. Yaovi, can you take the mic and, shouting again, please tell us what's up with the questionnaire. Are we ready to go? Do you have a copy of the questionnaire that people can look at? Either on the screen or...? Where are we? Thank you. The floor's yours.

YAOVI ATOHOUN:

Thank you. Yaovi speaking. I think this [inaudible 00:18:02] to the questionnaire. There is still a big problem in some form of [inaudible]. I mean, every problem [is format? 00:18:15] and it's still very useful and helpful for Tijani. So I finished it over the weekend and posted it on the Wiki, and then probably people haven't had time to look at it, but what I want to talk about is [inaudible 00:18:36].

In the group, we were not able to discuss what everybody was [inaudible phrase 00:18:46]. So we can... I can put the link in the Adobe. And then I want to talk about the [primary? 00:19:02]. In the [primary?] it said that I talked about... A little...

That we have this problem online and then, as discussed in China – correct me – at the ICANN meeting, some volunteers have [inaudible]

00:19:18] on the questionnaires, have [inaudible 00:19:22]. So that they can bring back input to the document.

So that is the text that we want to use to correct the information. Then we thought about the direction of the survey. We think that in giving enough time to write, we can reach maximum and then we can hear from the first group. So we need to define this [text? 00:19:53], when we can start and then when we should end the information correction.

Then the target: how to reach the target. And [force one? 00:20:05], we have written everything we can use the ICANN website to send the information as ICANN used to do, and we can put the survey up. And then post it if we are ready for Durban. We can also maybe prepare some flyers and then they can be, after ICANN [Board? 00:20:30] so that we relate to the service, so that people can go and take the survey.

And then also these flyers can be available for people to give their ideas in the second ICANN meeting. So that leads to the second question that Avri has asked already, that at least we should consider, after Buenos Aires [inaudible 00:21:03] meeting.

And then lastly, we think that in this form it is possible that we could have the survey, or some of the survey in some of the languages – and I just think the six UN languages. So this is something we have to prepare. So this is what I want to say, and this is the plan. And now we need some contribution and comments on the questionnaire with regards the content.

And, just... We talk about the people to [present/prevent? 00:21:44] the [passages? 00:21:45] of the first part of the survey. The second one, we talk about the program in general and want to alert people, again, about the program. And in the third one we talk about the support program. And then in the last one we talk about the observations and considerations.

So this is the [inaudible 00:22:05] of the survey. So thank you. This is all I want to say for now. Yeah, thanks.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, this is Avri. I'm hoping others... I heard a bunch of it but parts of it aren't clear, but what I did pick up, and I'm going to repeat it so that hopefully you can correct me. By the way, my first look at the form, "B2B," "B2C," things like that. And I'm not even sure I know what they mean.

And I love acronyms but they don't look to me like acronyms I've run into before. They probably have something to do with business or whatever. So we probably should settle up things like that with just a quick comment. So if I understand this, this is now a draft of what you would want.

I didn't quite pick up whether you would want to do this in something like LimeSurvey and that needs to be set up, or whether you wanted to do it as a sent out survey. I understand you wanted to get it translated into some languages – I'm not sure which. And then I guess you had

some other questions at the bottom dealing with when we start it, how we interact with the people, how we make sure we reach the target.

And what I'd like to do on a schedule, and this one is talk about it some now, keep talking about it on the list, but be at the point where – and I want you to let me know if that's possible – be at the point where at our next monthly meeting we can do the go for the survey. Or is that too late if you want it done by Durban?

And I wasn't too sure whether you wanted it finished by Durban or running through Durban. So please, if people can answer those... Yaovi, if I missed your point, I apologise, but I was having trouble hearing. Anybody? Am I still on the line?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: You're still here.

AVRI DORIA: Oh okay, thank you. I was ready to start dialing back in. So, yes, Yaovi, we need for people to comment on it, so that's it. And I think it may need more than just another three or four days. And also, though, do we want this in LimeSurvey or do we just want it translated into numerous languages and people submit by paper?

I'm asking, I don't know. Oh I see, Business 2 Business, and Business 2 Consumer. Okay, thank you. Yeah, obviously we need ALAC's approval for breathing, but I assume that we need to be ready with the survey

before we ask them to approve the start, and we need to know that it's ready. And then we have to go through that extra step to get their permission to actually do it. I understand that.

Survey Monkey would be fine. I see Murrays' suggestion. Is that something we want to do though? I haven't been clear on whether we want to do a paper survey where people send write-in answers... And lately I've been in a couple of efforts with online surveys and they've had mixed effects. Okay, Yaovi says it will be online with the help of ICANN, once we approve the content.

And Heidi says, "ICANN can support you with LimeSurvey." So I'm assuming that LimeSurvey is one we want to do. Does one do LimeSurvey in more than one language? Okay. Do we want to do this in more than one language? And does that mean, if we do, that we will also need to do the paper survey as well? Yaovi, please go ahead.

YAOVI ATOHOUN:

Yaovi. We will have some programs, if you want to do the survey in four of the languages, but if we could try, because it will be a lot of work to translate the content back into English. So we can have it translated – just the content, on paper – so that people can read the Russian, the [inaudible 00:27:06] in Russia can use it. And we assume that these people can bring the information back into English.

So my worry is that if you want to do this survey in many languages, we may have issues in getting it translated back into English. This is my only

qualm. But if you [inaudible 00:27:32] and you want to make many people to have it available in many languages, at least the simple one we can have it in many languages. This is my comment.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, thank you. So if I understood correctly, just to repeat, we would probably just do the online in English, and that, yes, as with all things, when we put out a question in a language other than English, then we do need to get the answer translated back into English. So that would need to be part of the process.

In terms of languages on the screen there, you have languages for online survey – English, French, Chinese, Arabic, Spanish, Russian. Is that the correct list? Do we want to talk about that online? Whether we need more languages, or we can go with fewer? As I say, I do not know. Okay, I see [inaudible 00:28:30].

So, yeah, the languages list was at the end. Okay. So anybody else have any more comment? What I suggest is that we continue working this and... Oh, the one thing I wasn't clear on yet it schedule. Are we okay if we spend the next month getting ready to launch this, or do we need to launch it sooner than that?

ALAN GREENBERG:

It's Alan. I don't see any tight schedule.

AVRI DORIA:

Because what I think we'd like to do is get this survey kicked off before the meeting, though of course it won't end until a reasonable time after the meeting. But it would be good to have the survey open during the meeting so that in Durban we can use it to talk to people, we can convince people to do it, we can do all that stuff.

Does that sound like a reasonable schedule? And if it looks like we need it dated as earlier than our next meeting, then we'll figure out how to solve that problem. Any more comments on this? We've gone over the 20 minutes on it but I thought this was important, and since we've had some really good work done I wanted to make sure we get to the further world with it as soon as we can.

So to reiterate, I will be doing a three-day call on the letter once I'm sure that it's up and available for comment. Then I'll do... I mean, a three-day review then a two-day last call on submitting two ALAC with a request that contains the conditionals we discussed; internal then external or just external – however they want to do it.

On the survey, I'm going to ask for people to spend the next week or two commenting on the content and the plan, and then over the week or two overlapping with that, we start putting the questions into LimeSurvey and find out the date when we need to kick it off. Hopefully we can do that at a meeting, but if I have to schedule before the meeting, I'll do one of those online last calls that restarts if there's substantive change.

Is that workable for people? And I'll try to write this up also on the list in the next day or so, so we know where we're at. And as I say, I really appreciate the way the two of you have taken the lead on this, and when it comes time to doing the third part on developing the paper that discusses recommended solutions, I'll be looking for another strong volunteer.

Okay, anything more on this before I move onto SARP? Okay, and we've got only 25 minutes left, so I don't know how far we're going to get in this. We had the webinar. We had very little time for discussion. So at the end of this, what do we believe should happen? And is there stuff that this group should be doing? Should be recommending? Should be writing? I open the floor. Anybody got a comment for starters?

Heidi just put the briefing session... Agenda that we have, meeting that we have. Nobody has any comments? So then I'll make guesses and see if people agree. We heard about it. It went the way it went. Oh, yes, Alan, please. Thank you for sparing me.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I guess I'll throw a question out. We hear a lot of comments now, both from applicants and from other people, saying: "We really want to know exactly why we failed." I don't recall discussing, when we were coming up with the criteria, specifying that the analysis should be public after the fact.

And normally these kinds of things... I'm not sure there is a normal... Sometimes things are published – sometimes they're not. But I don't recall even having a discussion. So I think we need, in this group, seeing as we're the closest thing that comes right now to reconstituting the JAS group, to have a bit of discussion saying in retrospect, should we have said everything is public? Is it correct that the detailed analysis was not announced?

I think that warrants some level of discussion because clearly, going forward, a decision is going to have to be made. We won't be able to ignore this a second time. But I think we need a bit of retrospective discussion of, did we air, or is the way that it's been handled the appropriate way to not release details?

I don't even know to what extent the parts of the application and the SARP application that are being analyzed, were made public. So if the application itself wasn't made public, there's a breach of confidentiality if the analysis is released. So I don't have any strong feelings at this point, but I think it warrants some level of discussion.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, thank you. And once you bring up that discussion, that sort of sounds like, very much, one of those postmortem questions. And I'm wondering, if we start thinking about issues that perhaps we should review in light of how the implementation went, then it may even be reasonable to do a postmortem discussion on the SARB.

And perhaps schedule a whole meeting of this group, that's open to others, to basically discuss that. Or, is there just the one issue Alan, that you brought up? The self-standing, and everything else is pretty much fine? What do people think we need to do?

Just an analysis on that one issue? Is there a need for a broader post analysis? Is there a need for an analysis paper that outlines these issues, discusses them and makes recommendations for the future? What should we be doing?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Avri, this is Evan.

AVRI DORIA: Yes please, Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I think doing an analysis is going to be problematic because we have so little raw data to work with. I mean, hopefully this survey is going to address this. I wouldn't bother doing an analysis until we get further along with the survey. Because right now we have very little to analyze. We have raw numbers of applications.

We have the work disrupted, but beyond that, I'm not totally sure what to analyze. The amount of information that we have is better known for its absence than its presence. And I'm a little concerned that if we try to

get into an analysis, what we come out with will be suspect because what we have going into it is so little.

This is the big problem – there’s so much that we don’t know. How much was it or wasn’t it talked about when ICANN did its roadshow? Anyway, I’m sorry, I don’t mean to ramble, but I’m just concerned about doing an analysis when we really have so little to work with.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. I’m wondering whether two issues aren’t being conflated. There’s the issue of why there weren’t more applicants in the whole analysis that we’re going to get, hopefully, from this data. Then there’s the postmortem of the SARP and the implementation itself, based on the recommendations that came out of JAS.

And that analysis, while there may be things that would be a numerical or whatever analysis, there certainly is the implementation that was seen, versus the implementation that was accepted... I mean expected, plus comments like the one that Alan made, which was: “They didn’t, but we never gave good guidance on whether they should or not.” Or something like that – putting it in a general sense.

And then there’s the point you make, that if indeed there hasn’t been sufficient transparency, there isn’t enough data, there isn’t enough reporting, that should be noted, and probably we should also subject ourselves to the same analysis that Alan made about the one issue, which is: was there so little transparency because we didn’t demand it?

Because it's just not the ICANN way? Because it was decided that for something like this it was better to have less than normal? Any number of analysis issues that could be discussed. So that was kind of what I meant by an analysis. I did not mean something...

And an analysis can include: "Here are questions that we thought were important but we don't have enough information to answer them." And that can be a worthwhile thing to say in a report as well. Does that make sense? I don't want to put this on our docket though, because I don't want to volunteer to be the one to do it.

And I'm kind of worried about committing ourselves to doing a bit of postmortem and then post-postmortem analysis and writing without there being somebody that thinks, "Yes, this is important enough for me to volunteer to work on it." Yes, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, I'm not volunteering either for some of the same reasons, but I really think we need to be careful about making statements about how inappropriately things might have been handled, if we're not willing to step up and 'no comment' on whether it was at least done according to our rules, and then go back and say whether the rules were wrong or right.

There are lots of things in life that aren't perfect, and maybe this is one of those that for various reasons has to be done under a shield of secrecy, or maybe we blew it. I don't know which it is. I just think we

have to be careful about pronouncements about... That we're not satisfied on how it was handled, when we haven't even had a discussion before or after on whether, ultimately, that was really the best way to do it. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Yes, I tend to agree.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: And I would agree with the both of you in saying I don't think people here want to volunteer for that particular thing because it's so ownerist, but Alan, it's getting back to what you were saying a few comments ago, when you were saying: "Well, people are going to come back to us and demand answers from us about why this is the case."

And I think it's unreasonable to expect the volunteer community to try and answer questions that we can't answer without an awful lot of research and an awful lot of work; the likes of which many volunteers just don't want to do or aren't even capable of doing or don't even have the resources to do.

But moreover, I think rather than think, well, did we make rules that were wrong? And so on, I think there might have been some assumptions made about the original development of the program, that didn't materialize. I don't think that there was... I think there was an assumption that we would have more than five applicants. [laughs]

And I think part of the problem right now is that when you have a process that has absolutely nothing getting by the application process and the evaluation process – so you had this entire amount of work happening and nothing came about as an end result of it – I think that’s the thing that a lot of people might seem outrageous; both from the applicant point of view and from the point of view of volunteers.

We went through an awful lot of grief getting all this done. And at the end of the day, to see not a single application benefitting from it, to me, is just so crushing. And this is the kind of thing that I think we may need to indulge in, and I don’t even know if this is the right venue for it.

But I certainly don’t think that when we were in the JAS group, trying to envision the process, that there would be so few applicants. We didn’t envision that there would be so little awareness of it. And there are all sorts of things to do with the program that were totally out of our control. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Two points – my recollection was one of the applications did go through. Am I wrong?

AVRI DORIA: That’s what I thought, but I was going to speak up...

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought .kids was...

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, sorry. I misspoke.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. In any case, all I was saying was that yes, we should do all this work and if we don't, we don't. I'm just saying let's be cautious about making pronouncements about the results when we communally have some culpability and haven't even really announced...

I mean, it's fine to be righteously indignant about particular cases, but I think we need to do it in the context of how this program was developed and, yes, some of it was out of our hands and they might have overruled us if we had made statements about this, but I don't think we did.

So I'm just saying we need to be cautious about how we go forward, because of the specific results. Thanks you.

AVRI DORIA: I don't think this group is going to make any pronouncements. Individually, we can all say whatever we please, that's in the nature of the world and ICANN, but I don't think that this group is going to say anything. And in fact I think that's why when I was [litnazing? 00:44:22],

I included all kinds of possibilities, from, “They messed up,” to, “We messed up,” to, “No problem.”

So I will keep this on the Agenda. I will open up the call for... It would actually be good if it was someone who wasn't in the JAS, wasn't in the SARP, and is sort of looking all quizzically without too much on their plate, saying, “This is something I'd like to take responsibility for.” But I don't know if we've got somebody like that? But I'll put the call out on the list and maybe someone will.

Without somebody say that yes, they are willing to take responsibility for working with me and the Staff and everyone else to get this to happen, I just don't want to go any further with it other than to keep talking. So a volunteer...

ALAN GREENBERG: It sounds reasonable to me.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah. And I'm assuming, Alan, that were the world's loads different, you might volunteer, I might volunteer, Evan might volunteer. But all of us are so far under the water with our heads in alligators that I just don't see how we can ever do something like that. And Tijani and Yaovi have their hands full with the other things, so other people in this meeting, well, most, are already buried.

Anyway, anything else on this before I move on? In the last 12 minutes? Okay. So it will stay on the Agenda, but until somebody takes it, it's just an Agenda Item. On rollout issues. Okay, let me, let me, let me... Let me share my screen here. And it's the main display... Yeah... Right, so are you now seeing the table?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah.

AVRI DORIA: Good. That's really freaky because as soon as I do that I can't see what I'm showing. Anyway, so we had various things on the table. Okay... And send out if people want to look at it themselves.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can see it. From my point of view, I have a big screen and it's not legible.

AVRI DORIA: Oh, okay. Sorry about that. I don't know what I can do about that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm just letting you know.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. I'll have to get better at it, but anyway... And I understand that Heidi put up the URL so people can look at it locally. We are in watch mode on the private generic word applications. Any change on that? Nope. Oh yeah, I won't even see if there's a hand. Someone will have to tell me if there's a hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can't see either. The screen has changed so that all we're seeing now is your window on a rather colorful newspaper background.

AVRI DORIA: Is that okay?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can read the words now but we can't see the rest of the Adobe.

AVRI DORIA: The other thing that's in watch mode, moving down, is the additional RPMs. Anything new on that? Nope? Ongoing – public interest commitments. That's still an interesting open issue. Hong's not with us. I don't know if anybody has anything to add on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I haven't heard any statements. ALAC has informally asked for more information... Well, formally, actually, in our public statement, asked for

more information on just how these are going to be enforced, but I have heard nothing.

AVRI DORIA:

Yeah, now there's... And that's one of the interesting differences between the community applications, where any of their public interest commitments are in their contracts, and the standard applications, where those seemed like they would only be in these PICs.

And as you say, the enforcement value of them is uncertain and this is an issue that is certainly ongoing in the various applicant groups – with one applicant group being very much in favor of, in sense, dealing with them because it allows a standard application to look like a community application.

And then there are the community applicants that are less than pleased about that. So it's an interesting ongoing issue in many respects. Okay. But, ongoing work on further metrics for the gNSO Consumer Metrics Working Group, Evan had that. Anything new?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Not that I'm aware of. As far as I know, the gNSO has presented its stuff to the Board. ALAC has presented its stuff... It's replied to the Board. I don't know... To my knowledge we haven't received anything back.

AVRI DORIA:

Right. So the response by Beijing didn't happen?

ALAN GREENBERG: The gNSO has just issued a letter on this but as far as I can tell, the information in the letter is several months old and I haven't taken the time to figure out why was this issued today, or not today, last week.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Avri, okay, the Beijing response was not a response, I believe, from the Board. It was... ALAC had committed to supplementary stuff in time for Beijing. But that's the commitment that I recall.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thanks.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Now, we said that when the gNSO came out with its report, we came out with the letter that said by the time Beijing rolls around, we will have our supplementary metrics and we will deliver them by Beijing. We did that, but that's the only deadline of that kind that I recall.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thanks. And then the next one is we are tracking the string contention sets. We saw what happened. We saw the plural strings etc. It lost out somewhat, perhaps, in GAC comments. Alan, you were watching it. Is there anything more to be said?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think so. There are some issues that are open, partly from the GAC comments, but I haven't paid much attention to it to be honest. I haven't even looked too far... I'm not even sure it's public. Who has filed objections over the singular/plural ones?

AVRI DORIA: I don't know. I haven't gone and checked the string comparison objections list. So I don't know. Good question.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can't imagine some people haven't objected over them, but I haven't looked at it at all.

AVRI DORIA: I'll actually check it later. Okay, so we have six more minutes. That's it for the list. I have nothing that will change. I'll make some small edits on it. Evan? I guess the issue is up to you about the .list?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Right now my understanding of the situation is very sketchy, and I'm still trying to research more about it, but the issue of starting .list domains has come up. It's my understanding that ICANN has been playing with it. That all the community response, including that from ALAC and SSAC has been, "Don't do it."

Or that it was opening up a can of worms that absolutely does not need to be opened and has no public benefit of all by doing that. And yet, the ICANN Board continues the belief to want to do economic studies about it. I believe, although I don't know the details, this has come to be by third parties saying that Microsoft has submitted statements against it, the Mozilla Foundation has submitted statements against it. We need to...

And I'm right now in the process of trying to research this myself, but we have a situation with .list domains that have a significant stability and security implications because of what companies do with internal domain names. And I am really trying to get to the bottom of why ICANN is still even toying with this.

This just seems to be something that has zero public interest benefit, and yet ICANN is still playing with doing it, planning... Or at least studying it, whereas this should have been killed a long time ago. And I don't know if this is something that this committee wants to get involved in. I mean, I have my personal conspiracy theories about why this is going on, but that may be beyond this group.

AVRI DORIA:

Yep, certainly conspiracy theories are not us, but if there is a legitimate issue then perhaps it is something that we should be concerned with. I've put in in the list now with a tracked question mark and your name. Does anybody want to comment? Now, how do I undo this so I can see

again? I don't... I think I did something weird to myself where I can't shut down the sharing now because I no longer see the...

ALAN GREENBERG: Ooh! Pretty teddy bear. [laughter]

AVRI DORIA: Oh, you like my teddy bear? Sorry! [laughs]

HEIDI ULLRICH: Nathalie, this is Heidi. Can you help Avri please? We can... I can do that.

AVRI DORIA: Oh, okay, there it is back. Thank you. Thank you for undoing that. Apologies for the teddy bear.

ALAN GREENBERG: You never have to apologize for a teddy bear.

AVRI DORIA: It's a cute teddy bear. It's one of my screen backgrounds. But only one of them. Anyway. So we have a couple more minutes. Does anybody have any comments on the last issue that was brought up? Do we want to take it to the list?

I sort of followed it with bemusement and I'm not sure what I think yet to be honest, and I'm kind of curious as to whether anybody does have any evidentiary-based ideas about why ICANN is doing it. I'd love to hear about those in the spirit of transparency, which I'm rather dedicated to at the moment. Although I won't tell people where I got the teddy bear.

So any other comments? If not, I'll leave it in the tracking mode. We can discuss it further on the list. Should... Evan, you can help me by giving them to me or sticking them in yourself – putting in the URL of the various bits of fact that you referred to in the table there, so that anybody wants to look at it knows where to go to find all the various bits and pieces that you consider important here.

And anyone else that has information on any of these things that we're tracking, please let me know, edit it yourself, let someone on the Staff know. We'll get those URL references and updated comments in there to keep tracking these.

As I say, I would love to have someone in the group take responsibility for the care and feeding of the rollout issues table for me, since it's something that I'm obviously not keeping up as well as I think it should be kept up. So if there's a volunteer, please let me know.

ALAN GREENBERG: We agree at least that it's a reasonable issue for us to be following.

AVRI DORIA:

Yes, and that would be part of the discussion. I think at the surface it's obviously reasonable to track it. I have no idea yet whether I think, and obviously whether any of you think it's something we should do about – which are two very separate points.

Anyway. Time's just about up. Does anybody else just have a last Any Other Business? Okay. In which case, I think I gave myself all kinds of Action Items. I didn't give any of you any. Well, except for the people working on outreach and evaluation, they have some work to be done. And of course, I've given a blanket Action Item in terms of volunteer to take responsibility for a piece; to help us with keeping this going and getting the work done, which I think we all think is worth doing.

So I thank you all and I'll talk to you at the next meeting and online. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Avri, this is Heidi. Is the next call in two weeks? I'm just confirming, or one month?

AVRI DORIA:

I thought it was in a month but we could talk and... We may decide that we need to do a special meeting in two weeks. I would really prefer, if it's all right with people, that we have the general meeting in a month and that we have the... Whether it's on a mid-week... On the mid two weeks or even every week, in this time slot, if one of the project teams needs a meeting slot, we can arrange one.

So in two weeks there's a tentative meeting slot for a project team. I don't know if any of the project teams can use it. Will the questionnaire team need it? It might. Are we further along on the SARP team and they want to plan something for two weeks? I don't think that will happen. That would be great.

But actually at the moment I think it's only the questionnaire team that may have a use for that meeting, and I'll leave that up to Yaovi. Make sense? And now I've gone a minute beyond the hour. My apologies. Thank you everybody. Bye bye.

[good byes and thank yous]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]