

**ICANN Transcription**  
**New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WG**  
**Monday, 18 July 2016 at 22:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WG call on the Monday 18 July 2016 at 22:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance of the calls are posted on the agenda wiki page:

<https://community.icann.org/x/NAKbAw>

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-18jul16-en.mp3>

Coordinator: Excuse me. The recordings have started.

Woman: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on the 18th of July 2016 at 22:00 UTC.

And in the interest of time today there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room so if you're only on the audio bridge, please let yourselves be known now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This is Cheryl. I'll be joining the AC in a minute but I'm only on the audio for now.

Woman: All right, great. Thanks Cheryl. I'd like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Also please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any

background noise. I'd like to turn the call over to Jeff Neuman. You may begin.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you very much. This is Jeff Neuman. Welcome to the first call following the Helsinki meeting. The – there were still people out last week so we just figured we'd give another week to go.

But now we're all back and ready to work. I know there's going to be a lot of holidays coming and vacations coming up over the next few weeks, so we're still going to try and see what work we can get done even though various people will be taking time off.

So with that if you're on Adobe you can see the agenda is up on the right hand side. We'll – I know we're not going to do the roll call but we'll start with any Statements of Interest then go into just a - kind of the outstanding items, which are the subteam signup sheets and the reminder for Community Comment Number 1.

Then I thought we'd do a little bit of substance on potential backend accreditation programs, and then if there's any other business we'll issue a call for any other business at that – at the end.

So we may or may not use up the whole time. This might be a relatively short call but wanted to get everyone back together. So with that said any questions on the agenda?

Okay with that are there any updates to the Statements of Interest? Anybody want to declare a new Statement? Okay hearing none I forgot there is one announcement as well.

For those of you that may not be aware Steve Coates, one of our Co-Chairs, has actually stepped down as a Co-Chair because he's taken a new position, so he's left Twitter or he's in the process of leaving.

And so as of now there are only two co-chairs of this group. The leadership team had talked about whether we should issue a call out for a third co-chair but our current thinking - unless anyone disagrees and I'll open it up.

But our current thinking is that it's really at this point more important to get leaders of each of the subteams than it would be to get a third overall leader. And so at this point it would be great to kind of focus on that kind of leadership, and those leaders will be added to the leadership team during our calls anyway.

So rather than having a third overall chair we thought it would be best to kind of have the groups pick their own track co-chairs or rapporteurs or whatever we end up calling them.

So I want to throw that out for comment to see if that was an acceptable way forward. There is – Alan agrees. Paul agrees. Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes and Cheryl.

Jeff Neuman: Yes Cheryl. Sorry?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That was a yes from Cheryl.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks Cheryl. Okay so it sounds like there's general agreement with that approach so good. If at any point down the line we think that we have a need or anybody in the group thinks there's a need for a third co-chair we can always revisit that petition, but for now we'll focus on the track work.

Also by the way Steve – when he joined his new company - I'm not sure if he's made it public so I won't announce it, but when he joined his new company he does plan on still participating in some of the track work.

He just cannot volunteer to be one of the co-chairs so it'll be good to have him back when he joins that new company. Great. With that let's turn your attention – I don't know if we're going to pull it up but there was a reminder sent out today about the – signing up for the different track work.

Just to – as of now we have for Track 1, which is the support and outreach and general procedural questions we have at my last count 20 people that signed up as active participants, 6 of those observers.

For Track 2, which is the legal/regulatory we had at my last count about 14 active participants and 8 observers. Track 3, which is the string contention, objections, disputes – we had about 13 people sign up as active participants, 7 as observers.

And for the technical track the IDN's universal acceptance technical we have 12 active, 6 observers. We would like to have everyone fill out their preference for the subteams by the end of this week.

It would be in a perfect world so that on our next call we could then go over the final numbers, and of course it's not really final because, you know, if people sign up later you could still sign up.

But we do want to get the groups kind of kicked off in August, at least starting to just organize themselves in early August so to the extent you have not filled out the form please do so this week.

One of the other things I think we should do is that we may want to remind our constituencies to get any subject matter expertise in there. So to the extent that we have people let's say - I'm thinking of the Registry Stakeholder Group.

If we have anybody that's a technical expert and that maybe wouldn't have signed up for the full committee, maybe they want to sign up for one of the work tracks so maybe we have expertise within our organization.

So to the extent you can all issue a reminder not just to the people that are in this group but to others that would be great. I am noticing a high level of overlap in the active participants between the groups.

So there are some that have signed up for all four, some that have signed up for three of the four and I'm just a little concerned that the amount of work may be too much for one person to serve on every group.

Avri and I are signed up for every group but we are really not intending to actively participate in all of the groups, but just more from a kind of monitoring standpoint.

So I see Rubens has said that he's guilty for signing up for all four. It's fine. If you want to take on all that work that's great but it would be great to have some diversity of participants so that we can spread the work out.

And, you know, it's our expectation that each of these tracks will set up their own conference schedule, will set up their own mailing list. Well we will set up the mailing list for each of the track and so, you know, if – it'll be tough if the same people serve in all four to find convenient meeting times and things.

So it would be great if we can get additional volunteers. Again if everyone could please sign up by the end of this week by Friday - hopefully everyone still has audio.

I see Sara has a note. Can you all still hear me other than Sara? Okay. So hopefully everyone could sign up by Friday. Is there any questions on the subteam signup sheets?

Steve Chan do you have anything additional or Avri to add if Avri still has connectivity? Steve you have your hand up.

Steve Chan: Thanks Jeff. This is Steve Chan. Sorry. I was just trying to get off mute there. So I had a couple of comments. The first one is in regards to the descriptions of the work tracks on the wiki.

So right now the baseline is simply pulling the short explanation of each subject from the charter document. So I think the thought is to try to refine those a little bit based on conversations to date.

But what we'd also like to do is try to wrap in some suggestions that were made from ICANN56 and so we started doing that actually. If you'll take a look at the descriptions on the wiki – so I'll just put in a link to the – that's not it.

Sorry. One second. So this is the link to the general workspaces for the working group. Underneath there are where all the work track wiki pages are found.

So if we just click into Work Track 1 here -- I'll provide the links for that too -- you'll see some red text there. So some of the suggestions that were made at ICANN56 during face-to-face.

One was to make sure that change requests were included in the scope. That was already actually for instance included here in Work Track 1 so it's just highlighted in red.

But someone had suggest that we look into the ways in which public comment could be provided, and to also clarify the role of public comments in the application processes.

So that's added as a – just for the moment as a miscellaneous at the bottom of Work Track 1. And so I think Work Tracks 1, 2 and 3 each have small additions to them.

Work Track 2 for instance there's a suggestion to move TLD rollout - which is one of the subjects within the working group charter. The suggestion was to move this to Track 1.

That's in red now as a topic for discussion. And then at the bottom of Work Track 2 is a suggestion to add the selection process as well as the guidance provided to service providers within the new gTLD program.

That was also suggested as a topic for discussion. And I guess since there's only one work track that has additions I'll just go through that one quickly as well.

So for Work Track 3 actually this wasn't a suggestion from ICANN56 but rather a suggested addition based on the conversation with the leadership from the Rights Protections Mechanisms PDP Working Group.

It was a suggestion or a clarification for which working group should be covering the PIC DRP or the public interest commitments dispute resolution process, as well as the RR DRP or the registration restrictions dispute resolution process.

So there's a suggestion from Staff as well as I guess the leadership from both of the groups to include that in the scope here as well. So just I guess a quick heads up to all the members that the descriptions for the work tracks have been amended based on the conversations from ICANN56.

And I think I had one other thing to comment. Let me just look in my notes. The other comment I wanted to make is that the leadership and Staff had talked about a possible schedule for how the work tracks would meet.

So Jeff had talked about, you know, potentially for members that want to participate in all four groups it might be unrealistic or not feasible to be able to participate in all four groups.

So the thought was to try to have some I guess rotation of how the groups meet it and so the – as an initial thought the – or a proposal the thought was that perhaps during Week 1 Work Tracks 1 and 2 can meet and then during Week 2 Work Tracks 3 and 4 could meet as well as perhaps the full group.

And so you could be on a rotation so that all the groups are not meeting during a single week, which is difficult for working group members - participate in all the groups as well as Staff and leadership that might want to also be able to participate and support all the groups.

So that's all I had. I also see Avri's hand so I'll turn it over to her now. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I don't have too much to add. I'm assuming I can be heard. I don't have much to add. I just wanted to add that, you know, once we start these off maybe you want to start them off in one to two weeks maximum that Jeff and I will help get going.

The first issue will be to pick the leadership for these, and then after that we're going to ask that the groups basically look through what needs to be done with the schedule and try and scope out the – how long is that going to take them, so basically start taking ownership of the scale at the moment.

Steve worked out a schedule and it was very much, you know, finger in the air, check the wind, check the humidity and make a best guess. We would like each of these groups to basically take ownership of the schedule and with us all to figure that out.



That's something that we will – both within the groups and then when the leadership – then the next step will – to work on creating the comments requests.

And those can be done the way we did EC1 or those can be done in some other way that seems more appropriate to the members of the subgroup. So that will be the symbol to me, talking through all the topics and figuring what information we need from the rest of the – pardon me.

I have Windows open and motor scooters going by. So I just want to basically put that on the table so people have an idea how this is going to start, as we start and then Steve will be updating with the rest of the leadership teams the schedule once we've got – sure what everyone else has.

In the meantime we will also have sent a comment period on Community Comment 1, but we'll talk about that some more in the next item but I just wanted to bring that extra topic. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Thank you Avri. Susan I know you have your hand up. Is it still up or, I mean, I see the hand's down now but do you want to – okay. I don't see a hand up anymore but Susan if you want to add anything please feel free because we're going to go on to the next subject.

Now any other questions on the signup sheets and the work track? Susan's typing and I'll give her a second to type in. Oh okay. So Susan is typing her question into the chat.

Let's carry on. Okay well let's go into the next subject and then we'll come back to Susan's question. So for the next item, which is CC1, just a reminder.

I believe, and Steve Chan correct me if I'm wrong, the date that we had asked all of these to come in which will be returned was the - or is the 25th of

July or maybe it was the 24th but the 24th was a Sunday so it's actually the 25th.

So my general question is I know that it's a lot of questions but just from the group does anyone have a sense as to where their constituency, stakeholder group, AC – where they're at with response?

And I remember there's two different things. There's CC1 but then there was also the kind of catalog of other statements. Those – both of those are due so does anyone have any comments as to where their group is at this point?  
Okay Greg?

Greg Shatan: Hi it's Greg Shatan for the record and speaking for the IPC. We're very close on Item 1. If not for Helsinki and 4th of July and other things that tended to fog the mind would already have been done but your reminder serves to unfog us.

I'll need to get that done. Number 2, not quite as close but, you know, we'll need to bend ourselves to finish that since it's important stuff and certainly want to make sure that our perspectives and history are included in both of those package. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Great thanks Greg. And just to remind everyone the catalog of statements is really to kind of help each of the groups so that you don't have to restate everything you previously stated.

You could just have your catalog of statements and then point to them as opposed to rewriting everything so it's hopefully to help but, you know, so the sooner we can get those in the better.

Obviously the more important thing at this point right now is the response to CC1. So thanks Greg for the update from the IPC. Does anybody – I can call

on people in different groups but I'd rather not do that. Does anybody have any updates from any of the other groups? Avri?

Avri Doria: This is – I just wanted to check with Steve. The last time we talked about – there were zero received so far and I was wondering if that was still the current status.

Jeff Neuman: Steve Chan?

Steve Chan: Thanks Avri. This is – sorry this is Steve Chan. And it's taken me longer to unmute today. I'm on my mobile instead of landline. So for the – what's it called, the historical record of statements and advice I just provided a link to the responses collected from that.

So there's several received in regards to that outreach attempt. As for Community Comment 1, which I believe Avri was referring to, she's correct. There has not been any responses received yet and that's also – the – which effort that was – that Jeff referred to for the 25 July due date. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Great. So anybody else? Thanks Avri and Steve. Is there anybody else that knows kind of where they're at, whether we should provide for some extension?

It's not my preference to do that but obviously if nobody's going to make the date then we may want to issue an extension. Anybody have any thoughts on that and if we were to have an extension how long should it be?

Our next meeting by the way and I was going to talk about this at the end - we're not going to meet next week but we're – we'll meet in two weeks so would that be enough time? So let me – I'll turn to Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes I was going to say some – this is Avri. I was going to say something similar to what you’ve just said. In other words because you’re out and I’m on a plane next Monday at this time we had decided to skip that meeting.

So I would like to suggest that perhaps the people from this community organizations, SOs and ACs, stakeholder groups and constituencies could take advantage of the 25th.

And perhaps we could look at not do an extension at this point but basically look at that – engineer would. And basically whenever I have something due on Friday I basically say, “Okay Monday morning is bull Friday.”

So the 25th is our next meeting. The following Monday is our virtual 25th and so if anybody could work on aiming for the 25th perhaps using this time slot in the 25th to pull that together then getting it – as much as possible.

We could have them all by the end of next week if that seems at all reasonable to people. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks Avri. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thanks. I don’t have anything specific. I think we may have already or will soon submit our catalog of previous statements. The other work is a lot more difficult.

With Staff being on vacation and a lot of our volunteers on vacation I really don’t know where we at – where we are at right now. I suspect we will not make the date but we’ll try to make it as soon as possible after that. But I’m speaking more in generalities than really knowing. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks Alan. And just to clarify (Kim) was set up with SO/AC, right?

Alan Greenberg: That’s correct. Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Okay thanks Alan. Yes I agree with Avri. I mean, if we can use the time and we shouldn't – I don't want to come out with a full extension because then people just then delay again.

They just put it off a week but between us internally we know we're not going to start discussing that till not this coming Monday but the Monday after that so I think that's August 1.

So it seems like people on the chat are saying that they could use the extra time. I'm sure Registries, Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group - Tom Dale, the GAC Secretariat, says that they're close to finalizing it so they need to get it done by next week or close to it so that sounds great.

You know, the more we can have by the August 1 date the better. So Greg is quoting from the musical Oliver asking for more time, and so Greg you have till the 1st or actually the Friday before that so we can talk about it.

Great. Anybody else have any questions or comments on it? All right, not seeing any others I thought one thing that we could discuss as far as the matter of substantive in a topic that's come up a couple times – it's technically slated for Track 1.

But – oh wait, before I do that Steve wants to say something. Oh I forgot something. Okay Steve Chan let me turn it over to you.

Steve Chan: Thanks Jeff this is Steve from Staff again, and yes I just wanted to bring up something that was distributed in the agenda. And certainly not meant to discount the contributions that we hope to receive in regards to CC1, but this is from a request that Avri had made at ICANN56 in which she asked Staff to start pulling together I guess initial – a summation of where the group stands on certain subjects, in particular the overarching subjects that we've already discussed.

And so it's now in the AC room as well as in a Google Document. The link is in the agenda. This is Staff's attempt at trying to assess where the group stands at this time on the six overarching subjects.

So it's a Staff assessment as I said so we may have gotten something wrong and we certainly welcome suggestions to make it better or more accurate based on the working group's understanding.

So it's very much plenary as I said and of course we're waiting from all the communities in regards to CC1. And in some cases we are actually specifically waiting for feedback from other groups such as the CCTRT.

The way that it's organized right now is it starts with the subject of course, and then it has the initial findings or conclusions where there's agreement or lack thereof, which basically applies to the rationale for reaching whatever outcome the working group is going to reach, and then the anticipated outcome where there is at least some initial thought and where the group will end up as a recommendation.

We've tried to put those into that far right column so that's just the way that it's organized. This was provided to the leadership I think late last week so there hasn't been a whole lot of eyes on this.

So I'm not sure if we want to go through this in detail or if we want to just make sure that the working group knows that this is available and there for their review, and perhaps we can discuss this in more detail at a later time.

Of course if the group – working group members would like to discuss now I'm more than open to going through each of these items if that's what is desired. Thanks. Back to you Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Steve. I would like to basically just have everyone read this before the next meeting and then discuss it after all the statements are in, because in theory the statements could drastically change these.

I don't want people to think that these are predetermined outcomes. Sorry. I'm just looking at the chat. It's making me laugh. So yes but unless anyone does want, I mean, we could always discuss this but just as kind of a cautionary note that these can change depending on the comments that we get in.

Any questions? All right. I'm not seeing any. Let's see. I'm just reading the chat here. Carlos would like to have the full doc as a PDF so if we can make that document available as a PDF that would be great.

And then Tom Dale is cautioning my use of musicals that they're part of literature. Hey by the way if anyone can make a musical reference in each of our upcoming meetings I'll be very impressed so that's just a challenge for everybody.

All right. With all that said what I thought we would talk about is something that the leadership team has been talking about in terms of if we could get to resolution on certain policy items or at least provide a – or we have a clear direction as to what our thinking is on policy items.

Now perhaps we can then in parallel work on some implementation or get the right people to work on implementation of those items. One of those items that people have been talking about and there's general agreement on - although we'll test that theory in a few minutes.

But one of the things that people have been talking about are the potential accreditation of backend providers, and whether we think this is a good idea from a policy perspective.

In general most people have been talking favorably about having an accreditation program for backend providers. If this is indeed still the case again we'll talk about the substance.

Then perhaps this is one of those items even though it's in Track 1 that we could kick off to an implementation group to work on developing that criteria, taking into consideration any concerns from a policy perspective that we would have.

So for example the one thing I thought we could talk about on this call was pros and cons of having an accreditation program, and then seeing if there was any way that we could, you know -- and we could talk about this from a policy perspective -- come to a initial policy conclusion and then if that policy conclusion required implementation work to kick that off.

Need to – some sort of group to work on implementation. So with that as an intro we could talk about – what would be great is to get documented kinds of pros and cons and concerns or good things about an accreditation program to see if there is general interest in kind of pursue the – proceeding down this type of path. So Donna is on. Donna has her hand up and so does Alan so Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks Jeff. Donna Austin from Neustar. So I just have a – I guess this is a clarifying question. I'd like to understand why this is a policy discussion and if we agree that it's policy then we go to implementation, because I think – and I'm – and this is – I'm just trying to get this clear in my mind.

So I think that what – potentially what we're trying to solve here is the challenges that came out of Question 28. I think it was Question 28, which it may not have been 28 but all the technical questions.

So I think that - potentially that were in the Applicant Guidebook and what the applicants had to respond to as part of this application process for 2012. And



I'm just trying to understand why this is policy and why it's not implementation. So - and I'm - and this might be quite obvious to some people but it's not to me, because I think we're using (unintelligible) accreditation to solve one of the problems that was in the guidebook, or one of the potential problems in the guidebook associated with responding to technical questions, but I'm trying to understand the link to policy.

So, Jeff, if you could just give some -- or anybody can -- provide some kind of background on that, I'd really appreciate it. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks, Donna. It's a really question. Without really answering the question in a satisfactory way, my response is that this was included from the discussion group as one of the topics we should address. I know that's not the best answer in the world. Nobody has actually kind of undertaken an analysis, that I know of, as to whether this is policy or just pure implementation.

My hope was that, you know, because of what you're expressing and what I've heard others express that if it's something the group does not feel is policy and can go straight to implementation, then we can do that. There are some questions that people may have, but, you know, if that's something the group feels is strict implementation then, you know, from my personal perspective, I'm happy to just take it straight away to an implementation group that can kind of work on this. But, you know, it's not the best answer in the world, I know, Donna but, you know, it was an issue that was kind of given to us in our - in the discussion group and in the charter.

Alan, you have your hand raised?

Alan Greenberg: Yes two different things. With regard to whether it's policy or not, I think one can make a strong case saying it is technically implementation because it doesn't really affect the outcome other than the ease and workload of

carrying things forward. However, to mention - to not mention it at all leaves it up to the, quote, implementers to decide whether they do it or not.

So I have no problem at all with us making a recommendation that it should strongly be considered, or something like that, as part of the implementation. It doesn't affect the outcomes but it is something which might streamline the process. So, you know, if we don't mention it at all then it's nothing we can have any say over. Recommending it I think is something we could do.

I was just going to add one more caution that technically we haven't decided if there should be any more rounds or any more gTLDs in the future, so anything we do in this one, in a fast path in this one, is conditional of course that there are future processes. Other than that, I think it's a reasonable thing to cross off our list if we can do it quickly. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Alan. And, yes on the last comment, pretty much everything is contingent on the outcomes of whether we should have new gTLDs. I think for the purpose of our job, the policy is still that there will be new gTLDs unless that policy is overturned, so - or unless we decide the policies - the GNSO community decides that that's no longer the policy. So. But I take your point.

And yes, I think some of the policy items to consider or some of the issues, instead of calling them policy or implementation, some of the things I've heard obviously are that having an accreditation program could lead to more choice and diversity amongst backend providers. On the other hand I've heard one of the cons or concerns is that it would basically -- or it could if not designed correctly -- could be sort of a race to a bottom or setting these minimum standards instead of having - you basically have everyone meeting a bare minimum as opposed to striving for excellence in service. So that's kind of on the downside.

On the plus side, I've heard - or also on the downside I've heard the difficulty in accreditation is knowing what they're accredited for. Are they accredited for all registries, are they accredited just for registries that have a registration base of -- and I'm making this up -- less than a million names, are they accredited to have more than a million names, are the names even significant, is it more about DNS queries. You know, so the question is what are you actually accredited for.

I've also heard what kind of liability does someone like ICANN take on by saying that they're accredited to do something and it turns out that they're not. So there's a lot of concerns. More positives by the way. I know I just made it sound like there were more negatives, but I definitely heard from applicants that it would be great to know who's accredited that you could choose from, it would be great from a backend technical provider to know that it's passed and it doesn't have to keep being reevaluated many times and that, you know, obviously in certain circumstances where they had different evaluators, they were evaluated differently with different types of questions. There wasn't general consistency. So if you have an accreditation process, you by definition have some consistency.

So there's lots of good things and concerns I've heard. I believe that most of the concerns can be addressed by an implementation team, but there's some great conversations going on on the chat. If I could just turn to that. Rubens said the policy issue is whether one is required to show technical capability beforehand and applications on or after. Donna says, "But there may be other possibilities to solve the problem. I don't see accreditation as the only answer." Rubens - "Donna, it doesn't need to be accreditation, it's just an option, but the same process can be used to have a greenfield operator start from zero."

Heather - "Picking up on Rubens's point, it would encourage applicants to apply if satisfying tech requirements was a separate step that came after the application's submission." Okay, Heather, that's actually kind of interesting. I

think most people thought that the accreditation would be before application submission so that applicants knew that there was a pool that they could choose from unless they wanted to, you know, obviously they could do it themselves and apply for accreditation with the application.

One thing that hasn't been mentioned in the chat yet is that ICANN is also looking at ways to - for frontend registries now that want to change their backend provider, in essence they have to have a process to evaluate whether the new backend provider would be sufficient in transitioning the registry to that new backend provider. So in theory, there are a number of elements that already ICANN is thinking about in terms of a pseudo-type accreditation process.

So it could be used as for both processes. So Heather's getting a lot of plus ones. I would love for someone to come up and talk about it on the call. Chat's a little hard to follow. Heather, great. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Jeff. Can you hear me?

Jeff Neuman: Yes great.

Heather Forrest: So apologies, I have a cold. (Unintelligible) I love (Paul)'s comment. My thinking was this. I mean I understand the point about accreditation coming in the beginning, but I wonder, you know, there's no reason it couldn't come at the end. There's no reason you couldn't have a list of accredited backend providers. But, you know, you essentially divorce the two processes so that you apply on the basis of question 18 and similar, you know, everything that comes before 18, if you like. And then at the end, you know, you get the green tick and then you choose from a list. You choose from -- at that point -- from the list of accredited providers. That was what was in the back of my head.

I mean I full well understand the idea of choose in advance, select one and, you know, tick them in your application, who's your backend provider. But I don't see any reason why we couldn't put it in in the backend, let's say after you - your application has been accepted. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: I just realized I was on mute. Sorry everyone. I was talking. Heather, thank you. That actually makes a lot of sense, you know, to divorce the two processes. And, yes, I had never thought of it from after the fact but I guess that does make a lot of sense and is in line definitely with divorcing the two processes. (Karen Day), you have your hand raised. (Karen), I don't know if you're on mute or it's just me that can't hear you. Oh okay. (Karen) just said she thinks she lost audio. So is everybody - anybody else having trouble hearing?

Alan Greenberg: I can hear you. It's Alan.

Jeff Neuman: Ah, okay. Thanks, Alan. (Karen)'s going to dial back in. So as (Steve) notes, this is currently in track one but the thinking was that if this was something that we as group kind of came to some initial conclusion we could actually move it out of track one and move it to like, you know, more of the technical track to give them some work to do. So. But we don't have to. It was just kind of test to throw out there.

Some other comments. Donna has said that -- or sorry, going back even further -- (Rhonda) said that it makes sense to her in developing areas mostly they're under back ends already known services. Donna: "Wouldn't ICANN need assurances that the applicant has technical capability before they approve the application?"

So, you know, obviously, Donna, that's something that, you know, maybe there's a contingent approval in that. I guess the answer could be that until they get an accredited backend provider, they couldn't go on to the next step of pre-delegation testing. And delegation is a root is maybe there is some sort

of timeframe that could be built in there, maybe not as strict as, you know, signing an agreement within one year and all that kind of stuff, but, you know, that's another are to talk about.

Okay, (Karen), are you back on yet?

(Karen Day): I am. Can you hear me now?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, great. Yes, thanks, (Karen).

(Karen Day): I feel like the Verizon guy. "Can you hear me now?" I just wanted to reiterate, just for those who aren't in the chat, what I had said in support of what Heather was saying, which is an applicant who is involved in a contention set, it would have been much, much better to have waited until that played out to contract with the backend provider. So I think having that option later in the process is better.

Jeff Neuman: And, you know, you're not the only one that's made that comment. I think that there was some - there was some frontend operatives that did have to pay fees to pick a backend provider, whether or not they won the contention set. And so I think that was also a concern I had heard from having an accreditation process divorced from the actual ICANN application process.

Donna has corrected, or not corrected, but Donna has made a good point about potentially if there an accreditation process, there may not need to be a pre-delegation testing unless of course there was something proposed that wasn't in the accreditation process. But I think that's a good point, Donna, as well that you could eliminate that step.

Rubens makes a point of ICANN does a lot of work before signing the agreement, like background checks. Adding the backend at this point would be a very small addition to the signup process. Okay. (Karen), is your hand still up or...? Nope. Okay, anybody else have any comments on

accreditation? Obviously this is something, you know, this is only the first time we're really bringing it up.

What we could do is bring it up - as is policy, we normally bring it up several times before we come to any types of conclusions, but this would be one of those topics that I think would be great to talk more about on the list, getting together kind of the pros or a list of concerns - maybe a list of concerns that would need to be addressed in the implementation of an accreditation process.

I'm still looking for, by the way, and I was hoping to have it by now but there was prior to the 2012 round, there was actually discussion in 2009 about ICANN establishing an accreditation program. And what happened though is that a lot of - if everyone remembers, the program was actually approved in 2008.

So everyone was assuming that implementation of the 2008 policy would actually be in 2009 or possibly early 2010. Nobody really wanted to address the concerns of an implementation of an accreditation program at that point because they thought it would significantly delay the implementation of the new gTLD process, which again they were thinking in their minds would be 2009.

Obviously it didn't work out that way and probably could have considered an implementation program, but hindsight is 20/20 as they say. And so there was some work done on it. I've been trying to get the documentation out of ICANN that - as to the work they did. I know that they retained (unintelligible) a guy by the name of (Lyman Chapin) was working on that issue. And the reason I remember that is because I remember that while I was working for Neustar and others some other backend providers or registries at the time were interviewed as to how such a process could work.

It would be great to find those documents. I don't know if Steve Chan, if you at ICANN can see. Maybe Karen Lentz has that information. I know (Kurt) was there at the time, but I'm not sure who else worked on the issue at ICANN, but it'd be fantastic if we not have to start from scratch if there were some documents out there.

Steve said he was just taking - to dig around. I e-mailed (Lyman) as well. He remembers it. He just doesn't - all the documents are with ICANN. As with any consulting, they don't keep the documents. It's kept by the - ICANN. So Donna says, "Jeff, if this is in work track one, would this discussion happen at work teams?"

So, Donna, at this point I what I was hoping was that we could actually start some work moving out of - this is slated for work track one, but if there was general agreement before we constitute the work tracks or even early on, yes we can move this into work track one. But I thought we could get a jump on this because it was something that sounded like there was general agreement on.

Ultimately I wouldn't expect work - I would expect work track one, because it's more policy-oriented to either kick that into an implementation team, which could be track four or it could be - it could create a new work track five of just implementing things that come out of the other work tracks, other decisions. So that was my current thinking. It could be - but I throw that open to everyone. So, Donna, thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Jeff. Donna Austin. So when you say kick it to implementation, does that mean that ICANN staff would become involved or is that an implementation team that is set up within the PDP working group?

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, I think that's a great question. My initial answer would be kind of a mixture of both. I would hope that - and it all depends on the direction of the guidance from the policy group. So something like this, you know, it could be



the guidance of the track to say let's kick it out into a team comprised of staff, who obviously knows about implementing this type of thing, plus members of this group or even other subject matter experts that we might get involved.

So, you know, I know for example there are plenty of people in backend registries that are not members of this group but they may be interested in working on an implementation for an accreditation program. So I think it's, you know, it's really as the work track provides that kind of guidance but I wasn't thinking that, okay now we just kick it out to ICANN staff and forget about it. I think the thinking was that we could have kind of a mix. Does that make sense, Donna?

Donna Austin: Yes. I guess I'm just getting a sense that we may be over-engineering and we're creating a hell of a lot of work for this working group that already has a lot of work. So I - to the extent that we can be really clear about what we're doing, I think that would be really helpful. You know, I don't necessarily disagree with what you've proposed, but if we're going to do loops around what we think the process is when we get to certain points, then I think that's going to be unhelpful for us. The extent that we can, you know, agree to the process now I think would be really helpful.

So maybe we just need to think a little bit more about what the process is we're getting into now to ensure that we're not creating more work for this group, you know, at the end of the day. Because there is, you know, and I don't think anybody is underestimating how much work's involved here, but it seems that we may be unintentionally creating a lot more as well. Thanks, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks, Donna. I'm happy - you know, obviously this was just kind of thrown out there to just get some input. I would love to have more comments like that, Donna, on the mailing list and, you know, who you think, you know, what your thoughts are in terms of how we can, you know, just move these things forward.

The whole idea really stems from the notion that we talked about several times in the past, which was that what tends to slow these things down is that in the past we've waited, we being the ICANN community, have waited until policy was completely final before any implementation work was started.

So what we're trying to do is have some implementation work go on in parallel for areas that we think we're agreed upon from a policy perspective so that it's not, you know, we finish our work in early 2018 or whenever we do, and then all sudden we say, "Okay ICANN staff, now propose implementation." Because if that happens, then we're, you know, well into 2020, 2021 and beyond. So any ways that we can kind of satisfy those concerns, you know, please weigh in. Let us know how we can do that.

Any other thoughts on this? I see Donna's typing. A bunch of people are typing. Agree on the reasons. Donna says, "Agree on the reasons, just trying to find a way to make it efficient." Yes, Donna, if you can think of ways to make efficient -- or anyone else -- please, you know, propose a way forward. This is kind of - this is different and that usually most groups wait till they're done before they start any implementation. So if there are better ways, you know, we're all kind of taking a first step at this new process, so I'd love to hear it, love to hear it over e-mail.

I've noticed that most of our discussions happen in person or on these conferences and we're not - we don't use our e-mail list as much as other groups. That could be good, that could be bad, but it'd be great to just get some progress on this over the next couple of weeks.

Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Alan Greenberg. I must admit, I'm somewhat confused. We are talking about implementation as if it's something that is under our full purview, and I'm not quite sure how that comes about. I mean in general

implementation happens after we make recommendations. The board approves them, and then they go to implementation. So I'm not quite sure what you're talking about. You know, maybe you're talking about a group here which will do some prep work to help the implementation that happens after recommendations or you're talking about something else, but I'm just a little bit confused.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I guess my thinking was that there's no reason why you can't present a package to the board that includes policy and implementation in that package that goes. I don't think we need to follow the -- again, people can disagree -- but I'm not sure you need to follow the policy must be completely approved before you start any implementation work.

True, if the board comes back and says, you know, that policy is junk, then obviously all that work we've done on implementation goes down the tubes. But hopefully you could present a package to the board that would include implementation, more implementation guidance than what was previously provided.

Rubens says - oh Donna you've got your hand raised again. Great, Donna?

Donna Austin: Yes thanks, Jeff. Just picking up on Alan's concern, I - you know, given some of the discussions that we had in Helsinki about process and what the council can do in terms of their role and what the board can do within what's within their purview, I think, picking up on Alan's point, we need to be really careful in how we go about this so it becomes more important that we have a pretty clear idea on what we're doing here. So I, you know, I tend to agree with Alan. Let's be sure we understand what we're doing here and how we're doing it. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Donna. Before I got to Alan there is a couple comments in the chat. Accreditation is - Rubens says, "Accreditation is an implementation that can affect already established registries." (Phil Milano) from (Mayo Brown) talks

about some good comments about the questions and the nexus between the registry services and the business components. So there's some comments there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr says, "We need to provide the board with a package that includes some implementation guidelines." Yes, Cheryl, it's implementation guidelines. I'm not saying we design the entire program, you know, everything that there is. But, you know, even in our -- when I say our, the GNSO's -- final report to the board in 2007, which was approved in 2008, there was some implementation guidance but it was very sparse and it was very, very high level. I'm talk - and then of course there are many that believe that the implementation that came out of that did not reflect the policy.

So there was general agreement from the community that in this process we needed to be much more specific with implementation than we were the last time. But that doesn't mean we need to, you know, design the entire program from beginning to end and including all the technical criteria and everything else. But we are trying to give some more or put some more meat on the bones, if you will, of these policy recommendations so that we don't have a three, four-year process of developing a guidebook after the fact.

Going back - oh sorry, Alan, you've got your hand raised. Sorry, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I did, thank you. Just to be clear, I didn't really have a concern, I had a question on what we're talking about. And I think between what Cheryl said and what you just said, it's addressed. And I think we have to be very careful on terminology. If you look at the range of PDPs that have happened over the last decade, they range from the new gTLD one, which gave a very bare bones set of recommendations and presumed it would all be fleshed out during implementation, or perhaps in our naivety, we didn't even think there were details left out, we just hadn't thought about them, but regardless.

Other PDPs, as a reaction to that, have been in some cases very specific about their recommendations. Things that in a few years earlier might have been left to implementation were spelled out in detail in the PDP recommendations. And I think that's what we're talking about here. We're talking about providing a fair amount of guidance to the implementation and, to be honest, less latitude in the implementation than we might otherwise have because we have concerns that there may be too many options and we want to drive the process, not have staff drive the process going forward.

So I think what we're talking about is not implementation but a more fleshed out recommendation with more details in it to make sure that the end product is what we envision and not something else. So maybe implementation is the wrong word to use so that we don't send mixed messages. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks, Alan. Great points, and you said it better than I. And Avri does point out from - as one of the chairs from back then, or the chair, she said they had thought about the issues and we thought about the issues back in 2007 but we - and we were talking with ICANN staff about implementation, but it was just never written down. Then some of the rules have changed, and so implementation is - yes.

But I agree with you, maybe I'm using the wrong terminology. But I do also agree with the fact that, you know, the groups now are providing much more guidance than they did because of this whole process from 2008 on. So if we can think of different terminology, let's do that. Let's - but the point was to basically kick it out of a policy work track, a pure policy work track into a some group of people that were - had expertise in these types of things to help develop some implementation or some -- there I used the word -- some guidelines or more concrete guidance so that we don't have to recreate the wheel after all the policy is decided.

So I see that Alan has to leave. Thank you, Alan. And I think we're actually at a good point at this point to continue the discussion on e-mail. Phil, can you

resubmit - I'm going to ask you to resubmit your comments on e-mail to make sure we have them all, because I think they were good and Heather's response to that. I know there were some other responses, Rubens. I think they're all good. I don't want them to get lost in the chat. So to the extent you can submit those in e-mail, that'd be fantastic.

With that, is there - are there any other business anyone wants us to address at this point? Not seeing any hand raised. So just a reminder, our next call will not be next week, although Avri told you the real reason, because she and I are out of town. I was kind of hoping it was more giving you all a week off, but Avri busted me. I am on vacation. So everyone have a good couple weeks and we'll talk on August - Monday, August 1 at I'm not sure of the time, but it will certainly be sent to you. So everyone have a good week, two weeks, and talk to you all on August 1. Thank you very much.

Avri Doria: Have a good vacation. I never told them you were on vacation. I said you were out of town.

Woman: He confessed, Avri. (Unintelligible)

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. Bye, everyone.

Avri Doria: Bye.

Woman: Thank you. This concludes today's call. Operator, please stop the recordings and disconnect all remaining lines. Have a great day everyone.

END