ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group is scheduled to take place on
Monday, 22 August 2016 at 13:00 UTC
Note: 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. The audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-
subsequent-22aug16-en.mp3

Attendance of the calls is also posted on the agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/2g_sAw

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar
page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Coordinator: Recording has started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to
the New Subsequent Procedures Working Group call held on Monday the
22nd of August 2016.

In the interest of time there'll be no roll call as we have quite a few
participants. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room, so if you
are only on the audio bridge could you please let yourselves be known now?

Hearing no names I would like to remind all participants to please state your
name before speaking for transcription purposes, and to please keep your
phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any
background noise. With this I'll turn it back over to Avri Doria. Please begin.

Avri Doria: Thank you and hello everyone and thank you for joining the meeting. First thing will be to review the agenda, so we'll review the agenda then we'll discuss SOIs and make sure there are no updates needed.

Then we'll look at the Working Group meeting schedule as we move forward. We're making – trying to make some adjustments in a – given all the subgroup work.

Then a brief discussion on the Board letter as it keeps coming up in discussions just to make sure that we kind of all understand where we're involved or not yet involved with that.

Then as a standard part of the meetings we'll do the work track subteam status updates. In this case there won't be that much yet but just to start the practice.

And then we're going to start working on the Community Comment 1 review tool. As people know the third deadline or maybe it was the fourth deadline passed and we now have the – to start doing the work of reviewing the comments we've got and then any other business.

First I'd like to ask does anybody have any other business that they think we should put on the agenda now? Okay hearing none I'll ask again when we get to any other business to see if any other business has since emerged but we'll go with it as that.

Any objections to the agenda as it stands? No? Okay well then I'll start. On SOIs everybody has them on file I assume. I don't assume we've had any new join who don't have an SOI.

So all I'd like to do is ask anyone that needs to update it because there's been a material change that affects this group to speak up and give us an indication.

Anybody have a change in SOI? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices I'll assume that there are no change - just remind people that if things do change in your interests then you need to update your standard – your Statement of Interest and need to mention it on a following call.

Okay moving on again the Working Group meeting schedule – I think I turned the floor over to (Emily) on this one. She's been doing the hard job of trying to figure out how to schedule our meetings, how to schedule our meetings in such a way that we've not put ourselves in a conflict trap with any of the other regular meetings that are happening, which in a large case means trying to miss the CCWG Workstream 2 meetings since so many people are involved in those. So (Emily) I turn it over to you.

Emily Barabas: Hi Avri. Sure. This is (Emily). Can everyone hear me okay?

Avri Doria: I can.

Emily Barabas: Great. So thanks for turning that over and I just wanted to share with everyone as Avri said we've been trying very carefully to find time slots for this group to be working the – to the least extent possible collide with other initiatives.

And in particular a number of people expressed concern about Workstream 2 activities, which are going to be happening on sort of a variable schedule but in three different time slots on a regular basis, which is 05:00 UTC, 13:00 UTC and 19:00 UTC.

So we're hoping to move our meetings for this project out of those time slots every day of the week because there's a pretty big chance of collision. So what I'm going to share right now with the group is a Google Doc with a proposed schedule.

And what you're going to want to do – the first one was us attempting – the first tab is us attempting to schedule for this month so you can just click out of that because all this is almost finished.

But the second and third tabs are proposed schedules rotating for September and October and what we're looking at is three time slots. One is 03:00 UTC, the second one is 15:00 UTC and the third one is 20:00 UTC.

And the reason we selected those is because those are time slots that do not frequently collide with other initiatives, and also because they would accommodate the range of time zones that were looking to be accommodated.

And so the 03:00 UTC is new and that was because folks in the Asia-Pacific time zones were very much inconvenienced by the other two existing time slots, so I encourage everyone to take a look at that.

The idea is that – and this is just a proposal that the full meeting would happen every other week. The subteam meetings would also happen every other week on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

The full meeting would continue to happen on Mondays and that there would be a rotating schedule so that different people would be differently inconvenienced at different times.

So that's the idea - again just a proposal. We're welcome – we welcome your feedback but, you know, keeping in mind the connected scheduling with everything else. We're hoping that this is a solution people can live with. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you (Emily). I see Kavouss has his hand up. Please Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Thank you. Good day. I think the speaker that was spoken was too fast. It was difficult for me to understand. I am not criticizing anybody but just I'd request respectfully that everybody speaks slowly and separate syllables from one the other in order to enable the non-English Spoken person to also understand and take the point.

And the second is the 19:00 hours meeting – it is now a popular time. Everybody book for 19:00 hours. Some people like me are involved in other meeting and I see that the 09:00 hours is everywhere.

So please kindly consider that this is the – may end up that excludes somebody that – who is interested to participate. Can you please coordinate with other groups?

CCWG subgroups and the CWG and IOT - 19:00 hours is totally populated and overrided by everybody. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you Kavouss. I do believe that, I mean, today's meeting is in this – well obviously we've had meetings in this 19:00 slot. I guess we're not in it today.

But that is indeed one of the time slots that we're trying to avoid and (Emily) did we have 19:00 slotted in our regular sessions? It would actually have been good if we had been able to put up a picture of the times.

And Kavouss I do hope that I am speaking slowly enough. Please let me know if I don't speak slowly enough. But 19:00 was not one of the times that we were targeting was it?

(Emily): Hi Avri, this is (Emily). I'll try to – I apologize. Nineteen hundred is not one of the time slots that we're proposing going forward. If you look at Tabs 2 and 3 of the Google Doc the three time slots are 03:00, 15:00 and 20:00 UTC. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you. So that Kavouss should deal with that particular issue since the meetings in WS 2 that are in the 19:00 are one hour slotted meetings. There may occasionally be a longer meeting that we might have conflict with, but we really have tried very hard to pick our own tracks, similar timings but not the same track so that we have the pain sharing but we also do not conflict with those times.

And as long as we stay within those tracks hopefully we'll be safe, and certainly open to more discussion on it but just wanted to bring that up. Okay if there's no more question on the timing and hopefully – yes Kavouss I see the note.

If possible I've, I mean, you put – oh you prefer to have a weekly or fortnightly schedule and I do think that that will be the case. I think that now that we've sort of figured out how to do it we've gotten started with the subgroups.

We've shifted the time of the full meeting to the ties to the time track. I think we will be able to put out a fortnightly or greater schedule going forward. We'll work with the leadership of the various subgroups and (Emily) and the rest of the Staff to try and come up with a longer-term schedule so people can put things in their calendar.

Okay so if that's any more – is there any more on schedules? I know it's in some ways the least important but in some ways it's the most important if we're going to get work done.

I'll move then to the Board letter. Don't really have a lot to say on this yet but the letter has made such a very large splash that people keep asking about it in all the various subgroups and there has been communication.

We did send a letter to the liaison, Paul McGrady, basically saying that, you know, we're not sure what the Council's going to do about it but please talk to us before you make any decisions about changing things.

Understand that the chair of the Council has indeed sent a letter to the Board basically saying thank you, and if I understand the letter correctly that they will work on it and they will be consulting us.

I think our next step is to – well we really have two steps. One, in all the subgroups we really need to start understanding our schedule. But in terms of responding to the letter I think we need to wait now for the discussion that will occur in Council, and then deal with whatever questions they pass on to us.

At the moment we continue working on the charter we have that says, "Here's the load of stuff that you need to get done, and following regular PDP process you will do community comments and then you will do a draft recommendation.

You will deal with comments and you will do final recommendations of all issues in your charter." So that's the basis on which we were chartered. That's the basis on which I believe we should continue to work.

And if the Council wishes our charter amended to have segmented deliverables then we would have to work on how to do that. And that's why I preface this by saying we will need to get realistic projections from the subgroups, which haven't even all met yet on how long it will take them to get various work done and how they could rearrange if they had to rearrange.

So it's really quite a complicated process that we're right at the beginning of. Kavouss I see your hand and so please go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Thank you Avri. You know that the work that you are reading – leading, sorry, is one of the most important activities in the ICANN and the shortcoming difficulties on the first round is still before us.

So if there is no urgency why we should rush and without going in the sufficient level of detailed discussions to provide something provisionally. And also take into account that there's still some people in Europe - maybe not in the other part of the world.

In this Northern Hemisphere or Europe there are still until end of the – end of August on vacations – annual vacations and so on so forth. So perhaps it would be – as I have not membership counted please convey that we should avoid any rushing in order to have a positive impact of our activities through the second or new round but not have negative impact. Sorry to taking the floor again. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you Kavouss for your comment – sure that they'll be taken into account in the discussions. And I have Philip next.

Philip Corwin: Yes thank you Avri. Phil Corwin for the record. About an hour ago I shared on the – this Working Group's email list the text of a letter that I conveyed to the full Council on Friday.

This letter represents the views of the Business Constituency in response to what - Chairman Crocker's letter. And quickly the key points in that letter for those who have not read it yet – the BC doesn't want to see any unnecessary delay if there's going to be an opening of a next round, particularly to permit timely submission of Dot Brand applications that didn't make the first round.

That said the BC believes that the application window should not be open until all necessary reviews have been completed and considered by the community and the Board.

And the necessary reviews in the BC's view are not just the work of this Working Group but also the work of the related working group that's reviewing the rights protection measurements, and I'm a Co-Chair of that

group and also the CCTRT review mandated by the Affirmation of Commitments.

So far as prioritization essentially of Workstream 1 or Workstream 2 procedure with any GNSO Working Group, we don't know of any precedent for that but we do believe and this'll be consistent with what you just noted Avri that to do so would require a charter revision to be approved by the Council for this or any other related working group.

Our members also wanted us to inquire of Councilors what process the Council would follow in responding to Chairman Crocker. Beyond that I gave personal views.

Informed by my position as Co-Chair of the RPM Review Working Group this is just a personal review. So far I haven't discussed this with the two other co-chairs that there would be no need for a subsequent round to wait on completion of the second phase of our work, which is the UTRP review that's going to commence in early 2018 but that I didn't personally see any way that we could prioritize and create Workstream 1 and 2 procedures for our first phase, which is the review of the new TLD RPMs.

We are sticking to timetables so far on that review, and we anticipate releasing a draft for completing that work mid-next year and releasing a final draft report and recommendations for comment in fall 2017.

So that other than the personal observation on the RPM Review Working Group is the position of the Business Constituency based on some pretty extensive email exchanges and a discussion on our member call that was held last Thursday. So I just wanted to inform other members of that BC position. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much Philip. Jeff you're next.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Avri. This is Jeff Neuman and thanks Phil for forwarding that letter to us. Let me just be brief and just say that, you know, look a lot of us have thoughts on that letter and I just would all – would encourage us to talk to our Council's members just because I think this is not really the right place to have that discussion.

So while interesting Phil I – and I appreciate the – forwarding the letter to us, I think the right place to have this discussion is at the Council level. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you Jeff and I do think that that's where it is. However the one thing I would point out - and now we'll go into Alan and ALAC does have a liaison in the Council.

But I thought that the airing of view – and of course through this community but there are others in this group that might not have members of Council so it's good that they're informed.

And if there's anything that they need taken to Council they should perhaps also talk to Paul McGrady, our liaison to the Council, to make sure that their views get in. Now Alan please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Alan Greenberg. I'm looking at this from rather pragmatic point of view. The Board is charged with balancing all the various views within our community.

They were told by a number of people that this is going too slow and they're reacting. I would like to hope that the GNSO when it does come to deliberate and decide whether to take any action it will go out to the community, because yes as Avri said not everyone has a Councilor that is there to vote on the issue.

So I'm rather perturbed that the Board has chosen to add to our rather heavy load. Yes something else that we have to stop our work and do but that's

where we are right now, and I'm hoping that it will be deliberated with full consultation of the community if anything were going to be changed. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you Alan. One thing though that I am proposing is that we do not stop our work, and that's one of the reasons why I wanted to sort of take this time in this meeting to get this out of the way that after this – until the Council comes back to us we proceed on our – doing our work.

And in fact the first part of our work in all of the subgroups is the prioritization of the tasks and the sharpening of the schedule, so this is work that we need to do anyhow.

It's work that was planned even before the letter showed up and it was work that we would need to do to deal with any question that came down to us. So at this point I don't think we're stopping anything except perhaps the further progress of this particular session.

And hopefully we won't need to do this at every meeting and every subgroup until such time as Council takes action and makes a request of us. I see your hand up.

Did you have further comments or – Alan or is that a remainder hand? I will assume that it is a holdover from your previous time. Anyone else wish to comment on this before – somebody has an open mic and sounds like they might be having sinus problems or something.

So can we move on now? Okay on the work track subteam status updates we started those meetings last week. We had a meeting of Subteam 1 and Subteam 2.

For the first meeting I chaired Subteam 1. For the Subteam 2 Jeff chaired it. Subteam 1 did go through its work thing and did decide on two co-leaders to

take the work forward, so that's pretty much my status on that for the moment.

Jeff I don't know if there's anything you want to add about Subteam 2. Oh or perhaps I should name who were the Subteam 1 – the leads. We had Sara Bockey, and I hope I pronounced the last name correctly, and Christa Taylor as our two Co-Leaders for Subteam 1.

They are now working with us on scheduling meetings forward on starting to get the work structured for their next meeting. Jeff did you want to add anything on Subteam 2?

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes sure. The update's fairly similar although two different co-leaders that were appointed. The two Co-Leaders that were appointed by Subteam 2 are Phil Buckingham and Michael Flemming who I believe both are on this call, which is great and other than that same kind of status.

We reviewed the items that the work team will look at over the course of its tenure. And the co-chairs or the co-leaders and Avri you and I and the leadership allow me to try to figure out the schedule and to come up with initial ideas on the work plan. That's it.

Avri Doria: Hey thank you. Alan I don't know if that's a new floor request. I believe it's an old one. So just to finalize on that one this week Subteam 4 will be meeting.

I believe sub – a - Subtrack 4 will be meeting on Thursday at 20:00 if I have it correct. Please (Emily) correct me if I had it wrong. And Subteam 3 will be meeting next week.

It had to do with a problem in my schedule in terms of doing it – 3 this week, so we went out of order since I'm doing the odd numbered ones and Jeff is doing the even numbered ones.

Having said all of that just the last thing I want to say is that Subteam 3 and Subteam 4 still need leadership volunteers. I suggest that those of you that are on the list start talking on the lists for these subgroups and, you know, start putting either your names or your suggestion of names forward on the list to make – to enable the decision to be made more easily during your first meeting. Anything else to add to the subtrack status updates? Yes Kavouss please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Since I and maybe many others do not have the opportunity to participate on the subteam, would we have some source of the more formal briefing of each subteam at our subsequent meeting with something written, not said a word, not everything, pointing us to various wikis?

And this is very, very difficult. Could we have some sort of collected data with respect to the issues briefly as presented to your meeting, with respect to the activities of each subteam because we may not have time to go to that meeting or having time to find out where they are? Is this a possibility or not? Thank you.

Avri Doria: Yes the – for example this is why first of all we put a regular slot in this meeting on work track status update so there will be statuses. There will be the statuses.

I don't know whether we'll do it every two weeks for all of them. We may also stagger that. The wiki is the same wiki we used for the group and that, but certainly we'll put out in the various notifications the list of those wikis, where to find the transcripts, where to find the recordings, et cetera.

So that information will all be made. There will be written reports. I'm not sure if we're going to ask them to do them at every meeting. But certainly at least monthly each one of the groups should report simply because we wouldn't want to necessarily use this whole meeting just for status updates.

And once we've finished the work on CC 1 dealing with the comments that have come in from the community and have finished with writing the first draft of CC 1, dealing with the issues that people are talking about in those subgroups will indeed be the main topic of this meeting.

So, you know, the first thing that each of these groups is doing just to be clear is going through their list of tasks, and these tasks are tasks we've talked about often.

They're in our charter. They're in our final recommendations for this group, you know, the final issues report so they're all well-known to everybody. As they start to do their schedule and as they start to prioritize within their own groups, we'll ask them to bring that discussion back here so that everybody has a clear view.

So there's full intention of keeping this meeting apprised of everything that they're doing, perhaps not, you know, all the way down to repeating all their work but certainly – and it is this group that will have to make a decision on any draft recommendations that they propose because they don't decide.

It's this group that makes the decisions. They're the ones though that will propose to us and keep us informed along the way. I hope that answers your question satisfactorily. Anyone else wish to comment on or work track status updates or any other pending questions they've got on this whole work track sub team process that we've gotten started?

And as Jeff did indicate, we have a meeting, I guess it's also every two weeks, of the whole leadership team, that's the staff, Jeff and I, and all of the work track leadership to basically coordinate, make sure we understand what we're all doing and figure out what's on the agenda for the next one of these full meetings.

So, you know, we'll - the people that volunteer for these tasks are wonderful in that they're volunteering for not only the meetings of that track but one extra coordination meeting at least every two weeks.

Anything else on - really appreciative of the co-leaders. If there's nothing - Kavouss, your hand is still up. Is there a further comment or is that a remainder? Thank you.

Okay, in which case our next task is, as people know, we put out a community comment request to all of the community components, SOs, ACs, stakeholder groups, constituencies, et cetera. We have gotten a number of answers back. We certainly have not gotten answers from everybody. Staff has begun to coordinate those into the customary review tool that we use so that we can walk through those and deal with them one by one, as has become practice.

I've also asked staff, but it is something they have not had time to do yet, I don't believe, to also include the issues that were pending from the exercise of asking the various SOs and ACs and stakeholder groups and constituencies to let us know of any pending requests they had made of the board on the previous gTLD round so that those issues were also captured in this review tool.

Now some of those may fit into the categories of the CC1 questions and that's good. I'll ask that those be dealt with there. Some of them may not, and I've asked that they'll just be added to the list. Some of them may need to be looked at them sort of remanded to the proper subgroup once we've look at it and said, "Oh yes, that's definitely sub track 1 work or that's definitely sub track 4 work, et cetera." So we'll deal with that, but wanted to make sure that all of those issues were captured.

Now the last thing I wanted to say is that the period for submitting these things has ended and the synopsis or the synthesis into the work review tool has been made. If any others do come in, they will not be ignored but they will not be discussed in this first pass. They'll be dealt with as we go through after this first pass. The first pass will focus on those that got submitted by the third time call.

So any questions on that? If not, I'll turn the floor over to Jeff, who's going to start walking us through the review tool row by row. I do not see any - oh I see (Emily)'s hand, sorry. (Emily)?

(Emily):   Thanks, Avri. This is (Emily) from staff. You'll see on the screen, I hope everyone can now see the first few rows of the comment tool, and that's the actual comments themselves. There's a larger spreadsheet that will also contain responses from the working group, as well as some of the work done so far in response to these question areas. And that XLS is available through this link in the chat. It doesn't really fit very well in the AC room, so I've just loaded up a section of it in a PDF, but if you'd like to look at the spreadsheet, it's available in the wiki. And this does not yet include the comments from before CC1, but I'll be working on adding those. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much, (Emily). I see no hands. So, Jeff, the floor is yours.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you, Avri. This is Jeff Neuman, and please let me know if I'm not talking loud enough of I'm talking too fast. I'm originally from New York so I tend to talk very quickly, so I will try my best not to talk so quickly.

So yes, as Avri said, this is - this public comment tool has become pretty much standard over the last several years. We are required as a working

group to consider and respond to each of the comments that are submitted, and this includes the comments that we got from CC1 but will also include all future comment periods as well.

So what you'll see here is the standard format which is - which are the comments themselves, followed by who made those comments, followed by the relevant working group initial findings, conclusions, or you could also say responses to those. So it's really incumbent upon us to as we form our conclusions to respond thoughtfully to each of the comments that were received, recognizing that many of these groups spent a long time in developing these - their comments.

And, Avri, if I could just ask you to keep me in check with comments on the chat, just because I'm looking at a couple different documents right now on my screen and the chat is not one of them at the moment.

So the first thing you'll see here are general comments by each of the commenters. It starts with the GAC comments, the general GAC comments that didn't really fit into any other category, registry comments, and ccNSO comments, I believe. And I think in the latest tool there are some IPC general comments as well.

So if you guys could all click on the link, it would help simply because you'll see all the columns there. And as (Emily) said, we did have some discussions on all of these issues - I'm sorry, not the general comments, but on the specific questions we had discussion. So we'll be filling those in the third column on initial findings and conclusions, and then map those initial findings with the comments as well.

So with that, I'm going to go through the general comments, and please stop if you have questions or really the focus should be on responding to each of those, and even if that response is, "Yes thank you for the comment, that will be considered or referred to work track whatever in future discussions" or "Thank you for that comment, you know, we have considered it and this is our response." So, you know, just looking for people to raise their hand and offer comments.

So I'll go one by one through the comments. And the first set of comments relate to the GAC advice from the Helsinki meeting, and it goes to the starting point for development of policy on further releases of new gTLDs should first take into consideration the results of all relevant reviews of the new gTLD round and determine which aspects and elements need adjustment. In addition, the following should be addressed.

A - requirements with regard to interoperability, security, stability and resiliency can be met. B - an objective and independent analysis of cost and benefits is conducted beforehand, drawing on experience with all outcomes from the recent round; and C, there is an agreed policy and administrative framework that is supported by all stakeholders.

So I'm going to put that out there. That's the GAC advice. Obviously that GAC advice is intended for the ICANN board, but to the extent that we have input into that, the board is looking for - the board and the council are looking for our views on it. I should note, and perhaps (Emily) we should update it, the council has responded to this GAC advice and perhaps we should put that in as well as a set of comments, because they did at least respond to some of them in the form of the working group will adjust that, and others they responded with we agree and provided some rationale. So if we could just update this with the GNSO Council's views as well.

Okay. I'm looking at the comments to see if anyone's raised their hands. I'll go to number two at this point. All measures available to the board should be used to ensure that a comprehensive and measured approach to further releases of new gTLDs is taken in a logical, sequential and coordinated way rather than through parallel and overlapping effort and/or timeframes that may not be agreed by all relevant interests. I'll stop there.

I'll offer my own thoughts, unless someone wants to come on in. Okay, just looking at the chat. On this one I think this is really, you know, an issue between the council, the board, and the GAC. You know, as a working group, we were tasked to work on certain items and unless and until we're told to work on this in a different order, we're going to continue our work. I think that's the decision that we had made at the very beginning of the formation of this group.

The GAC I think was offering its thoughts on having us start our work before all the reviews were done, but I think we're kind of past that point at this juncture and to the extent the council wants to change anything, which it did not indicate that in their response, they will let us know. (Heather) in the chat says just to note the suggestion to the council that the working group be involved in future council responses to the next GAC communiqué. This is something (Heather) will ensure is raised in the council. Thanks, (Heather).

Moving on, unless anyone's got any comments on these. In your letter you asked that the GAC consider and clarify the extent to which a range of work across the community should be considered by the PDP working group during its deliberations. The GAC notes that there is currently a range of interconnected reviews and policy development processes relevant to new gTLDs.

With regard to those identified in your letter, the GAC notes that work by ICANN and some PDPs and reviews to develop and maintain metrics to support both policy development and ongoing implementation should be considered as a specific stream of work. (Unintelligible) says, "While the GAC is addressing some relevant issues through the GAC working groups that you list in your letter, the input to PDPs and other forums will be coordinated through the GAC membership as a whole."

The next says, "The GAC's response to the question from the subsequent procedures PDP working group should be seen in the context of the broader policy development landscape. Public policy issues will be addressed by the GAC through all appropriate forums, and the GAC will certainly continue to participate in this PDP. However, it is essential that a comprehensive and measured approach to new gTLD policy be taken in a sequential and coordinated way rather than too many parallel and overlapping efforts."

Okay. And then moving on to their last set of comments, or general comments. With regard to existing GAC consensus advice related to new gTLDs, I separately responded on May 18 to the request for a historical record and then come back to the GAC if we have any questions on any of the advice given by the GAC. So thank you for that. That was submitted by the GAC secretariats, and so we will definitely come back to the GAC on any questions.

Any thoughts at this point or should we move on to the registries? Okay, the registries had a number of general comments as well that - and some of which are - or they're all expanded on in the individual topics. So the registry, as (Donna) noted last week, did not agree on - or had some areas of in which not all registries agreed, but these principles, these seven principles were in areas in which all the registries agreed and so they were called out in front of all the other questions.

So the areas where the registries agreed, one was that additional TLDs - the registry stakeholder group supports the introductions of new gTLDs in the future. With respect to categorization, the registry stakeholder group supports the continuation of the categorization of the gTLDs as the outlined in the new gTLD operating guidebook and the inclusion of brands in any ongoing mechanisms.

Three, future new gTLDs, just talking about whether it should be in rounds, the goal for future applications should be implementation of a continuous process on a first come, first serve basis. However, they appreciate that one or two rounds may need to be imposed before the goal could be realistically achieved. And so they recommend a clear commitment by this working group should be given to shorten the time spans between each of those rounds and in line with the original target of one year, which was in the guidebook.

And on the next subject, predictability should be maintained or enhanced without sacrificing flexibility. In the event changes must be introduced into the new gTLD application process, any disruption should be minimized. And they offer some thoughts on the 2012 round suffering from too many unforeseen rule changes and delays. I'm trying to paraphrase without reading everything. Sorry, is there a hand up? Yes there is. Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, thank you very much for the explanation. I have one question and one comment. The question is that the second point two, the second to last part starting with however, it essential that so on and so forth, how this will be taken into account in order to avoid that kind of multiple activities or multiple overlapping activities. This is the question. The other question or comment is that do you expect any further action in terms of recommendations or outline from GAC in general for the point that you have faced till now. It is not included in this Helsinki advice. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you, Kavouss. I will see is there anyone from the registry stakeholder group that is on that wants to address the first point Kavouss makes, which is on point number - registry principle, was it three, Kavouss, to however the registry appreciates there may be one or two rounds?

Kavouss Arasteh: No, not that one. On this however it is essential that a comprehensive and measured approach to the new gTLD so on and so forth, this one, in order to do so and so rather than too many parallel and overlapping efforts. I am referring to this one, but not the registry one. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Oh thank you, Kavouss. I'm - this is Jeff Neuman. Thank you. I'm following you now. This is on the GAC general comments on number two, the one, two, third sub bullet that starts with the GAC's response to the question from subsequent procedures PDP working group, and then more specifically the however sentence, which is the second sentence. I'll throw that question out to the full group to see if there's a response.

                    My own response is that our charter for this working group does clearly state that we are, we being the working group, are required to consider any and all findings from the various groups that have been tasked with evaluating aspects of the new gTLD process.

                    So that includes the CCT Review Team, the RPM Working Group, as Phil Corwin mentioned earlier, the INGO-IGO Working Group, I might have that name backwards. I think Phil is actually one of the co-chairs of that group as well. There's also consideration to the geographic names cross-constituency working group, and then there's references to other parallel activities.

And so the charter makes it clear that to the extent that those groups have findings and recommendations, that we are to absolutely consider those and include those within our deliberations. Does anyone else have any comments they want to make on that? Kavouss, is this is a new hand or…? Ah, okay. Okay. No other questions on that one.

Okay going back to the registry principles, we are on principle number five and this is with community engagement in the process and the application process. And really the comment there is the role of the GAC, the board, and the GNSO in resolving issues that arise during any ongoing mechanism should be well understood and documented.

I think that is actually a principle that the working group has agreed upon before. So hopefully our - one of our missions will be to, to the extent we can, clarify the roles of each of the groups that are involved in the new gTLD process.

And then their final - oh, sorry there's two more comments. Number six is well on the question of whether to limit applications by an entity or in total, they state that they do not support the notion of placing unnecessary limitations and that it would be anti-competitive to do so and is not - is antithetical to the purpose of introducing new gTLDs.

And then as a last comment, which I think is important and one that I would love to hear the view of anyone in the group, is that the recommendations from the registry stakeholder group that we try to narrow the work done by our group to focus on issues that need to be identified prior to a future round.

And so we should focus on areas where a change in policy from the 2007 final report is required or where most of the community believes the issue is

of such significance that its resolution should gate the initiation of a future application process. ICANN staff should work with implementation teams to address non-policy or less significant implementation issues without delaying the work of the overall PDP. Similarly issues that may warrant policy revision but need not impede on a subsequent application process should be addressed on an ongoing basis through more targeted PDPs.

Anyone have thoughts on that one? We have a very quiet group here. I know people do have thoughts on that subject just not stating it. This sort of relates to the letter that the board sent as well. So I assume that this may come back to us for consideration, so I'll move on to the general comment from the ccNSO, which is really sort of singularly focused that they - the main concern that they have is on country - the use of country and territory names as gTLDs and then a reference to the letter that they sent back in 2009.

I think this is an issue that will need to be addressed by I believe it is group or track number two anyway, so, when they're talking about reserved names. So this is certainly something. Our response to this can be "Again, thank you for the comment. This is a subject that will be taken up by track number two or sub team number two."

Any other questions, comments? At some point we will need to write responses to these. We did have some initial findings from the working group so it's possible we can start to draft some initial responses and get comment on those initial responses. It might be easier to work that way then to - but really your input is essential on responding to these. So, Avri, you have a question, comment? Please.

Avri Doria: Yes I - just one comment. I do think it would be good if people started really challenging those things. But at the moment, I just wanted to point out that in the form the current not decision but the current recommendation that we're

working with on all of these questions is included in the gray column at the top of each of the things because it didn't divide across the questions quite as easily.

So the foundation of what's going to be written is already there unless it's changed by these, and so I really think that we have to start having the conversations as looking at the comment, looking at, you know, what has already been suggested, saying, "Okay we have to add some comment to that, we have to change some comment (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Avri are you still…

Avri Doria: …and while it isn't yet written in a text document, that text, the ongoing text that we're starting as sort of the nucleus that we're building on at the top of each of these questions. So I just wanted to make sure that people knew that and so…

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thank you, Avri. You dropped - you cut in and out for a little bit of it but I think we got the gist of it. So basically that - and it becomes easier to see when we go through the more specific questions, and perhaps we'll come back to the overall recommendations, our responses after we go through the individual more specific items. Because I think that will shape some of the overall responses.

So with that said, going on to - oh, Kavouss, please?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I have a perhaps a comment. With respect to the general statement, similar to what we have received from GAC, I think it might be necessary to consider to have some sort of reply to that because the level of participation

at least from the GAC as I see in this and the sub team are not very high, therefore there would be good opportunity for them in that next physical meeting in Hyderabad to react.

So with respect to their Helsinki advice, if you consider that there is a benefit to reply to that in one way or another, in the general way, yes we understand what you are talking about and we continue to discuss this or examine. Or in another way, I think what I'm suggesting to establish is this communication back and forth to (unintelligible) not add the workload to the sub team or to the whole group - not to remain totally silent, at least with respect to those SOs or ACs that are similar to GAC does not have a, you know, has a high level of participation in the sub team or the main team. This is just for your consideration, and I would appreciate if you kindly advise whether there is a need to do that or not. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you, Kavouss. And this - sorry, this is Jeff Neuman again. Yes, I think that is a great comment. I believe that we will get back to the general advice I think after we drill down on some of the specific questions.

But I definitely do agree that a response that we could take back to or that you could share with the GAC or (Tom), the secretary can share with the GAC may be beneficial to help understand the issues. So, I'm hoping that by the time we reached the meeting in November that we have formulated at least initial thinking on, or recommendations on each of these particular items even if you could informally take that back to the GAC.

(Aubrey)?

(Aubrey): Yes, just wanted to make two points on the process of responding to comments. First, the use of the review tool sort of does require that there be

a response to every comment whether it's - that was already included, we have changed it after discussions we didn't change it. In terms of the comments that are put in formally by every (AC), actually I think the policy development process requires a specific response to the (AC) on the comments that they made.

So I think we actually have - I'll go back and check the wording and not rely on my memory but I do believe we have a specific response of once we have gone through all of the comments and made the decisions that we do have the obligation of sending the (AC) a response to its comments. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you (Aubrey). Okay, Kavouss is that a new hand or just left over?

Kavouss: Sorry, it is old time, I'm sorry.

Jeff Neuman: That's okay. Okay, then jumping into the more specifics in question Number 1 which deals with adding new detailed (views) in the future, sounds like someone is moving around there. With respect to the additional new gTLD's, there were comments submitted by the GAC and registry stakeholder group, the IPC and just to remind everyone what is in the gray area which (Aubrey) mentioned before is our initial thinking, the working groups initial thinking which was that we have not seen any real data points at this point in time that would suggest a change to the 2007 policy, preliminary the work - preliminarily, the working group has agreed that there should be additional new gTLD's in the future and does not anticipate changes to the existing policy.

Okay, now with respect to - there was also some comments from the working group that we welcome analysis on the effects of the new gTLD program on

consumer choice competition innovation trust, etc., which is going to be provided by the (ccTRT).

The GAC comments on this really refer to the Helsinki (communicate) and the GAC is also noting the economic analysis commission by ICANN in 2010, concluded that the largest sources of potential benefits are likely to be and they listed them out.

Additional user benefits that arise from innovation, new business models that are innovative new business models that are very different from those of existing TLD registry operators, development of gTLD's to service communities of interest and expansion of gTLD's to include (IDN)'s and use an expanded character set and thus can offer new benefits to specific user communities.

Their comment is that at the present moment it's not clear whether any of these have been realized from the recent (round). Any responses to that other than these are issues that the (ccTRT) is looking into and we are looking forward to seeing those results as well?

Let me ask another question perhaps maybe from registries, are these - even though these are what the economists said were the benefits of new gTLD's, do we think this list provided by the economists is a comprehensive list? Are there additional benefits? I see one that's not in here which is - well, just in general comp benefits from competition. Any thoughts? Very quiet group.

Okay, I'll jump on to the next one. From the registries, again this is in line with their overall comments, the fact - although the process was rocky and ICANN struggled to implement it, they believe, the registries believe it was a success and that they again say that subsequent rounds, they quote the part

of the guide book which says that subsequent rounds were supposed to start within one year and that obviously that has not happened but it gave potential applicants the impression that they could skip the 2012 round and still have an opportunity to apply for new gTLD's within a reasonable amount of time.

The announcement of an additional round has already been delayed well beyond one year and we believe it would be unfair to applicants that may have deferred their applications until processes and costs to apply were more certain or until business plans for a gTLD were more final to introduce further delay.

And then the IPC has made the comment that, again, they say no to the question of are there any facts and circumstances that have changed that you believe this should no longer be the policy and the IPC notes that there has, in fact, been no ongoing mechanism for which the policy called. Is there anyone from the IPC, and I see Kavouss has his hands raised, not from the IPC.

Kavouss: Not on IPC but on the previous one that if I understood it correctly that the new (unintelligible), did I understand it correctly that somebody says that the new (round) should be discussed in one year? I have doubts about that because it's not coherent with what we are discussing. We are discussing that until we finish all of these issues and identify shortcoming difficulties and so on and so forth, we would not start the new round.

So, we should take that into - unless I misunderstood because you referred to the one-year I have not read the document, I'm sorry for that but I heard from you that some (comments) are talking about the starting the (possibility of) one year. I don't think that that is coherent with respect to what we are discussing. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Kavouss. Yes, what is quoted is actually in the applicant guidebook. There is a sentence in there that talks about starting a process within one year of the close of the application window. However, there was subsequent GAC advice on this and the NGPC of the board responded that although this was the goal, they would not start a process until the reviews were over.

So I think that there's sort of conflicting statements there but it does say in the applicant guidebook that the goal is to start a new round, or was, to start a new round one year after the close of the first application window which would have been met - or would have meant starting that round in June of 2013 which is over three years ago. So obviously that has not happened.

Kavouss: Yes, that has been taken by events. I don't think that we could take that one literally in 2007 but now we are a different occasion, different situation. So I don't think that that's the common (unintelligible) anymore, thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Kavouss. Okay, the other item, is there anyone from the IPC that's on the call that could explain the sentence? However, we note that there has, in fact, been no ongoing mechanism for which the policy called? I think that was meant as sort of a literal interpretation of the words that were used and just to make the point that the 2007 policy said there should be an ongoing mechanism but the policy didn't specify what that mechanism should be. I don't want to put words in anyone's mouth. Is there anyone from the IPC that could explain that?

Okay, seeing that there is none, could we put as an action item just to see if we can - and make sure that the members of the IPC are given that question

just for some clarity. I don't want to misinterpret that sentence or maybe I did interpret it right but just to make sure that we have that correct.

So with that said, I don't think any of - or let me throw it out to the group. Does any of the comments in your view, or in the working groups view change in your mind the general statement of findings that we as a working group had come up with which is in Line 13 or, I'm sorry, in Line 12? Kavouss?

Kavouss: Excuse me, are we discussing the comment from the IPC because these comments are very substantial; one comment, 1B they said that there is no mechanism and in several other areas the repair to that 1B. So on this perhaps I don't know, understand you just take notes of the comment unless there is someone from IPC maybe. (Greg) is not at the meeting I do know, if he is because he signed the letter to just (fast) like that saying that, okay, no comment. But, I think they raise the questions, we should have answer to that or not. Some other part of the comments of the IPC data is that they do not clearly understand the question or the proposed different way. I don't know. Are you going into detail of the comments of the IPC or at this stage you just want to make a preliminary review without commenting, thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Kavouss. We're on 1A at this point so we will go through more details on 1B which you're correct, they do refer to, in many of the answers. I think one of the action items which I just mentioned would be to just get some clarification from the IPC on their answer to 1A first and then, yes, I think we are going to go on to 1B in just a minute.

Okay, so let's move on at this point to 1B which goes into the question of would the absence of an ongoing mechanism have an anti-competitive effect for potential applicants. So, this was a question on if we did not have a

process for additional new gTLD's, would this be viewed as being anticompetitive?

And, on this one the general statements from the GAC is that preventing or restricting further release of new gTLD's could be seen as a windfall gain for existing gTLD owners protecting them from competition with associated price and service disadvantages for end users. However, competition is only one factor to be considered as part of any independent assessment of costs and benefits. The registries have made the comment that, yes, the absence of an ongoing mechanism would have an anticompetitive effect.

The current uncertainty regarding whether and when a future application process will be opened, creates a closed market for the operation of gTLD's, unpredictability regarding application processes or long gaps between application windows may have similar stifling effects on competition by limiting the number of new entrants to the market.

New entrants could improve competition by increasing market dispersion or by introducing new and innovative product offerings and the third - the response from the IPC states that given ICANN's monopoly control over entry into the new gTLD marketplace we believe that a failure to maintain an ongoing mechanism of some sort could potentially lead to anticompetitive effects and then there's a statement on brand owner concerns remain about the impact of additional new gTLD's on consumer confusion and trademark protection and these must be addressed during the PDP.

Nevertheless, potential applicants including potential brand applicants may have chosen not to apply during the 2012 application round on the understanding from the language in the guidebook that there would be subsequent procedures and then they quote the language from the guidebook.

So at least from the comments received, it seems like there is agreement that at some point not having an ongoing mechanism would be viewed as being anticompetitive and although not - they're not all saying that that means we need to start right now it just means that all of the comments do have the common element of, yes, not having a process, an ongoing mechanism, would be viewed as anticompetitive.

It seems like there's a common thread there. (Michael) you have your hand raised? (Michael), I don't know if you're speaking, we can't hear you at this point. Okay, (Michael Flemming) is typing. Let's just give one minute for (Michael), if you're listening - if anyone listening to the recording we are just waiting for something to be typed into the chat.

While we wait for (Michael), is there anyone else that has any comments? I think as one of the areas while we're waiting that we will certainly respond to this question is that, you know, we are looking forward to the results of the (RPM) PDP which I think would address the impact of additional new gTLD's on consumer confusion and trademark protection and so I believe that will be handled by that group. If anyone believes that there are aspects that won't be handled by that group, please speak up.

(Terri), do we know what the issue with (Michael), is it just a microphone issue or…

Terri Agnew: Hi Jeff, it's (Terri). I do believe it's something on his side and he is providing me a telephone number now that I'm providing to the operator. So it will be just a moment.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, while you do that then I will go, Kavouss has his hand raised so I will go to Kavouss.

Kavouss: Yes, my question is that the footnote in the reply or the responses from the IPC, my quote (the year) in the quotation mark, ongoing mechanism, does this description or definition, is it still valid, thank you?

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Kavouss, are you talking about the quote that says I can't go with the (launched) subsequent gTLD application rounds as quickly as possible, that quote?

Kavouss: I'm referring to the ongoing mechanism will be a phrase that will be used throughout the (supplements) and should be considered to mean that then subsequent procedures by which new gTLD applications will be received by ICANN in the future without making any predomination to the size and nature of these procedures. This definition still stands is still valid?

Jeff Neuman: Maybe someone can - I don't have the IPC comment in front of me. Was that a - does anyone know if that was a quote from just the IPC or was that in our - I can't remember if that was in our question? I believe that's an IPC footnote, is that correct? Emily?

Kavouss: Yes…

Emily Taylor: I'm sorry Jeff can you repeat the question please?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, the footnote that Kavouss is referring to, that - I don't have the IPC statement in front of me at the moment. That's from the IPC correct, that's not a definition that we crafted, is that correct?

Emily Taylor: One moment, let me check.

Kavouss: Jeff, you said that the use of the term ongoing mechanism stems from the
                   following text in the GNSO's 2007 final report on the introduction of new
                   gTLD. So this is getting the source. I am (wondering whether) this is a
                   (unintelligible) valid today or not.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Kavouss for clarifying, you know, my response, and (Aubrey)'s got
                   her hand raised too, so my response is that the 2007 policy is still valid and
                   unless and until a GNSO group declares it not to be valid, but (Aubrey) do
                   you want to respond to help me out?

Avri: Yes, thank you, this is (Avri) speaking. I agree with what you just said that
                   until such time as we change things, the 2007 recommendations are indeed -
                   do hold, but it also is to be remembered that those recommendations did also
                   include that there would be a review before anything proceeded. So there
                   was sort of contradictory considerations in that, that it should start a year later
                   but that reviews would need to be completed first.

Jeff Neuman: Kavouss did you want to respond to that or…

Kavouss: I think if the following sentence from the IPC mentioned that they said that we
                   don't have any substantive comments on this other than (deciding) to 1B
                   above so the back and forth going from one to the other, I don't know, I want
                   to take it - if no one else has any questions, I don't have any questions in the
                   absence of the order of this document, thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks Kavouss. (Terri) have we got (Michael) on the phone?

(Michael Flemming):   Can you hear me now?

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

Michael Flemming: Perfect, I just wanted to make sure, we're still on 1B in trying to get the
                  audio connected I kind of - we were.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, yes, we're still on 1B, thank you.

(Michael Flemming):   Okay, perfect. Just wanted to echo the - that this - any future…
                  …everyone is commenting on a future reference (1B), a strong, well basically
                  saying that there should be - there's no chance of competition for the current
                  gTLD operators.

                  But, I also had one question for clarity, are the current working groups
                  comments all highlighted in the subject area rather than each individual -
                  shown in gray or… Does each - I'm sorry one of your… I'm wondering if that
                  the working groups preliminary - in regards to these questions are all
                  highlighted in the subject area for each of the questions that are within the
                  subject itself or (unintelligible) broken down question by question?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks (Michael). I think at this point they are not broken down question
                  by question. I do think that we will need to break that down for our response.
                  The only discussions we've had have been very preliminary on the overall
                  subject and then we created the questions to elicit further thought from the
                  constituencies and stakeholder groups and advisory committees but I do
                  agree that we will have to break those down into responses to each of the

individual questions just as the - just as we asked for comments on those broken down.

Michael Flemming: All right, thank you very much.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks (Michael). Are there any other questions or comments on 1A or 1B? Yes, sorry (Aubrey) do you have your hand raised?

Avri: No, that's okay. Yes, I just wanted to add a further consideration on (Michael)'s point. This is (Avri) speaking, is that while yes, in terms of responding to the questionnaire and doing the synopsis of it, we should answer each of the questions.

I think in terms of making the recommendations which is the end goal that we don't need to necessarily have a separate recommendation for each question. I think we need to cover all the points in the recommendation but it can be done as a single recommendation on each of these main questions that touches upon the issues brought about.

But in terms of a proper response for the review, then yes we do answer each question more than each, you know - we need to have answered each question and sub-question but I don't think that that predicates what we need to actually put in our recommendations in terms of structure. Thanks. And I'll point out we have four minutes left.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks (Aubrey) I was going to just - this is Jeff Neuman I was going to turn it back to you figuring we would not get to 1C. So if I can turn it back to you to finish the call up. Thanks.

Avri: Okay, thank you this is (Avri) again. So, I think it's good that we've made a start to this. We definitely have a long way to go. I would hope that in future conversations we actually have, you know, more people speaking to these things and such, I wanted to ask at this point, so we'll continue from where we left off last time, I mean next time.

So, at this point I'd like to ask if there's any other business that we need to deal with in these last few minutes? I'm looking here, I see nothing coming up but just are there any last - any other business, last comments, what have you that should be aired before I close this call?

Okay, we do have one from (Jorge) that (once) GAC answer seems to be cut off and one from (William) who said he'll post the issue to the mailing list as it requires more time to discuss. Thank you both and we'll check on that (Jorge). So anything else at this point?

If not then I'll close this meeting and talk to you all in the subgroups and at our next meeting. And please (on-list). List is a great place for extended conversations on some of these issues. So, thanks everyone and I'll give back the time. Thank you, you can end the call.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Once again the meeting has been adjourned. (Christine) the operator - if you could please stop all recording and a friendly reminder to everyone else to please disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

Operator: Recordings were ended.

END