ICANN Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WG
Thursday, 08 September 2016 at 03:00 UTC
Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of New gTLD
Subsequent Procedures WG call on the Thursday 08 September 2016 at 03:00 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 may be found at:
https://community.icann.org/x/ohWsAw
The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-08sep16-en.mp3

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Michelle DeSmyter :   Great. Thank you so much. Good morning, good afternoon and good

evening. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group

call on the 8th of September, 2016 at 3:00 UTC.

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 today would you please let yourself be known

now? All right, thank you.

And also as a reminder, 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, sir.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you. Welcome, everyone. Good evening to those in the United States and good morning to those in Europe and afternoon to those in Asia. Thank you, everyone, for joining. This is a new time that we're trying out to accommodate some more people that are in the Asia Pacific region. I know it's very inconvenient to the Europeans, Middle East and so on. So apologize for that but we're each going to try to share some burden as we go through the schedule.

So first on the agenda, as always, we'll be obviously reviewing the agenda. Any updates to statements of interest. And then the bulk of the time we'll do a quick update on each of the work tracks, now at this point each of them have met.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Oh, I don't know if that was – okay. And then we'll spend the bulk of the time on the continuing a review of the CC1 review tool which is the public – it's our response to public comments that we've received during the CC1 community outreach over the past couple months.

So with that said, are there any – are there any updates to any statements of interest by anybody on this call that someone would like to make known? Okay, hearing silence I will assume that nothing significant has changed, although you're reminded that if anything does change please go to your statement of interest and revise it to reflect that change.

With that let's go to an update on the work tracks. I'll start with overall, in general, we have had our first meeting for each of the four work tracks. And in fact one of the work tracks has had two meetings, the second work track will have after – probably in about – in less than 24 hours a second meeting as well. And the second meetings have been scheduled for the other two work tracks.

We have two co-chairs for both – for Work Track 1; two co-chairs for Work Track 2; we have one confirmed co-chair for Work Track 3; and two confirmed co-chairs for Work Track 4. We are still trying to get a second co-chair for Work Track Number 3.

With that said, I know I'm putting some people on the spot, but the two co-chairs of Work Track 1 are Sara Bockey and Christa Taylor. I know Sara, if you're on, can you just maybe say just a word of what we did this meeting and just what the status is of Work Track 1?

Sara Bockey: Sure, yes. This is Sara Bockey for the record. Our last meeting, we started working on our subject area work plan and discussed prioritizing based on policy versus implementation. Also looking to bundle some of it however it makes sense to try to save time and make it more (unintelligible) discussions.

We also briefly discussed the accreditation program and asked people to start thinking of pros and cons. And we'll probably start getting into that more in our next meeting. Also briefly touched on support for applicants from developed countries and the likelihood that they would be a potential for dependencies on the other topics as we are going along so discussions for that for the developing countries will probably last the length of the Work Track 1 work.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Sara. And for – so if we could just slow down a little bit when we're speaking. I know I have that issue as well so thank you, Kavouss, for pointing that out. In the future with these updates, although we just started meeting, in the future we'll likely have a couple bullet points for slides when we dive more into the substantive work for these updates. And we'll also use this time in each of our meetings if any of the work tracks have any questions for the full group or want to just pass on certain comments or issues to the full group.

With that, let me go over to Workstream 2 which we have two co-chairs for that as well, we have Phil Buckingham and Michael Flemming. I know

Michael is on the call; Phil has sent his apologies. So, Michael, can you just give maybe a minute on what's going on?

Oh, Michael is going to call in. All right, I'll let you call in. So let me just go over to – I don't know if Jian is – oh, Jian, you are here. Jian was elected one of the – or appointed one of the co-chairs for Work Track Number 3, which is dealing with disputes. I'm not going to put him on the spot at this point because his first substantive call was actually next week. And so other than just having an introductory meeting and electing Jian as the – as one of the co-chairs and still trying to find a second co-chair to confirm there's not much of a status update.

And then for Work Track – unless, Jian, do you want to add anything?

Jian Zhang: Oh, I think I just want to say hello. And I'm looking forward to the second co-chair; I'm eager for that. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Jian. And we are too. We're trying to get one. If anyone's on this call that wants to sign up to help Jian, it's really an important subject where there are certainly a lot of issues dealing with string contention, objections, disputes, accountability measures and how that impacts the new TLD process going forward. All of those are really interesting subjects so if anyone was not on the last call for Work Track 3 and wants to volunteer be great to have you join Jian on this very important subject.

Work Track 4…

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: …can I comment before you move on?

Jeff Neuman: Oh please, yes, Avri.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Yes, that's okay. I wanted to add a quick comment on that, which is we've talked to both Jeff and I have talked to a couple people that wanted to ask questions about possibly taking on the role. I'd like to encourage them or anyone else who decides that they're willing to, to just send a note to the whole list saying that that being the process, that we're following saying I'd like to take it on, I, you know, et cetera, et cetera, I've got the time, and do that so that it's not just conversation with us in the background checking but that, you know, please make a decision and send an email to that list. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Avri. Okay and then for Work Track 4, that would be Cheryl Langdon-Orr is one of the co-chairs and Rubens Kuhl is the other one. I know Cheryl is on the call. I'm scrolling down, yes, Cheryl, and do you have maybe a minute to just introduce yourself and just talk about the status?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Certainly. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And Rubens and I, like the other Work Track 3, will be running our first substantive meeting coming up next week. The one meeting that's been held was the – the prepping and (administrivial) (sic) one where we appointed as co-chairs.

                  And in that meeting next week we'll be taking a very similar track to the ones that were running this week by Work Track 1 and 2 and that is looking at our timeline, looking specifically at the questions that are posed. In our case it's internationalized domain names matters and universal acceptance issues.

                  And looking if we need to draft or propose some adjustments to our work plan and any timings there.

                  And indeed, not that we have as many questions as some other tracks do to deal with, if there is some reordering of prioritization. But most importantly we'll be looking at if there's any interdependencies with other work tracks. And of course we'll be open to any interdependencies or nexus that are observed in the others coming across to us to deal with. And that's it for me.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Cheryl. This is Jeff Neuman again for the transcript. I appreciate –
both Avri and I and ICANN staff appreciate all of the volunteers that we've
had and are extremely looking forward to having them all have their meetings
and starting the substantive work. I will note for the record that Sara and
Christa did a fantastic job on the first Work Track 1 substantive call. And
Michael and Phil, I'm sure will do a fantastic job in just a few hours.

With that said, let's go on to the next subject which the document is already
up on the screen, which is the…

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: …online now.

Jeff Neuman: Oh I'm sorry. I meant to go to Michael. Michael.

Michael Flemming: Thanks, Jeff, for the introduction, and for the good luck as well. It's just a
few hours away but I'm hoping to get some sleep before then. So, yes, Phil
and I have been speaking and I have sent an agenda in regards to the Work
Track 2 for legal regulatory issues that will be held on 20 UTC this upcoming
Thursday and Friday for those of you who are joining me from Asia.

So far basically we are looking at doing a very similar way that was already
held in the Work Track 1 meeting. First of all, we'll be, obviously, going over
SOIs because I think there were a few that needed to be updated last time I
checked, but however, we'll be looking at the current work plan that we have
for the issues that we'll be tackling here.

I know that the schedule is only temporary and is only meant as kind of a
guiding post. But at the same time I think that there can be some
improvement on it. And at the same time we'll look at prioritizing issues and
looking at what would be the best method for us to tackle this work.

And at the same time, I think that we wanted to start with a few individual topics. We are looking at a controversial one with the base agreement. Hopefully we can get some good discussion for that. And we're looking forward to having everyone participate. I think it should be a lively one for everyone from Europe and especially the US. So looking forward to it. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Michael. Again, this is Jeff Neuman for the record. I'm not sure if I have to say it every time but I'll still say just for the transcript. And with that, now, oh, Kavouss, you have a question, comment?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, good time. First of all, maybe kindly in future review the three o'clock UTC is too, too early in the whole Europe. I see from almost 290 people registered, 29, 10% so this is an important group and everybody agrees to be but it is a very, very bad window. So may kindly consider in future in Europe in the next two weeks we changed hours, become another hour earlier. So it would be much more difficult. This is Number 1.

And Number 2, I asked for the documents last night, Terri kindly sent it to me. But it was so little in front that I could not read, you know, maybe some people have very – very big eyes and very good visibility and so on so forth. But I tried to make it bigger by some actions; it made it bigger on the screen of computer, but once coming to print that smaller.

Because I use to read the document on the printing side but not on the computer where I want to print and put some sign for the area that I have the question, not to waste the time of the people. Is it possible that we select a more – a bigger font and less congested arrangements if possible? Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Kavouss. This is Jeff Neuman for the transcript. We are going to – on the first point, on the timing of calls, we're going to take a look at the

attendance from this call, compare it to the other calls that we've had just to see, you know, we're testing this period out because it's open from all of the other times that are taken from Workstream 2 Accountability and other groups that are meeting.

So we're using this as sort of an experiment at this point just to see if there's any effects on attendance. But we're all trying to rotate to share the pain. And as noted in the chat, this is a great time for the Asia Pacific area, semi-inconvenient for North America and South America; very inconvenient for Europe. So we'll have to take a look at the attendance records.

On the second point, I will leave that to see if we can work on doing something about the font or making it customizable in a way that would be easier to read and to print out. So let us take that back and see if we can produce another version that's more readable.

I notice that Michael and Avri are in the queue so I'll go to Michael.

Michael Flemming: Thanks, Jeff. I just, you know, being in the Asia myself I just wanted to echo the chat. And especially Cheryl. She's pointing out exactly what I wanted to say. For the majority of the calls that we attend from Asia, I think the bad end of the stick is what we usually get. But we, at the same time, a lot of participants have been rather flexible to attend these times.

But – and I know that there's no way to accommodate every single person but at the same time I think flexibility and, you know, having – taking that share of the pain is one I just wanted to echo for everyone because it's kind of ICANN standard in a way for a lot of us. So sorry, just driving that one home.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Michael. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, thanks. This is Avri. I guess I want to also put in a couple words about the rotation. And I think after this (unintelligible) rotation, as Jeff said, we will look at it and see. That is also part of the reason for the recordings, for the discussions, for the fact that we go back over things again that we do at least two readings, if not many, many more before calling anything even provisionally decided. So I'm hoping that using those various techniques allows us to have a time when people in Asia Pacific can participate more and such.

But we will do that so – but I think it's very important to also remember that there are the recordings for those whose life makes it impossible for them to do a middle of the nigh meeting to catch up. It's a good reason to use the list more for discussion. And again, that multiple passes through issues should mean that no one ever misses their opportunity to input on one of the discussions.

But if we see statistically that things don't work out or we find a way to move it an hour here or an hour there, to make it work better, you know, after this one rotation through the three times, we'll do that. With our schedule of meeting every two weeks, meetings at this horrible time will happen only once every six weeks. So anybody's horrible time on this rotation is every six weeks or once every two months.

On the other thing on the printing, I notice I'm looking at a spreadsheet which was available to me. But one of the things that happens is it's there in a 12-point font so it's big enough.

But I think in printing it out perhaps there's this notion of printing it in one screen across and so there may be some help made also in just the way that the PDF or something is created to allow someone to print it bigger, to print it landscape instead of portrait perhaps or something. But definitely agree, you know, it's easy – I forget about the paper users and so something should definitely be done there.

I was going to go directly into stuff but I see Alan's got his hand up so I will stop and be called on for the next section.

Alan Greenberg: Two very brief comments on the one you were just talking about. If the document could be made available as a Word document or Excel document, then we have a little bit more flexibility about how we look at it. So that may be worth considering.

In the – you will have noted, perhaps, that the ALAC never did get their comments in. They are almost ready. If the workgroup – PDP workgroup chooses to look at them they should be submitted very shortly. The saving grace is the comments are all very short and terse. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Alan. This is Jeff Neuman again for the transcript. And you beat us to kind of the first question that we were going to ask which is if there's – if there was any update from any of the groups that have not yet submitted their comments to date. We still only have the Registries, the GAC, the IPC and the statement from the ccNSO.

And so if any other group does have comments coming like the ALAC, we're also told potentially the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group or the NCUC may have some comments as well really just trying to keep us in the loop so that we can be on the lookout for those comments. But otherwise we'll assume that comments are not forthcoming.

And with that let me turn it over to Avri. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. This is Avri speaking. And, yes, I had put my hand up briefly to say NCSG is working on a set. They've got a nag amongst them that keeps asking for comments so hopefully they will get some in.

I also wanted to – I raised my hand at the beginning but didn't get it in in time. I wanted to do two things. I wanted to point out to everybody that we have Steve Chan back with us after a bunch of weeks. And what I really want to do – and I'm glad to see him back – but what I really want to do is thank Emily and Julie from the policy staff for two people doing the work of three especially during this time of starting up the work teams.

And I want to especially thank Emily who jumped into this cold and basically did an amazing amount to help us get organized to the point where we're now talking about the work track meetings and that work having been started. So welcome back to Steve and thank you so much, to Emily and Julie.

And now I will move on to the CC1 document. From what I understand we only made it as far as 1c last time. And so we'd be at 1c(1). Now one thing I wanted to point out is that in looking at the lines above in our discussion last week, we did not come up with any tentative responses to any of these issues.

Now I know some of them may be difficult, some of them may take more discussion, some of them the response may be well it looks like this might be a Work Track, you know, 3 type of issue, etcetera. But I think that while we're walking through this, and I did want to go back to the work that's been done, we will go back there again in our next walk through the document, but I did want to say that as we move forward I'd like to try and get at least some tentative words into that column before we jump to the next row.

And even if those words exhibit confusion or those words say we need more information, but basically to start thinking about what our responses is. If we can get so far as to start figuring out what to recommend, even better.

Let me know, by the way, if I'm not loud enough, if I'm too soft or if I'm talking too fast please.

So that being the case, I will go to 1c-R1. And actually before asking – I'm going to read the comment into the record for anybody that might not have it open in front of them, whose font may be too small or what have you.

1c-R1, the question requires further clarification of what sufficient diversity means in this context. There are a number of possible elements of diversity including innovative new business models, geographic diversity, equitable treatment of underserved regions and communities of interest, quote, "as opposed to commercial driven initiatives," unquote. These should be addressed in the work of both the PDP and the CCT Review as appropriate.

The final issues report, especially section 4.2.3, includes relevant information on the limited diversity in terms of geographic diversity of the applicants, as well as the distribution between standard and other types of application types, which might be an element to consider when discussing the possible need of establishing a differentiation between different types of applications.

This comment came from GAC and I'd like to give any of the GAC members, GAC representatives, a chance to delve more deeply into this, explain more completely if they'd like before I go for (unintelligible).

Okay, I see no one from GAC so if there's anyone else that wants to comment on this to perhaps come up with a first stab at how we should handle this comment. Basically, you know, we do have a commitment to diversity. Is this the work for one of the work tracks in terms of the outreach?

Is this because part of it is in terms of applications and part of it related types of applications and some of that. So in trying to unpack this one figure out where the response needs to be and what response is actually needed here. And so I'd like a little bit of comment on that if anyone has any.

So is it – okay thank you, Donna.

Donna Austin: Hi, everybody. Donna Austin from Neustar. So, you know, I think it's a reasonable suggestion by the GAC that, you know, the question requires further clarification because, you know, what are we talking about when we talk about diversity? It does mean many things to many people.

So perhaps if we can articulate that - that if anyone has any applications and related types of applications and some of that. So that might make the discussion easier to understand whether, you know, we are achieving the diversity that people thought was going to be achieved, or if we're not, how do we live up to that.

So I don't think it's an unreasonable question, and, you know, to the extent that we can try to provide some clarification around the term diversity we should try to do that.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Donna. So Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. The GAC comment is not unlike what you'll see from the ALAC, although we say it in far fewer words, and not nearly as eloquently. The definition of diversity, you know, really is key there because there are just so many ways you can do this. And some answers will address some diversities and not necessarily others so what we're looking for is key.

And it's going to be really difficult to do this without seeing the conclusions of indeed this PDP and the CCT review. So it's a little bit premature to ask this kind of question at this point. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Now one note that I've already written in the scratch copy I'm keeping on the spreadsheet is further clarification and elucidation on diversity. Donna, I see your hand still up; is that a reoccurrence or the old – thank you.

So the first note I've put in there is that we need further clarification on the – which drives the question of where should that clarification be done? Is that a task that we should start talking about in this group? Is that a task where a couple people want to go off? Do we want to look at, for example, there was a report put out in the – in a sort of (unintelligible) related to the accountability stuff talking about diversity. There's a group in there that's working on diversity that may actually be able to bring some input.

Does this fit into any of the work tracks? And I worry about so many of these issues are intertwined that I worry about saying that any issue can't be touched until another issue or that diversity can't be understood. I think instead of bolting diversity on at the end, it seems to be the sort of thing that at the beginning we should try to define what requirements we're going to meet for diversity. So that's part of further clarification and elucidation.

And perhaps there'd be some draft of what exactly do we want to hit in terms of diversity as we go forward in this process? And, you know, Donna has said that she thinks GAC has made some suggestions on that. So we could potentially build on that.

So indeed there is some in the comments there, perhaps more will come out in the ALAC. So this further clarification and elucidation on diversity is something that would be – this would be included in the document, in the (unintelligible) we would have a section on diversity.

And I'm wondering, is there anyone, certainly hopefully maybe from the GAC or from ALAC or whoever, who would like to sort of, you know, try to create a little note for the group on these diversity requirements and something concrete building on what GAC did to start building something. I'd like to also point out that Emily has put the Excel URL up. So that is also available on the wiki for anyone who wants to look at it in Excel so that they can play with the sizes of the screen themselves.

So do I have anyone that wants to sort of help take this task on? Seeing no volunteers, I'll make that a pending so I'll make a note that we want to add a section on diversity to the draft report. And that we need some volunteers to, you know, start a document to drive a discussion.

And (unintelligible) in mind and hopefully the staff (unintelligible). I just want to get some interest – some work – okay great. I've got Tom and I've got Donna. So, Tom, please.

Tom Dale: Hi, Avri. Thank you. Tom Dale from the GAC Secretariat for the record. Look, I'd be quite happy to assist any members of the group who are trying to take the work on diversity forward and to work as, you know, liaising with GAC members to expand further if people have any queries. I don't think it's appropriate for me as an employee of the GAC, to take the lead on that but I'll be quite happy to support the work and provide some further background working with GAC members if that will be helpful to the group. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I think that would be immensely helpful so thank you. Donna, please.

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks, Avri. Donna Austin. I just – we probably shouldn't read GAC response in isolation here because Registry Stakeholder Group have provided some comments and also the IPC. So it's interesting that the IPC has picked up on the idea of while they had no substantive comments they note that if you introduce more brands you have, you know, potential to enhance consumer space – consumer trust in the domain name space.

So I think there might have been a couple of different interpretations of this question. So we should, to the extent that we try to define what diversity is, noting that choice and trust were identified as the two possible options in this question, we should make sure that we don't look at the responses in isolation but take them as a whole and see what we can take out of that as possible – as a possible answer to the question. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And I very much accept that, though I guess I also want to certainly understand them all as a group but also tried to look at what it takes to satisfy each one of them. And then if we find that we have different things coming out of each that tells us where we have to work to bring things together. So we both have to answer each question and I very much agree, we have to answer them all in a consensus-based way, so thank you.

And if there's no more comments on this one, I will move on to the reading of the next one. Okay. So this one was from the Registry Stakeholder Group. And by the way if someone else wants to read theirs as opposed to me, just give a shout. But I really want to get these on the record. And I want to make sure that anybody that can't read at the moment can hear.

Yes, we believe that the widespread participation in the 2012 round made a broader, more diverse set of prospective applicants aware of the potential benefits to launch a new gTLD. By preserving an ongoing mechanism these parts, including communities, brands and geographic TLD operators could more easily participate increasing overall choice for registrants and, potentially, inviting new and innovative uses of the DNS.

We note that in the recently published ICANN gTLD marketplace health index, (beta), ICANN uses the distribution of ICANN-accredited registries by region and the number of jurisdictions with at least one registry operator as indicated of competition and industry diversity. However, given low participation in the 2012 round of applications in certain regions, very limited improvements can be made to current statistics without an ongoing mechanism.

We are also aware that as a result of the 2012 round, there are potential applicants that are anxious to implement their own TLDs. This is especially true for brand TLDs which could suffer greatly if their competitors have TLDs and they do not. Including for brands that did not exist at the time for 2012

rounds. This is also true for geo TLDs and generic TLDs where demand exists that is not met by the current choices.

I would like to offer the floor to anyone from the Registry Stakeholder Group that wants to further dig into this, further expand on it, you know, correct any misinterpretation that may have come from my reading, etcetera. Is there anyone that would like to comment on this at this point?

Okay, seeing none. Is there anyone else that would like to comment on this? I guess the question I have is a response to this is, yes, this becomes an input to the decision on why we need a continuing mechanism. Does it – is it arguing that there is sufficient diversity that we can't know about diversity until we have another round? So I guess I'm trying to understand what argument are they taking other than we need to get on with the work of moving towards the ongoing mechanism?

So is it correct to – okay thank you, Donna, I see your hand.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Avri. Donna Austin. So I think it's just making the point that the 2012 round has been responsible for people being aware of new domain name extensions. And in order to, you know, ensure that we – well not ensure but one of the potential mechanisms for having more diversity in domain name extensions is an additional round. So, you know, the 2012 round there probably wasn't a lot of people that knew about that or understood the value of the domain name extension.

So in order to build on that it's important, well, important, you know, an ongoing mechanism is important to achieving, you know, we've said here – the question was about sufficient diversity. I don't know whether you ever completely reach sufficient diversity.

But I think it's just making the point that, you know, there was a 2012 round. That was some time ago. There are some benefits in that it has raised

awareness about the importance or the uses of domain name extensions. And other people might want to buy into that.

So I think that's where the Registry Stakeholder Group is coming from. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Jeff, please.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Avri. This is Jeff Neuman. Two points. The first is that I think this issue is also interlinked with some of the issues that are going to be worked on in Work Track 1 especially the communications piece. You know, how we get word out there that there is another window, round, application period, whatever we call it, you know, and also applicant support as well or outreach – sorry, outreach is a subject for Work Track 1 so that should help with diversity.

But I also take the point of the Registries and Donna basically saying that, you know, one of the things that helps get awareness out there that new applications can be accepted is actually putting a stake in the ground for a date, a date certain.

A lot of people will pay attention to the new gTLD debates but then as time drags on without any certainty or predictability, you know, they kind of fade from the conversation or they stop paying attention.

And so I think, you know, one of the points the Registries have made is that, you know, if you announce a date you – it'll help by drawing more attention to the matter to help you with your communications and to help you reach some of the underserved areas to get word out there. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And I think that as we start to build a definitive schedule based on the work that the work tracks are doing, we may indeed be able to, you know,

start giving an indication. I'm not sure about date certain, but certainly date projected.

Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I'm going to be devil's advocate to some extent here. I think some of the issues that are being raised here are red herrings. Additional brands, be it toothpaste or automobiles, provides consumer choice. Additional TLDs for those targeted at those brands specifically are a marketing issue - they don't provide choice; they don't provide choice for someone who's looking to - where do I register my new domain because in general, the dot brands are not open to that kind of thing?

So although there's no question there's probably a huge demand for dot brands, and ultimately we may decide to address that particular demand and away that's different from other types of TLDs, I don't think it's a diversity issue at all.

It might ultimately be a trust issue, if going to the TLD associated with the particular, you know, supplier manufacturer gives you a higher degree of trust that you're going to the right place, yes, but I don't think it's a diversity issue at all. Thank you.

Avri Dori: Thank you. Paul McGrady.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Avri. Paul McGrady. Just to respond to what Alan said, I think that the comment seems to be rooted in this notion that second-level registrations are the thing itself rather than a diverse ecosystem where perhaps second-level registrations are less important than the top levels themselves.

And that's where the diversity of the dot brands bring into the mix, come into place, and we also want to make sure that at the end of the day, whether it's dot brands or some other new form of entries to the ecosystem, once they

come in, that we have an adequate program to allow that kind of diversity (that happens) and that we don't get sort of wrapped up in the traditional ICANN second-level open generic marketplace that existed before in round one. Thanks.

Avri Dori: Okay, thank you. What - I don't see any other hands. What I've taken out of that at the moment is a possible (for track one) linkage also linkage both communications and applicant support.

(Unintelligible) the round itself contributed to building diversity and certain will help and somehow keeping the interest alive in the fact that interest being kept alive helps somehow in increased diversity.

So, I've made notes of that. And then we had the notion from Paul that really comes well with, you know, (their), in which, you know, in fact I'll read (it) now, which is we offer no substantive comment on this other than the referred to respond to 1B above that said we do believe that a streamlined approach to that brand has the potential to quickly enhance consumer trust in the (domain) space.

And as such, one of the discussions we've addressed having is the relationship between the consumer trust issue and the diversity issue. And this was a specific question about diversity but under diversity was included, for example, choice and trust.

So those were seen in our first conversations as being related. Paul, I know you just spoke. I'm wondering if anyone from (IPC) wishes to make a comment on your comment. I see Kavouss Arasteh. Let me first check to see if there's anyone from IPC that wanted comment on your comment further. Seeing none, Kavouss Arasteh, please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, at the previous meeting, I said that it would be more helpful if one of our distinguished colleagues from IPC or anyone making the comment is present in order to provide further clarification.

For instance, I have the question that what we mean by a streamlined approach, more explanation. In what sense? Unless you are someone, (Jeff) or anyone, could interpret what they mean by a streamlined approach. Thank you.

Avri Dori: Thank you, Kavouss Arasteh. I would just be guessing at the moment but we do have some IPC people. We just had Paul speaking so perhaps Paul would like to comment (on that). Okay, here in the open microphone (unintelligible) your microphone.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. This is Greg. Can you hear me?

Avri Dori: I can hear you and I don't hear the echo.

Greg Shatan: Okay, I've turned my speaker down just a bit. Just to answer Kavouss Arasteh's question, by a streamlined approach, generally speaking, we're referring to the fact that in the 2012 round, there was really no differentiation during the application process itself between brands and open TLDs in many parts of the application, or at least arguably, don't apply to the dot brand model.

And, therefore, it could be possible to develop an approach that has fewer elements and requirements in it, and this would be more streamlined without losing any of the necessary elements to determine whether dot brand (element) should be delegated on new TLD. Thanks.

Avri Dori: So thank you. Okay, Kavouss Arasteh, I assume your hand is from your prior question so I'll move on to (Christina). Thank you, (Christina), please.

(Christina):   Hi, (Christina) (Unintelligible) from Amazon. I can't - I don't want to speak for the BRG but I will say that, as a member of the BRG board, which is the Brand Registry Group, I would actually respectfully disagree with Alan's contention that diversity of registries that happened to be on the dot brand model does not contribute to diversity of the system.

Because geographic diversity and the rotation, primary rotation of those registry operators, the diversity and the customer base use that they appeal to, the Specification 13 does, in fact, allow for all broader distribution of second-level names in those TLDs that we have seen thus far.

It doesn't mean that it won't happen. So I would just note that I do, in fact, think that the dot brand can frankly - do contribute to the diversity of what we've seen to the 2012 round.

Avri Dori: Thank you. I think - and this goes back somewhat to (Donna)'s comment of (being) all of the now, together, and in fact, if we go back to something that we talked about what we were talking about the GAC comment, is that in trying to build a list of the diversity requirements and in the list of the possible solutions to the (unintelligible) that this idea of the diversity that is brought by the brand.

And perhaps some discussion of how that relates to other kinds of diversity, brands being somewhat global and that being yet another mechanism, another vector by which, you know, there can be more geographical and such.

And I'm really hand waving on that at the moment, but in terms of looking at it, and it also made a note that, you know, in terms of looking at this, that the diversity is linked, not only for brands, but especially for brands in terms of the diversification in the application process.

And that same reasoning that's being applied to dot brands in terms of diversifying within brands is easier, geographical diversification brands, would be easier if (there's a streamlined) process.

So the other clients of diversity may indeed be aided by specific streamlining and such as something that we me to explore are something that (work track) one can explore. (Sharon), yes, please. I see your hand. Your hand was - already put back. Okay, please.

Man: Yes, I came back. Sorry for the disconnection - came back. I heard a lot of discussion about, like, dot brand or geographic diversity. I just want to add one dimension for your consideration.

It's about, like, language diversity. I think if there are more internationalized TLDs from other languages besides English, so I think more people would think of this as like diversified TLDs (attention). So maybe brand, geographic, language, culture, those kinds of things can be thought together. Thank you.

Avri Dori: Thank you. Good contribution to the list of diversity aspects that we need to look at and have something to say about. What anybody else like to comment on these three to (suggest) and come up with anything about how we move these forward?

We talked a little bit about collecting some of the diversity factors, perhaps starting a (drive) document where we can collect diversity factors and have some diversity discussion might help.

We can certainly start a thread on the list are we could say that, no, now let's sort of take this and, you know, move it to work track one. Of course will go through it at least the second time here, but to what extent can this - though the diversity and scripting language relates to the IDN issues which, you know, I think I being talked about and tracked.

Or - and so, you know, will need to pay attention to the fact that this diversity issue is not just in one track. So before I move on, is there anything else that others would like to add about these three responses?

Seeing none, I'll move on to 1B. Okay, 1B, the question was, is it too early in the review cycle of the previous round to determine the full range of benefits of the 2012 round of new gTLDs?

Should - okay, let me see. It ran off my screen. Should that impact the decision to introduce additional (unintelligible) and/or the timing of ongoing mechanisms for new gTLDs?

So the first answer we have on this - the first comment was from GAC. It says please see their general comments which we discussed in the previous meeting.

The PDP should be conscious that evidence from the recent round is still being gathered and note the development in agreement of open (parent) let alone collection of (closed parent).

Relevant metrics appear to be spread across several processes and are far from complete. So (Scoa) notes there that I would interpret to be somewhat that we can't ignore the (unintelligible) being done but I don't see it as an answer that's saying we can't continue with our work because of that. But, yes, Jeff, please.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Avri. I think your last - what you just said is probably one of the main points and I think this is closely tied to one of the earlier questions that we went over the last call which is that it did not - subject to a couple constraints, and some believe that all of the reviews have to be completed, et cetera.

But all of the groups that commented said - or I should say, none of the groups that commented said that the existing policy of providing a mechanism for the continuous release of gTLDs, that that policy shouldn't be changed.

So when you read those two in combination, they're saying, hey, look, yes, it is kind of early to know all of the benefits, the full range of benefits, but it seems like everyone is still saying but the policy shouldn't change. We shouldn't stop everything just because we can't realize all of the benefits.

Or on the other side of the coin, we can't realize all of the detriment either at this point because it is that early. But, again, reading in conjunction with one of the earlier questions, I think it still is making the point that we should continue with the existing policy.

Avri Dori: Thank you. That we should continue with the existing policy - you mean the policy of 2012, we should - I'm not sure I understand what you just said.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, let me clarify. With the existing policy of having a - I'm sorry, I've got to find the exact words from - I believe it's probably 1A, and it's getting - it's late so my brain is shutting down a little bit.

But, you know, the policy of having - shoot, let me find the exact language, or someone can tell me out here - that ongoing mechanism to accept applications for new gTLDs essentially. Does that make sense that that policy - thank you.

Avri Dori: Kavouss Arasteh. Right. Thank you, yes. Okay, thanks. Kavouss Arasteh.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I think no one is against continued existing policy but, no doubt, identify any difficulties, problems, deficiencies, shortcomings and take remedial actions to that.

So we're not going to put (stamps) and when you have been doing is exactly - should be continued without any change. So the whole purpose of all of these questions for all of these back and forth conversations or communication is to make some improvements.

So no problem that we can go back to (score zero or scratch one), but we need to identify those problems. (Many identified) have yet - not been - any problems have not yet been identified. So you have to do that while continuing the existing policies. Thank you.

Avri Dori: Thank you. Anybody else before we move on to the second comment, the one from the registries? No? Okay. From the registries, it is early to determine the full range of benefits of the current round but that doesn't mean that the studies of the impact should not be commenced nor that the introduction of additional new gTLDs should be delayed further.

The ccTRT has already begun to access the impact of new gTLDs on competition, choice and consumer trust and ICANN's proposed marketplace, (both) indicators, will also track progress on indicators related to the impact of new gTLDs.

However, based upon prior commitments to an ongoing process, it is clear that the studies are not intended (unintelligible) the commencement of a future application process.

Further, we believe that initial indicators, particularly the widespread participation in the 2012 round and the growth in second-level registrations in new gTLDs suggest that there is no reason to change course from the original (invention) of introducing an ongoing application process.

We would also note that multiple TLDs have gone through the application, objection, GAC advice, evaluation, reevaluation, IRP, private auction, ICANN auction, pre-delegation testing, delegation, trademark clearinghouse sunrise,

land (rush) premium auction, specialty periods, general availability, renewal cycles and (evarra).

Each anticipated phase of the gTLD lifecycle has been experienced (and are more applicable). As (unintelligible) ICANN and the community has considerable information available to make operational and process improvements on the implementation of ongoing (events).

Kavouss Arasteh, is that your hand from before? Thank you. Is there anyone, first of all, from the registries that would like to amplify comments or correct any misreading? In which case, I'll open the floor to others who may wish to content - to comment on that.

I will comment that while reading it, it was quite a litany of processes that applications have gone through. So it was interesting to read that it out loud. Anyone else?

This seems to go along with the notion that basically bearing out an agreement to - we've got to keep doing the other work, we've got to keep doing this work and we shouldn't unnecessarily delay, I'm not sure whether there is a difference between the first comment at some of the comments for completion of reviews before and introduction.

I'm not sure that we even have an issue there but I don't think that that issue is necessarily resolve that between the various comments. But certainly, (admonition) there is to get a move on and that we've got a lot of experience to build on much of which I think is in the membership in this group, so I think that's good.

 I see, while I was talking, no other hands came up so I will move on to reading the third response from the IPC on this one. While it may be too early in the review cycle to fully determine the (range) of benefits, parenthesis, and

(harms), closed parenthesis of the 2012 round, we refer you to our responses to 1B and once the above.

We also note that it is too early in the lifecycle of the previous round to make such determinations so this round is still ongoing in many respects and should properly be (used) as the current round at this time.

While these timing issues cannot be ignored when considering how and when to introduce new gTLDs, these are factors to consider and not absolute bars to moving forward.

Would someone from IPC like to further comment, amplify, correct the reading? No? Okay, I must say I'm very thankful to the authors of all three of these so far for (unintelligible) that stand well enough to be read aloud, just as an aside.

So this one seems to be in the same layer that we need more information. I would say that this may be further along that scale of still needing more information given the analysis that we're still in the round we are evaluating. Yes, Kavouss Arasteh, please.

Kavouss Arasteh: I see two times IPC refers that it's too early. Do they have any timeframe in mind? What time would not be too early? So this is too early. Is there some point of time they're looking for our after some actions or what are the (tolerant) conditions that this early would become more reality? Thank you.

Avri Dori: Thank you, Kavouss Arasteh. Okay, (Alan), I saw your hand up briefly but I'm wondering if there's someone from the IPC - yes, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan again. Just making sure you can hear me. I'll assume you can.

Avri Dori: We can hear you.

Greg Shatan: Great. In terms of timing, as we indicated, things are still really in midstream. You know, we're not looking for chronological time. But in many ways, we're trying to redesign an airplane that is still in midair.

It may be, you know, somewhat closer to its destination than it was to its starting point but there are, you know, both, you know, quite a number of things that have occurred either only recently or have yet to occur, a number of fairly significant TLDs that have not yet really opened for business.

And a fairly few of the dot brands have really fully opened for business in terms of realizing their plans for those TLDs, assuming that have them. There are, you know, numerous reviews that were calls for as I believe the 12 month anniversary of the beginning of the process which are - anyway, those reviews are, you know, either ongoing or yet to occur.

So I think the point is - and, you know, we did say this is not an absolute bar but that we do need to, you know, look at the fact that we are looking at something that still very much a moving target. And the - even the short-term effect of the, you know, huge expansion of the name space have yet to be understood well at all.

And the, you know, the official ways of trying to understand them are still in early days. So we're looking at, you know, ideally for something that's a bit more mature in the lifecycle of what I still will call the current round of TLDs. Thanks.

Avri Dori: Thank you. Jeff, please.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. This is more of a kind of a personal comment. Sorry, Jeff Neuman for the record. You know, I - so used to, as most people know, I used to work at a registry and the registry, at (NewStar) at launch.biz.

And I could tell you it was a number of years after dot biz was launched, probably about, you know, four, five, six years later that we really saw lots of small businesses use dot biz, at least in the United States.

And so it took a number of years to see the benefits of just, you know, introducing dot biz at that point in time. And I think this may be very similar, while you have kind of introduction to newer gTLDs and you have people registering the names, it takes time to actually use those sites and to, you know, get word out there about the sites and to really - for, you know, those benefits to be achieved.

So I kind of agree that it's not really a time - it's not a time that you can define and say, okay, in two years, three years we're going to know better. But these types of dramatic changes often take a number of years before one can look back and say, oh, yes, this is - this past event is what caused these benefits to arise. And so I think, you know, it's going to take a number of years but I don't think anyone can define that. Thanks.

Avri Dori: Thank you. I see a response from Kavouss Arasteh in the (text) saying thanks for clarification, Greg and Jeff. Okay, anyone - oh, (Michael), please.

(Michael):   Yes, I just wanted to quickly - and I'm not sure this is as much of a clarifying question or statement, but for Greg's comment that many of the new gTLDs still haven't opened for business, we're asking this question in the aspect of the current rounds have gone through the application process and delegation, correct?

I think we need to look at both of those aspects of whether or not, you know, a lot of brand gTLDs is actually started using the TLD they went to the process for, but looking at the overall process of the TLDs that have actually gone through fully, while there still are a - there still are those that are left but a significant portion have already gone through.

Avri Dori: Thank you.

(Michael):   Thank you.

Avri Dori: Any further comments. I see there's been some discussion in the chat between (Paul) and (Donna). I don't know the needs to be read out. Let me see. I can find (Donna)'s entry.

Okay, Kavouss Arasteh asked the question - 1229 (unintelligible) agreements have been executed (to date). Then there's (Paul) and (Donna) - perhaps the contracts are the same thing as use.

Perhaps dot brands would be further along if we didn't have to spend months and months just getting recognized as (unintelligible). And, indeed, that was the difference in that are going around that probably will (unintelligible) in a future around.

Before moving on, is there anyone that would like to say anything more on the 1B question and answers that we've gotten? Now that we've read all of the 1B together, are there any additional comments?

(To say) we will be back here, we will work with staff to try and craft and understand where we seem to be getting to so that (we have) something to build on and discuss at the next and such.

Okay, before moving on, Jeff, there're 12 minutes left. I could possibly get through E and F in those 12 minutes. I'm not sure. It depends on how much there is to say. But also, I wanted to give a check to you, any other business? Don't try to force it, but you're chairing this meeting so I wanted to pass that decision back to you before I went on.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, so thank you, Avri. This is Jeff. Don't believe anyone had raised their hand for any other business but I'll do that call right now. Is there any other business that anyone has other than finishing up this review?

Okay, ivory, I would say I know, although there's only ten minutes left, let's quickly do E and F because those are kind of like miscellaneous, what additional factors.

And I think we could go through these fairly quickly especially 1F because really there are no additional comments except from the IPC on accreditation which is actually a subject of work track one. So I think what you go through E, will be done with question one.

Avri Dori: Okay, so let's go through them. I want to have one comment from (Michael). So we have to highly consider benefits in the relative aspect (that) (categorized) TLDs use them looking at the application process and where we are in that. Start measuring benefits (to not be) done equally across the spectrum.

Okay, I will wait for all three of E since they are short to get it said. So, the GAC, in 1E, the GAC suggested that there needs to be a commitment by ICANN, registries and registrars, together the most appropriate data on security and consumer safety issues and ensure that this is fully transparent.

And the answer to the question here was what additional considerations, so there is definitely consideration of collecting data on security consumer safety. I doubt there is much disagreement there.

I'll move on. I'll come back to open the floor. From the registries, we do not believe there are any outstanding factors that need to be considered in determining whether an ongoing mechanism is warranted.

And we have from the IPC, it is prudent, not only to diagnose the problems and errors discovered to the 2012 round, but also to anticipate the problems which may occur to the next ongoing mechanism -- where there are rounds or other procedures -- in order to fix those in advance, thus providing additional certainty to applicants.

It looks like there is the request that we consider data on security and consumer safety issues. There's the comment which goes along with other comments. We're already talking about enough things.

We've got a lot on our plate and there's nothing additional. And we need to get on with it. And the cautionary comment that says we've got to make sure that we've covered, not only known existing problems, but there then needs to be some analysis on new emerging problems that might be created by changes that are introduced. I see a hand. Yes, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. A personal comment, and other people have called this kind of the Neuman rule in another PDP. I appreciate the IPC's comment of, you know, anticipating problems which may occur.

But I want to caution against, you know, spending too much time on the over the theoretical because we, you know, prior to the introduction to the 2012 round, again, personally speaking, we spent a lot of time thinking about potential corner cases most of which didn't come to fruition.

That said, I think now we do have experience to have seen what could happen with different mechanisms and so I do think that there, you know, there are some low hanging obvious things that we can anticipate with the next ongoing mechanism. So they just needs to be a balance between, you know, what's reasonably foreseeable versus what's theoretically foreseeable. Thanks.

Avri Dori: Thank you. I must admit as someone who, in my early life, had a career as a stage manager always looking forward to what might crash on you tomorrow is the useful thing.

But I think the key word is balance. It's assessing the risk versus the amount of effort one has to plan to be able to (unintelligible). I see (John). (John) has his hand up. Please, (John).

(John): Yes, I also want to share some of my personal observation of Chinese new (unintelligible) market to raise my question. I know it's hard to reach a universal acceptance whether the new second - the second round should be more quick or be slow.

(Someone has) to say there is no - any problems. (Some will) say, oh, there are many problems. We need to fix it before we open the second round. I just want to say here in China, many company organizations, they don't think that it's too early to review all the questions are review all the benefits.

They just feel (unintelligible) that they didn't act quickly to apply some new gTLDs in the first round. So they just wonder when the second round can be open as soon as possible.

So I think maybe one of the - their concerns is that whether we should have a fast-track for those TLDs that have no - any controversial debate. We - they know that someone may have controversial, then they just let them debate and find a solution.

But some kinds of TLDs, they may be less controversial, so it only just have, like, a fast-track to move as soon as possible. I just want to say there are debates. I know there are many debates there but maybe we can (have) different types of TLDs and apply different processes for that. So just some of my personal observations.

Avri Dori: Okay, thank you. Kavouss Arasteh, please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, we should be very cautious about the fast-track that was mentioned. It might be fast-track but it is made longer than the others. Thank you.

Avri Dori: Thank you. That sounds like the voice of experience with fast-tracks. And, of course, one of the issues we've got on fast-track is when you - and I'm also not sure whether you mean fast-track through the policy process or fast-track through an application process once we finish the policy process.

I wasn't clear on that but we should make a note of fast-track and come back to that in discussions of both of those issues. I don't see any comments here. Let me (see) if there is anyone else on E at the moment.

I will jump forward to F, which said, any other issues related to the overarching subject, GAC (said) no comment (unintelligible). Registries said no, and IPC said they believe that an accreditation process, that they can providers would greatly (unintelligible) process as well as the application review process.

And a response to that is work track one is working on that as Jeff said and so, you know, I think that that one is actually being looked at very closely and it is the work track one item that are actually already discussing substantively or at least have discussed (the side of that).

So there are three minutes left. Other any comments on either E that you thought of after I moved off of it so quickly, or on F following this whole discussion of one? No? In which case, I will take it that we have done our first reading of these comments.

We've come up with a couple possible areas where interest can be structured. We'll work with staff to see whether we can take from the notes, from the transcript and such, and start framing wording that the next time we

make a pass through this we have (something) to say, yes, that's right. No, that's wrong. No, that needs to be amplified, clarified, corrected. I see no one else has raised their hand. Jeff, I turn it back over to you. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Avri, and with that said, the next meeting is going go - we're going to go back to Mondays. That is our scheduled day. This week we changed it because of the US holiday.

But we will go back to Monday and if the date can be posted in the chat - it's not this coming Monday, but the Monday after that. So just waiting for someone from staff hopefully to publish the date and time.

But that will be the next call of the full group. Of course, please be on the lookout for your work track calls which there are two work tracks generally meeting each week.

And so thank you, (Emily), for posting the date and time. It's Monday, the 19th of September at 1500 UTC. And Avri and I will work with ICANN staff to collate the comments on question one and the next time we will take up question two and…

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Oh, sorry, it sounds like someone is not on mute but I just want to say thanks everyone and talked to in a week and a half. Thanks.

Avri Dori: Thank you all and good luck with all the work track meetings. Thank you.

Woman: Thanks, Avri. Thanks, Jeff. Bye.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you everyone. Again, the meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop the recording and disconnect all remaining lines. Everyone, enjoy the remainder of your day.

END