

ICANN
Moderator: Nathalie Peregrine/A
February 14, 2017
8:30 am CT

Man: Please start. Thank you.

Man: Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: So now that everybody's awake – and we've got, how much time do we have for this one now Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: Five minutes.

Avri Doria: Five minutes.

Rob Hoggarth: You have until 15:45 local time.

Avri Doria: 15:45. Okay. So, I don't know if anybody's on this slide. So, what we're basically going to do is I have – is talk about new (gTLD)'s and (next phase). I have, perhaps, a liability in this session in that I'm coming in not only as (NCSG) but as one of the co-chairs of the (PDP). And it is really hard – for me – to put that -A - neutrality and – B – pressure of that beside me. So, what Tony and I talked about doing is that I would start with a quick review of where we're at and what's coming up and what we need.

And then Tony was going to basically bring up a couple of concerns. And then – from there – we would go into a discussion. So, on this – so basically I would say that in the original schedule that we put together – we’re probably at close to a half way mark. Now the half way mark is sometimes the putting out of the draft recommendations. We’re nowhere close to that. But – and as people know – we did community comments – what used to be called constituency comments, in a different way. And that we divided it into two parts. Constituency comments (CC1 and 2).

On constituency comments one, and the six topics are up there again to remind you all. Some of the constituencies and stakeholder groups actually sent in answers. Some of them didn’t. Mine is one of the ones that didn’t. Very hard to explain that when -- you’re chair of the group and -- you couldn’t get your own stakeholder group and constituency. Nonetheless, so basically, we had six subjects there. And – you know – do we want to do more (gTLD)’s? That was one that came up with a yes quite quickly. Yes we do.

Categorization, future, whether we’re going to do rounds, predictability versus flexibility. We know that last time it wasn’t as predictable as people hoped. But the flexibility seemed to be necessary. Community engagement. How far does the community get engaged? That’s in terms of objections, in terms of basically (GAC) comments, that’s community, et cetera. So basically – while the application process is going on – what is the community’s involvement. And then the notion of limiting applications in total or per entity.

That’s another place where we made a fairly quick decision that, no, we’re not going to recommend any limitation. Going to the next slide, though, there are really three issues that are pending. There’s different (TLD) types of categories. We have not been able to settle down to a kneeling point where we

know what the categories are. Sure, there's geographical. Sure, there's brand. Is there community? Is there not community? Are there other types -- you know -- of that. So we were basically putting together a drafting group to sit down and write a proposal for us on that.

The next one is the predictability and community engagement. When we were looking at the predictability -- and flexibility -- we noticed that often it was community engagement that sort of sent things spinning off in sort of a less predictable range. A certain number of issues came up. The issues had to be dealt with. And that required a change in the process that the applicants had to go through. And so, there was a certain -- so basically we're trying to look at that issue.

Then there's the applications assessed in rounds. We've had a couple discussions about it. There's really a desire to get to a steady state where you have a first come, first serve. But that doesn't work in terms of objections, in terms of trademark checking, in terms of contention. And so, we're looking at various hybrid approaches.

So, this is my first advertisement for the group is there are at least three charter topics, drafting groups being put together to hammer out possible solutions. There's not enough people working on these at the moment. So -- you know -- it would be good. Yes, (Steve), I see your hand.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Avri. Steve DelBianco. A topic that you were in charge of, I believe, seven years ago was Joint Applicant Support. And that was...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: That was really just code word for something on the second topic. I'm wondering whether engagement with community could include – this time around, the next, as we open up for more, can it include – financial assistance or technical assistance to applicants again. Or is that off the table?

Avri Doria: No.

Steve DelBianco: What's your view on it?

Avri Doria: Not at all off the table. Let me get to (CC2) and then I'll get that one. So – in this one – we're talking about community engagement – not in terms of helping them become applicants but – in terms of them interacting with the application process. The other one will come up when you get to see the list of issues in (CC2).

So, it basically wanted – so the first part of the status is so we're close on our draft recommendations -- for this part -- which was the overarching topics. Now the next slide.

I'm going to start just showing you a list of the topics that are being worked on. And we have four different sub-teams. Each of the sub-teams is working on a set of topics. We're just about to put out community comments to requests. And it will be coming to all of you. Probably our goal is to get it out before Copenhagen. So, hopefully, we'll actually meet that goal. We had our first reading of the questions last night. Some of the questions are going back to the groups. And then we're going to do a second reading. And, hopefully, the questions will come out.

There'll be a lot of questions. A lot of them. Now, no one will be expected to answer all of them. People will be expected to answer the ones that are

relevant to them, that they've got experience in, et cetera. But I just wanted to give you a list of the topics. And there'll be questions in these.

So, on sub-team one, we're talking about accreditation programs. That's registrar – I mean registry service provider. Are we going to have pre-accredited service registry service providers, (RSP)'s? So, the people can switch registry back and easily. So, that every registry back and doesn't have to be tested for every application. Issues like that.

Applicant support. This was the one (Steve) just asked about. It's what are we doing about applicant support. Clarity of the application process. There was a whole lot of issues on clarity. Application fees. Same fee, flexible fee, forgiving fees, et cetera. So, variable fees. Application queuing. You know, are we going to have archery again? Are we going to have lotteries again? How are we going to queue? What kind of queue mechanisms can we use?

Application submission periods. How long? How short? Do we cycle them? One of the suggestions we've got is three months of application, three months of processing and objection, three months of application in a continuous process. Is that good? Is that bad? How that basically the systems work for the applicants. Communications from ICANN when this is all going on. And just the applicant guidebook in general. Is the applicant guidebook – as it was done – pretty much okay other than the changes it needs? Or do we need a different sort of mechanism there?

The second group. The second group is looking at the base registry agreement. It's looking at second level RPM's. Basically, on any of the RPM stuff, we are waiting for output from the various (PDP)'s. But we're already getting indications of issues they may or may not answer on. Any issue that isn't

answered by one of the standard RPM groups is going to be something that we've got to take on ourselves.

So, we're starting to try and figure out what that. Reserve names. All kinds of issues with reserve names. How big a list? How many lists? What about the (IATF)'s lists. How many reserve name list can we have? The (IGO INGO) procedures. Closed generics. A big question that came in the middle last time. But no policy was made. There was certainly a board decision or was there? But, anyway, there – you know that's one that – we really need to deal with before we have more names.

Application terms and conditions. Registrar non-discrimination. Registry registrar separation. Going to have to visit that separation again, issue, and see if what – if the board decision – based upon a policy non-decision – worked or not. Registry, registrar standardization. (PLD) rollout. Are there rules? Are there specifications, contractual compliance? What we talked about here. What can be in a contract for contractual compliance? Kind of what (Jamie) was saying.

Can we put (pics) in if they are counter to the mission? Global public interest. Again, how much can that feed into it. These are all questions. Each one of these breaks down into several questions. You know, the third group is working on the whole objections process. Did that work? Does that need to be changed? Applicant freedom of expression. Community applications, community priority. There's been a lot of issues in that. Community saying it was terrible. It discriminated against us. Some registries saying it was just an opportunity for (gaming) and should go away.

Council of Europe and (GAC) making a very strong plea for communities. A lot of discussion. String similarity. Getting into things like are plurals really okay? Accountability mechanisms being discussed in terms of those.

And then the fourth track is working on (IDN)'s. Looking at the universal acceptance, how far has it gotten, how much do we need to worry about that in terms of the next one. Applicant reviews. Name collisions. Security instability. So, that is the work. When people say new (gTLD)'s and I got a lot of "I'm not all interested in new (gTLD)'s all that much." These are the issues that we have to resolve on.

There's room for people to work in the groups. And there'll be lots of questions for you all to answer. That was it for my part of a quick dump of where we're at. And, yes, I guess before I give it to Tony, yes, please.

Woman: Forgive my complete ignorance here. But how does this group interact with the other reviews are already ongoing? And how does all that really fit into the group?

Avri Doria: Okay, there's a certain amount of – the chairs of the groups keep in contact. We also have the staff that's working on all of the keeping us. They've got this draft out. They've got that draft out. We've had meetings with them to sort of coordinate. And --that's one of things -- we're paying attention to their draft reports. When we see a draft report – and we see oh, they didn't deal with this, this and this, okay, I guess – we're going to have to deal with this, this and this.

So, the coordination. It's not a tight interlinking. But – between staff and conversations amongst chairs when it's necessary – we don't meet regularly. But any time there's sort of a feeling that we're losing track of each other, we

plan a meeting and we talk. But we also have staff members who are serving all the groups. Basically, sort of keeping us aligned. And we have a very clear stated of dependency on any of the ongoing RPM stuff.

Before getting into all the discussion, I wonder if it's better. I mean I'm willing to answer questions. But I wonder if it's better if we go to Tony's part and then we come back to questions. But I'm willing to take them. But Tony, it's really up to you now. Because I pass the token to you. But I see one flag up, two, three flags up. So, I don't know how you want to deal with that.

Tony Holmes: Well, we can do two things. We can take questions and I'll go wait. Or I don't think we'll have time. Or else I'll do my brief comments with...

Avri Doria: I would like to see you do your brief...

Tony Holmes: ...with some of my colleagues. And then open up the floor. Actually, if the previous (white panel) or presentation window of time – I think we should have the same privilege of 10 minutes or so. Sorry Rob, but that's my opinion.

Rob Hoggarth: Except that we have the CEO getting on the phone with us.

Man: Well, you have until they call you.

Man: That's not possible, fair enough.

Tony Holmes: Well, basically, first of all I just don't see why we suggested this issue in the first place to be discussed. It came from us, the (CSE). And particularly (ISPCP). I thought this was a subject that should interest everybody. I mean it may not be a main interest. But if you're an (IP) lawyer worrying about

protecting your – the domains of your customers. If those domains don't work and don't function, they'll be upset about that also.

So, one of the first things we looked at -- in the (ISCP) -- when the new round came out was the question of non-resolution of new (gTLD)'s. Because we had several examples -- presented to us in one of our meetings -- which were really amazing. I mean the main banks in the U.S. we're rejecting and any application that had an email address which was not dot com, dot net or dot org. So, what I would like to do is ask Christian and/or Mark – sitting over there – if you'd like to make a few comments of the progress made by the Universal Acceptance Steering Group.

I think this is a milestone in ICANN history. Nobody seems to talk about it or pay much attention. But there's an incredible effort being done by very challenging people to make sure that the new (gTLD)'s function. Would you like to -- sort of take a couple of minutes between you and -- say a few words of where you're at with that?

Christian Dawson: I would certainly be happy to start and give some comments as to what it is we have been doing in the Universal Acceptance Steering Group. By the way, this is Christian Dawson: for the transcript. And I am Vice Chair of the Universal Acceptance Steering Group as well as the Co-Chair of the Outreach Committee. We have had a productive two years since the inception of our group at the meeting two years ago. We've basically started from zero. And needed to produce a lot of documentation that took us way back to simply defining the problem set at hand.

And trying to figure out how to agree on a language -- that people could understand -- when we went to what ultimately is the people that build systems on top of our Internet's infrastructure which is pretty much all the

coders in the world. And – to some respect – we needed to narrowly define who it is we were going to reach out to tell them to update their systems to be compliant to all major – with all modern (TLD)’s. I’m sorry. Not major (TLD)’s, modern (TLD)’s. And we needed to figure out what terminology we could use that was going to resonate with them.

We also acknowledged the fact that when you are talking about everything from Web browsers to all sorts of apps coded in all sorts of different coding structures. We needed to speak in broad terms so that we weren’t – sort of – pigeon holing one specific type of tech. But we needed to figure out how to be prescriptive so that somebody said, “yes, this is a problem that I need to solve.” They actually had some means by which to do it.

So, we’ve spent about two years developing the right language, finding the right targets for outreach and developing (CIO) guides that were going to help people who wanted to self-identify as individuals who wanted to bring their systems in compliance with universal acceptance guidelines could actually follow along with our step-by-step guide and do so.

Those are a lot of achievements for two years. What we’re doing now is we’re trying to figure out how to take what we have built and (shining) a light on it with other organizations. The fact is there really aren’t groups outside of the Universal Acceptance Steering Group that are really talking about this much. We can have an amplification of our message the more that we can convince other groups to say this is an issue. They’ve got some good prescriptions on how to deal with this issue.

And so, we’ve developed a list of sort of target amplifiers -- of our message -- that we’re trying to get spun up on the universal acceptance issues. We’re trying to make it very easy for them to pick it up as their own issues. And the

more organizations that we can have also pointing at this saying, “yes, this is important” – I think – the more effective our message is going to be. Mark would you like to add anything? Mark do you want to...

Mark McFadden: Let me just say a couple things. I hesitate to just duplicate the stuff that Christian just said. But this fits in something that’s really important to the (ISP) community. And some had referred to the (ISP) community as the people who did the plumbing this morning. And I hope that’s not true, if you use the bathroom in my house anyway.

What Avri has on the – on her slide or her and Tony’s slide here this – section - the work track four are topics that are extremely important to the (ISP) community. Because they speak directly to the operational stability of the changes that we might make as a result of having another session, another event that would create new (TLD)’s. And we have a lot of experience that tells us that not all of our problems were solved. I believe we have some experience that not all of our problems have been identified yet.

Man: Right.

Mark McFadden: And so – I think – it’s very, very worthy of the group that Avri is working with that they’ve come up with this work track. But one of the things – that is specific – that is extremely important, is making sure that anything that we do actually works. I’ll slow down for the transcript. We should make sure that anything we do actually works in the real world.

The new (gTLD) program – as we invented it – does not currently work. I’ll slow down again. You must realize – in the pursuits – in the business constituency and the (IPC) that the new (gTLD) program – by many metrics – is a success. But – for users of the Internet – it is not necessarily a success.

And why is that? Because the software applications -- and services on the Internet -- still do not cope with and do not acceptably use those new (gTLD)'s.

And sometimes people get confused. I'm sorry for the transcript. That was Mark doing a Christian imitation. Some people say, "oh, look. This is" -- Avri, more than half the room is not old enough to get that reference. For the transcript, that was (Avri Doria) who is younger than I am. Some people conflate (IGN) issues with this new (gTLD) issues. It's essential for you to understand that in this work track -- in the work that Christian's group is doing, the (UASG) and the work that Tony's group is doing -- the (UASG) is -- that they're working on the broader issue.

The broader issue of universal acceptance of these domains. And I'll tell you that there remain problems with our old new (gTLD)'s. The ones that are more than 10 years old. There remain problems with them. I implore you -- as part of the (ISP) community. But I implore you just as someone who is part of your own community -- that when we make changes -- when we think about this -- what we do must work.

And the work that's going on for universal acceptance is you can think of it is the auto repair station for the first round of the new (gTLD) program. It's attempting to fix -- in retrospect -- the problems that we had with that first round. And I encourage you to give it the attention it deserves. Support Christian in his efforts for outreach. And I implore you that -- as this work comes in to work track four -- make sure that your constituencies not just comment on the work -- but are engaged in it. That would be the end of the speech.

Tony Holmes: Thank you Mark and Christian. How much time do we have left? Anybody?

Woman: ...half hour.

Tony Holmes: Okay, fine. So, we got a little bit more time. I think basically I would add something on a different note here. Here I'm putting forward a little experience I have as a new (gTLD) registry which is our last extension. When we consider all these things that Avri has flagged which – I think, are immensely important and appropriate – I don't see the question. I don't see an item --maybe I missed it – about how domains are sold. In other words, the selling mechanism -- currently enforced by ICANN – to offer domains to the public.

There we have something very simple. The registrars are the people who are entrusted with this. And I'm not sure they do a good job. I'm not questioning that. But the fact is that they have the exclusive rights to sell domains. But they don't have any exclusive – they don't have any obligations to take on new (gTLD)'s.

So, you have cases of a lot of strings that have come out. Some from developing areas. For example, which they're not interested in. They don't carry. When I say they, I'm talking about the people who really matter in sales. We have four registrars that have -- between them -- 54% of the market. They are very simply Go Daddy. And we have (INEM) and we have (TUCOWS) and then we have Network Solutions.

If these four registrars do not take on a new (gTLD) -- and put it in their Website to sell, basically – any new applicant who does not get on these sites is denied 54% of the market. And for developing regions, it's even worse. Because – in a developing region such as Latin America – you don't have registrars. You have resellers. What are resellers? Resellers are domain –

people who do domain hosting, particularly (ISP)'s or (telco)'s or whoever. And who do they resell for? They resell for the big four. It's again, it's Go Daddy, It's (TUCOWS), it's Network Solutions and (INEM).

So, if we're thinking of new windows -- or new opportunities -- for applicants to present -- to try and get a new (gTLD). Supposing a lot of them come from developing nations. Being able to sell -- in other words, to market -- these (TLD)'s for them is going to be a big problem. Because they most probably won't get on these big four. And they'll have to sort of work around smaller registries.

And with the additional -- let's say -- downside which is resellers, the main people who sell domains in developing nations. And resellers depend -- or let's say they hang from -- these four main registrars. They're storefronts only show the domains sold by these big four registrars.

So -- I think -- that's an important issue. Because we can get all this sorted out, all these issues. And get a really good platform for new -- let's say -- openings for applications. But if you're not going to take into consideration how these people are going to get to market afterwards -- and the problems they're going to encounter -- this can be a big problem for a lot of applicants. And if they're governments -- well, then you might have an even bigger problem.

So, I'll close on that note. I think there were people had questions for Avri. I'm sorry we postponed them for a few minutes. But -- if you remember what they were or anything that we said -- let's take questions and use the rest of the time for that. Thank you.

Christian Dawson: Tony, Christian, for the record. Just one point quick clarification. (INEM) was recently purchased by (Tu cows). So, that reinforces your message by saying that the big four are now the big three.

Avri Doria: Okay, did we want to back to the questions that people had parted we want to take Tony's suggestion and talk about suggestion by example of talking about issues?

But to answer your question, Tony, we're not doing anything about the distribution channels other than in the discussions of vertical integration. But in terms of dealing with the top three and changing that particular expression, no, we're not - at least at the moment, I mean, any issue is tractable.

Any issue that you discuss in one of your comments becomes one of the issues we've got to deal with. So if you were to send in a comment that said, hey, it's nice that you say it's got to be done by a registrar, but registrars aren't bound to take people's names and the top three don't.

Then, you know, we would answer it. Now, granted our group is mostly registries and registrars. There're very few non-contracted. There are some from CSG and a few from NCSG, but really, the group is mostly registries.

Man: Well, actually, as a constituency, we presented this comment to the board in the last ICANN meeting. Okay, as to whether - what type of questions, I mean, let's leave it open. Anybody has a question, whatever it is, let's just go for it.

Avri Doria: Okay, I see a bunch of hands but I - well, I'm not sure, so I think I'll just go around the table that way because I have no idea of order. So, Steve, he had already asked, but I saw your hand as the closest hand to me. So then we'll

just go to - you - and yes, your hand was - you are the first one that I didn't get to, so.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Avri. Steve DelBianco. I would ask you whether you believe that the group that's involved in resolving these questions, is there an appropriate urgency to want to be able to open the door for new gTLDs?

And is it balanced by an appropriate segment and wants to be cautious and get it right in so many ways? And do you think there's a healthy balance or an imbalance in that group right now?

I ask because, from an outside observer, that is a tremendously daunting list that you presented. It so daunting that, even people working with urgency might still see a three or four year interval before we open for new TLDs.

And I wouldn't want people to construe the people to construe that that's because of any deliberate foot dragging but it's with all due urgency, there's just a lot to get right. What's your assessment on that?

Avri Doria: Okay, there certainly is a balance between the people that say there's already a pent-up demand of tens of thousands waiting to get in and we need it now. And I didn't make up that number. Somebody else might of the number.

Versus the people that are saying, no, we've got to - now, remember at the moment that - and it's usually starting a discussion on the new gTLDs with the thing that any policy that we don't change, 2000 - from the previous round, stands.

Anything we don't change in the application guidebook stands. So we have a policy. We have a default policy and we have people both and ICANN operational, corporation, what have you that say, hey, this is our business, let's get on with it already.

And, you know, we have registrars that - registries that say there's pent-up demand and we have others that say, no, we've got to go through all these things. There is a balance.

You know, there's a constant push on us to get done but then again, there's a constant no, we've got to deal with all the issues and even though my co-chair is more from the contracted party side than that, we're both very well balanced in terms of not letting things move until it's time for things to move.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Avri. And so one small follow-up is, where is staff and management on this? ICANN has spent a lot of money to build a new gTLD machine with staff and they - I believe that there's a lot of anxiousness with them to get on with the next round. Is that factoring into your discussion?

Avri Doria: It's a presence. Is it factoring in? No, but you don't forget it. You don't - you know, they have accepted that it's not going to happen until '18 to '20. But, you know, does it take longer than that? Then - but there's constant - there's a constant little nudge. Now, having staff budget me as the chair of a PDP working group is probably a good thing.

Steve DelBianco: Nothing from top management to suggest we need to get moving...

Avri Doria: No one has come and twisted my arm.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you.

Avri Doria: And you'd probably had heard me squealing quite loudly had they done so. But, no. Okay, and the next I had - okay, who's the - I'm going in line now. So I see your flag. Okay, (Erica). Yes, I can read that far. So, (Erica), then - yes.

(Erica): I think there's a different way may be looking at it and maybe a more rational way, not saying you're not rational in the current approach, but when you look at the Internet as a whole and you look into the Internet economies, the way that it's evolving, the domain name is just one part of it.

And it's typically the slowest moving part of the whole Internet economy which means you have so many different business models evolving which comes from different angles.

In the domain name, which we want to be a major part, is quite slow. The question is what does this mean? And when you look ahead and 2018, 2020, could cost an additional problem for the domain name system as a whole which we might miss opportunities just because we want to get it right.

It's always good to get stuff right but there's something you have to weigh against what you might achieve to speed up the process. And I think what we underestimate is the work we might need to put into developing a domain name market.

We haven't done this much. We - I mean, we got out the new program, the last year (developed) a new one. But we haven't put really an effort, real effort in understanding what a domain name market is.

And I'm not just talking about the economic side but the side for the consumer as well because if you don't have - and if it's not well understood by consumers, consumers will not use it I may not buy it.

And it gives them different securities and different aspects if you have a domain name or if you don't have one. Now, I'm not arguing against one or another, but I think we need to put more effort into this, into understanding it.

We don't do this right now so my plea would be to add this. I don't know where you want to add it. I'm totally agnostic. But we need to do it because otherwise we miss an important topic and we focus again too much on processes but we missed the economic side and the consumer side.

Avri Doria: Thanks. Yes, I mean, there has been an ongoing discussion but it's been basically a push back between ICANN, you should build a market. Yes, that's up to you registries and registrars to build your market. That's not our job.

So whose job it is, is probably - it's also certainly not in the working group scope and I don't think that GNSO Council will put it there, but.

(Erica): No, I agree with you but we have to put it on the table and it has to be solved. And it's part of the application of ICANN, as well, to do it, but this would be my way of arguing. You can't just put it, you know, to certain operators and players and it's not true. So I would push back then, if we would have the argument.

Kathy Kleinman: Okay, Kathy Kleinman. Thanks for the extensive presentation. I've learned a lot in the session. So a statement and then two sets of questions. The statement is looking at one of your issues and one of the tracks and one of the things you mentioned, the three months that every three months - that there would be a

three-month period for applications in a three-month period for objections and a three-month period for applications and a three-month period for objections to me and some of the people I represent sounds absolutely daunting.

So the question would be, how one can submit comments on a specific issue, on a specific track and whether, you know, can you submit comments like that selectively? Let me stop there and I'll ask a different question in the next (round).

Avri Doria: First of all, at the moment, you can just participate in the drafting group. I mean, the quickest way to affect that one is for somebody to participate in the drafting group that's trying to develop that solution.

In terms of submitting comments, I think, yes, you just send email on the list as a participant in the group and when we put out the draft recommendations, then obviously there'll be comments.

But that's why we send out the questions, we invite people to participate, we invite them to join the drafting teams. And when it's time for comments, sure.

Kathy Kleinman: So is the drafting team one of these tracks? Is that what you're referring to question, to join all these...

Avri Doria: Well, that's - going back to my second slide, if someone can - yes, we had three open issues from the community comments one. And this basically is based upon - we came up with some first set of questions on those six overreaching - overarching - perhaps overreaching - but overarching issues.

I worry about my own Freudian slips. But I'll take that to my psychiatrist in the mirror. But anyway, so we put out the questions for community comment one. We got answers.

Most of the answers we were able to work through and come up with what our draft recommendation would be. On these three topics, there still a lot of open discussion and open angst.

And so we're putting together three drafting teams to take the comments we received, to talk, to think, to whatever, and produce a draft that then the group will look at and say, yes or no and then would become part of our draft recommendations, that would then be open to further comment.

You know, and then of course, participating on the list anytime about anything that's being discussed. And you had another question.

Kathy Kleinman: If you can - you touched on briefly. Could you talk about the general breakdown of these drafting teams and some teams between the contracted party health and non-contracted party health and just kind of the number of people that are making these very, very important policies? Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay, and it is something that I actually brought up at last night's meeting. There're a fair number of people in the groups but like in any of the groups, it's a thing that comes up each and every time.

There are three, four, five, six, seven people that participate a lot. There are people that are on every phone call but say nothing. There are, you know, anecdotally, I haven't done the counting because people aren't participating as members of a constituency or stakeholder group.

It's a regular, you know, GNSO working group. Anybody can participate. Your affiliation is not what matters. But if you look at the rules within the GNSO working group guidelines, we say that, if the chairs have a feeling that maybe our diversity, and by that I mean diversity of user registrant, registrar or registry, and perhaps geographical, is not a program, we have to raise an alarm.

At yesterday's meeting, I raised a pre-alarm, alarm that basically, folks, if we don't start getting it together and make sure that we have that, I may feel it necessary to raise this flag.

I haven't yet. I think we're still in it. Eh, it's hard to say for sure but just I don't feel it necessarily the diversity is fully there for that. And that's why I'm going around and being so pushy about getting more people to participate if you've got an opinion while I'm going around and torturing you all with long lists.

Because, you know, if - when the CC2 questions come out and you go, "How could these people say that," the answer is, participate. And I know everybody's overextended and me, probably as much as any, but hey, you know, what are we going to do?

Okay, and going around to the - is there a flag before - okay, did you want to say something, Tony?

Tony Holmes: No, I thought (Klaus) had put up his hand but I was just thinking...

Avri Doria: Oh, okay, and I don't see the remote folks as having indicating that they want to either because we are, you know, making sure that the two who couldn't

make it here, one, because of US law and one because of illness, have a chance to speak and contribute.

Man: How're we doing for time?

Avri Doria: We've got eleven minutes.

Man: Ten more minutes?

Avri Doria: Eleven. Don't cheat us.

Man: Somebody wanted to speak?

Avri Doria: Okay, going to the next flag, is there anybody before (Anna) that - because there had been a couple up but they went down. Okay, (Anna), please.

(Anna): This is (Anna) for the record. I have a question about what's being done because there were a lot of issues getting the data for the original sort of - or the new gTLDs.

And I know (Jonathan) has said something about this, but ICANN doesn't have a very good, sort of, data, you know, sort of - (or space), right, for analyzing and then showing these metrics.

And I think that that's something that is concerning to me if we're moving forward but we don't actually have a full understanding of what we're seeing, sort of happening with the new (G).

So I'm wondering, you know, how are you working with this sort of ongoing process of collecting the original metrics and how are you sort of moving

forward while still trying to collect the original metrics and create policy or ideas that are actually going to, you know, (function well)?

Avri Doria: We're not actually collecting a lot of metrics. We're counting on (Jonathan) and the CCT as the metrics. And now if, when that comes back, we see that there are holes and stuff for people in the group saying you need metrics on this that weren't collected, then it'll be incumbent on us to do it.

But at the moment, in terms of CCT type of metrics, which is really most of the metrics we would want, I think we're counting on - where totally dependent on (Jonathan)'s group. And it's only after that, that we would do any gap filling.

(Anna): Sorry, I have one more question, actually, about applicant support. Just because looking at previous applicants and also looking at registry service providers and sort of just the gaps between where they are, where they're based, there's a huge gap.

I mean, you're seeing the majority of registry operators are based in North America, right, period. If you're looking at registry service providers, the majority are in North America, period.

And I think that this is - there is not a diversity. And so I - and I know that the applicant support, there was a lack of people taking advantage of the applicant support. So I'm wondering if there's any (more stories) (unintelligible) saying early that are talking a little bit more about that.

Avri Doria: There's certainly an awareness of it. There's certainly talk about it but there aren't that many people that are pushing that (pain). So it's one of the places where I did take off my chair hats. I don't take it off very often.

But I do on applicant support because I was very involved in the applicant support group. And I considered, for whatever other failures there might've been in the previous round, I consider that the absolute biggest fail we had because there's no medication to that failure. There's no pointing and saying, yes, but.

It was just unmitigated failure. And so it's one of the places where, in fact, that's why I don't have the chair had on at all at the moment, but it's one of the places - but we do not have enough people there that are fighting that issue are talking about - you know, but when we look at the licensing of RSPs of, you know, registry service providers, the registry group has not made up their mind on whether they support that are not.

Because to some of the incumbents, perhaps, that's not such a great idea, letting all these other people just take a test and get measured and then be as good as any of them that have a history of providing good services, you know, whereas, you know, somebody just takes a test and you're going to say, yes, they are equal and you can just switch over to them.

And the whole notion, because a lot of people thought, with that sort of thing, you could start forming registry service providers and areas that weren't, you know, (WEOG), you know, the Western Europe and Other Group, but were, you know, from developing economies.

But at the moment, that's still an open discussion and one that people can contribute to. Mark , your flag is up. Are you going to call me old again?

Mark : If you like.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Mark McFadden: I'd be happy to meet any of your needs. I mean, if that's what...

Woman: Any of them?

Mark McFadden: No, not any of them, no, just for the record, that was - two things. First of all, something that was just touched on here, I completely agree with you in terms of regional diversity and, although I don't agree with you that it's the biggest fail in the program and love to debate that over a beer with you, I do think that is on the list, the top three.

I think the fact that you have people promised a program and the identifiers that they supposedly bought into don't work, I think that's the biggest fail. But while you argue that there is at least remediation for that, and there isn't remediation for the fact that globally we don't have a diverse ecosystem, I certainly agree with those thoughts.

If I could get whoever's in charge of the slides to move down to work stream four - we don't call it work stream four, do we?

Avri Doria: No, it's (unintelligible) because we don't want to...

Mark McFadden: Okay, we don't want to confuse people. Yes, so whoever might have...

Avri Doria: And that's (stream four) so that's the last one.

Mark McFadden: So maybe we could...

Avri Doria: Well, that (was nine).

Mark McFadden: I was about to say imagine it in your mind. So one of the things that I can has that I think it's actually really - a really good support feature is that we do have advisory committees that look at technical issues.

And while everyone thinks they're special, and I'm all well aware of that, I would have - I would hope that you're - (Jeff)'s group would take these five issues and specifically direct them to (SSAC) and to (RSAC) for particular advice because, as technical issues, though for instance, (SSAC) has already talked about two of the five or three of the five of these.

I think that in the context of how you're answering the issues, how you're identifying issues in an attempt to answer them and then make policy, right, I think it's incredibly appropriate to reach out specifically to those communities for this work track.

And I know that's treating a part of the organization sort of differently but security and stability and the operational ability to use these new strengths, seems to me to be essential.

Other things are essential as well, absolutely, but to make sure that, as someone said this morning, the plumbing still works, we really want to take advantage of the expertise that we've gathered together over time in those two committees.

My experience with those committees, and I've only been around ICANN since 2001, but my experience with those committees is that if you don't direct stuff to them, they don't generally come back with comments. And so that's why I make that suggestion.

Avri Doria: And part of the whole community commenting as we do direct the comment, the request to comment, to all the SOs and ACs. So then, that we talked about perhaps pushing it a little.

And while we're sitting at the bar, I will give you my view of (SSAC) and name collisions, not one that I want to put on tape at the moment or I'm recording at the moment. We have, like, four minutes left and wanted to get to Renalia.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Thank you, Avri. Renalia speaking. Just a comment - your working group is incredibly important and I know that a lot of people are interested, but eventually, in terms of the number of people that you've got, it's probably lower than you should have.

And the reason for that is a workload of the total system. When (Fadi) was around, he tried to sort of (inventorize) the workload of the community so that you can see what's on parallel processing.

And I think it's worthwhile to ask Goran to do something similar so that we have visibility of community workload, what's really important, and also to look at whether there is sufficient diversity and each group so that we know where the gaps are.

It helps. It doesn't sort of, like, create immediate solutions but it helps to move in that direction. That's one. And then on the universal acceptance topic, I had to believe in that. It's really important.

I do (advocacy) on that. But I think there is a missing link between those who are working on it, saying that this is the problem, and those who can solve it

and those who want to be agents are intermediaries to getting it to the problem solvers.

And the problem is those in the middle don't know what to do because there is no directive to say if you are user, this is what you can do to help. If you are CIO, this is what you can do to help.

On the supply side, it's clear, but on the advance side, less so. So I think there's attention needed on that. On the point that Mark said about (SSAC), I pay particular attention to the (SSAC) because I think they're a special bunch of people, and I had a chat with them during the last meeting in Hyderabad over this issue of ccNSO ID and ccTLD evaluation of strings with similarity.

And the problem that I understood was that the (SSAC) was falling behind on policy development. They couldn't attend to the problem in time. And that has to do with workflow management as well and somehow it needs to get coordinated. Just a comment. Thanks.

Avri Doria: I guess, I'll quickly answer and then I'll give Tony have the last word, is I would never ask Goran to do anything that (Fadi) did. I just wouldn't do it. I wouldn't go there. Right. And, you know, I haven't been one that buys into the workload problem. I really don't.

I think we (win a lot). And I know I'm insulting everybody in this room that says it's a workload problem when I say that. But I believe we get done what we want to get done.

We participate in what we want to participate in. And then we say we are too busy for the rest of it. And, yes, I too, believe that (SSAC) is special.

Tony Holmes: Okay, I think we've covered everything, Avri. I'll just make a quick comment on an offshoot of the new gTLD program which is a new cross-constituency working group on (unintelligible) proceeds, just to comment that I'm a little amazed at the amount of people participating.

Most of them I've never heard of and there is quite a level of enthusiasm about spending OPM - other people's money - so I think that group will probably be very successful and (unintelligible).

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you're much, Tony, and Avri, very much. That was a great session and I appreciate your managing the time so effectively. This is the last time you are all going to be here in this room together until 10:30 tomorrow morning.

From now on - don't get too excited - from now on, you've got four hours of SG and constituency breakouts that you all decided based on your own internal agendas.

What's going to happen now, number one, there are some nice break snacks and things outside - members of the CSG are relocating back to Room G. You'll have 70 minutes together to prep for your conversations with Goran, although would note that the 13 questions you shared with me, you're probably already quite prepared for that.

The NCSG will stay in this room. We're going to initiate the call with Goran at 4:00, so right at the top of the hour. I want to remind you of the reception tonight. It's at 7:00. It goes from 7:00 to 9:30.

We've designed it with heavy hors d'oeuvres so if you choose, you can make that your meal, or otherwise go out and enjoy the sites and sounds of night in Reykjavik. The location is going to be past the gift shop...

END