ICANN Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group
Monday, 30 January 2017 at 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group Meeting on the Monday, 30 January 2017 at 15:00 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/krHDAw
The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-30jan17-en.mp3

Coordinator: The recording has started.

Michelle DeSmyter :   Great. Thanks, Raymond, Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on the 30th of January, 2017 at 1500 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?

Shreema Sarka: Hello.

Michelle DeSmyter :   Yes. May I have your name? Are you only on the audio bridge?

Shreema Sarka: Yes, this is Shreema Sarka from India.

Michelle DeSmyter :   Okay. Thank you so much. We will note that. And as a reminder to all participants please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this you may begin.

Shreema Sarka: Sure.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And welcome to everybody. Thanks for joining the call. The first thing is the agenda review. Kavouss, you have your hand up, you want to speak before I do the agenda review or…

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I'm very sorry.

Avri Doria: …are you okay with waiting until I'm finished?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I see. I'm very sorry, you know that…

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: …please ask the people to speak slowly. We are not English-spoken persons. English is not our (unintelligible). The lady that spoke was just rushing. I don't know what was the reason for such a rush. Please slow. Let us follow. Let us understand. If you want to be included. If you don't want to be included (unintelligible). Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay. Okay, thank you very much. Thank you very much for that, that's a great way to start a meeting. Okay, hopefully I will be speaking slowly enough. Okay so in reviewing the agenda we have the welcome and the review agenda, which we're doing.

Then we have the note about SOIs, then we have the work team update, then overarching issues, and the community comment 1, the update and next steps, then we go to the community comment 2, which is upcoming and

discussion of it, and there's a document that has been posted in the agenda. And then there's any other business. At this point, is there anyone that has any other business that they'd like to put on the agenda?

Okay, hearing none at this point I'll ask the question again, just in case there's any emerging any other business. So in terms of SOIs, just want to remind everyone that they need to keep it updated. If their circumstances change they need to update the SOI and should alert the group. Is there anyone at this point who has either just recently updated their SOI or feels the need to update their SOI? I see no hands. I hear no voices. So assume everybody's SOI is fully up to date.

Okay so the next thing we go to is the work team update. I'll go through those in numerical order. It's perhaps unfair, perhaps someday I should start in reverse numerical order but I would have to warn those reporting first that I was going to do so. So who would like to take that one? Okay thank you, Sara. Sara, go ahead.

I don't hear you, I hear a little bit of music and it looks like you're talking but I do not hear you. If you're having problems perhaps I'll go to Work Team 2 and come back to you afterwards once you've had a chance to deal with whatever is making it difficult for you to speak. Is there someone from Work Team 2 that can do their update at the moment and who is able to speak? No one from Work Team 2 readers here? I see Phil and I see – oh yes, Michael, please go ahead.

Michael Flemming: Hello, Avri, can you hear me?

Avri Doria: Yes I can, thank you.

Michael Flemming: Can you hear me? It's Michael Flemming here. You're asking for Working – Track 2 correct?

Avri Doria: I can hear you so please.

Michael Flemming: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you. Could you say that again please? A little bit cut out.

Avri Doria: Yes, I can hear you. Please go ahead.

Michael Flemming: Thank you. So as far as the Working Track 2 is right now is right now we just finished the (unintelligible) protections as far as the COI and the critical functions goes. We're going to be looking at – this week we're going to try to touch upon the – the – what's the word – I can't think of the word all of a sudden, basically the terms and conditions when you apply for a new gTLD.

I'm sorry, the wording completely escapes me at the current time. But basically we're going to be looking at the big question of whether or not you have the right to sue ICANN, that's one of the things we'll be looking at this week at our Working Track 2 meeting.

We'll also be looking at some work – some registrant protections as far as the – sorry, the terms and conditions, that's the word, we'll be looking at the terms and conditions. We'll also be looking at registrant protections as far as the background information for applicants goes, the background check as well as looking at the CC2 questions that we're going to be hoping to jump into. I will be – I will try to send out a document or some questions that we might be looking to ask for to the CC2 probably tomorrow.

I've sent out a questionnaire kind of in regard to the registrant protections, a follow up to our last meeting. So far new responses in regards to that. But at the same time, if people have seen that feel free to please go ahead and start answering to that.

There's also – I'm sure a lot of people might be confused at the current time schedule for the Working Track 2 meeting coming up this week. We sent the

Doodle poll whether or not to keep it at the – at the 20 UTC or the 15 UTC – or to change it to 15 UTC. We will be keeping it at 20 UTC this week. We need to send out the results from that probably tomorrow or so. But we'll keep it in the 20 UTC and then we're going to try to look at changing it to 21 UTC for future meetings in the future.

So that's where we're at right now. And I look forward to seeing everyone this Friday – or sorry, this Thursday, Friday for me but look forward to seeing everyone here soon. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Are there any questions. Yes, Susan, I see your hand up.

Susan Payne: Yes, thanks. Just a quick request to Michael, would you be able to resend that document that you mentioned? I cannot find it. So I had an email saying you were going to send it and then I don't – I'd be really grateful if you could resend. That'd be good.

Michael Flemming: Susan, it's not a problem. Sorry about that. I've – last week was a busy week for all, like I say, I think a lot of us were at NamesCon and some other events that were being held elsewhere in the world. But I will make sure to send that tomorrow. I'll make a mental note of that now. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Any other comments or questions? Okay, if not I'll go back to you, Sara. Are you able to report at this point?

Sara Bockey: Hi, Avri. This is Sara, can you hear me?

Avri Doria: I can hear you fine. Yes, thank you. Please go ahead.

Sara Bockey: Okay great. This is Sara Bockey for the record. Yes, Work Track 1 will be meeting tomorrow, January 31, at 20 UTC. And we're planning on doing a recap of our outcomes from our January 10 call. We touched on application (unintelligible), application submission period and applications fees and

variable fees during that call. And we sent out a follow up email looking for some input from folks. So if you haven't had a chance to read that please do.

And then tomorrow after the recap we're going to start discussing systems and communications and then hopefully, if we have some additional time we'll touch on the CC2 questions that we're looking to submit. And so that's what we have scheduled for tomorrow. Does anyone have any questions?

Avri Doria: I see no hands. So thank you. Okay, so having done Work Team 1 and 2, I'll go to 3. And Karen or Robin, which of you would like to give the updates? Yes, Karen, please go ahead.

Karen Day: Hi, everyone. This is Karen Day for the record. For our Work Team 3, our next meeting will be on February the 7th. And at that time we are going to continue our work on objections specifically the legal rights objections. We have a strawman proposal that was circulated to the list some week ago (unintelligible) on the list, we will be going through that with all on the call.

The other thing, an introduction of a new topic, applicant (unintelligible) just to go over some of the background on that and get – start thinking about that while we wrap up the work on the objections. With regard to CC2, we circulated, again, some questions to the list a week ago. Not had any input or, excuse me, feedback on that. We wrapped that up here – that later this morning. But again, please provide any feedback you have, any comments on the list. That's it from Work Track 3 unless Robin (unintelligible) that I forgot.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Does anyone – okay Robin says, "Sounds good. Thanks." Yes, Susan, I see your hand. Please go ahead.

Susan Payne: Yes, a quick question. I'm afraid you were very quiet at my end. I don't know if other people had difficulty hearing you, Karen. But, would you mind just you

said after you talked about the strawman on the legal rights objection, what was is that you said you'd be dealing with after that on your next call?

Karen Day: Sorry about that. Can you hear me better now, Susan?

Susan Payne: Yes, thank you.

Karen Day: Okay. Yes, we will be introducing the topic of applicant freedom of expression.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Any other comments or questions? Okay, then I'll move on to Work Track 4 – or Work Team 4. And I guess it's Rubens who's going to do that one? Yes, I see your hand. Please go ahead, Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks, Avri. Rubens Kuhl for the record. We had our last Work Track 4 meeting at 19 January where we discussed CC2 questions. We have already established some questions, have evolved some questions during the call and that's now reflected in the overall CC2 documents. Since the work track established a goal of finishing Work Track 4 in consultation to questions by end of this month, which happens tomorrow, I strongly urge everyone who wants to add to Work Track 4 CC2 questions to do so commenting on the Google doc or sending an email over the list or sending email to the track leadership or whatever method you prefer.

                But the idea is not to freeze at the end of this month but we can only guarantee that your input will be considered if given today or tomorrow. And we will consider whatever the finishing of tomorrow is for whatever time zone you are in. So you don't have to make that specific time zone. But when it the month end for all time zones, that's when (unintelligible) goes over. But we might be able to accommodate later including the discussions with the full working group.

Our next call is – will happen February 9, let me see the – February 9 20 UTC. And our agenda for that meeting is mainly focused on discussing IDN, whether we allow IDN variants or not or whether we allow (unintelligible) IDN TLDs or not. So if IDN is your thing please come by. Thanks, Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Rubens. Any questions or comments? I see one comment from Kavouss and he says he prefers email. He has difficulties in reading Google docs. So I would actually like to ask that – I guess it's all in one file, so perhaps we can send a copy of that file out, a PDF, so that people can submit their comments to the email list so that they can be included if they are unable to access the Google doc. Though the Google doc is the (unintelligible) way for making comments, if it is at all possible for you to access the Google doc.

Okay, and I see your hand is still up, Rubens, is that from before? Okay, I hear no response. I'll assume the hand is from before but please speak up if it isn't. so we've got through all of the work teams and now move onto the overarching issues Community Comment 1, the update and next steps.

I'm wondering, Steve, if I could start with you on just getting an update of how you see that document and what you see its state as and then we can go from there.

Steve Chan: Hi, Avri. Thanks. This is Steve Chan from staff. And, sure, I can provide a brief update on that subject. So as everyone is probably aware, we've been able to make our way as a working group through all of the comments received in relation to Community Comment 1. And so the outcome of those discussions was a decision to establish, I believe, three drafting teams in relation to a few open items.

And so that's pretty much where we're at and also sort of leads into next steps. So what we'd like to do, and likely after this call if there's no objections,

is to send around a handful of informal call for volunteers, which would, you know, write to working group members.

So the drafting teams would be in relation to different TLD types so that'd be one of them. The second would be in relation to predictability and community input, so it'd be a framework related to those items. And the last one would be in relation to the mechanism for accepting applications. And I'm referring to rounds or another mechanism.

So the idea is that if there are no objections on this call staff and the leadership will agree on some language related to those informal call for volunteers I mentioned and we'll circulate those after the call. I'm not sure if Jeff also had any comments on this or Avri, if you wanted to just take it back. But that's the update. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Jeff, did you want to add anything? If not, what I'll add to it is please volunteer. We have six people who are fairly well deep into leading the work tracks and having a fair amount of difficulty getting sufficient participation at times. So I'd really hope that others who have not been so active in the work tracks will jump in and work on these and volunteer for the teams going forward so that we can get that work done.

Any comments or questions on those? So this work will go on in parallel with the work tracks that's being done. And, you know, basically hopefully we can get a draft of the CC1 with the outcome of those in the near future. The way I would see this going is the groups will work separately, they can do it online, they can schedule calls, they can, you know, on email. But then once they get to a draft, bring it to one of the meetings of the whole group so that we can discuss it and then figure out how we move on with it.

So if there are no questions on that, and I see none, we can move on to the next item on the agenda, which is the CC2 discussion. And there is a draft

document in Google. And hopefully someone can send out a PDF of it. I can certainly do so if no one else can.

And so basically what we probably need to do now is take a quick look at where we are in that document. So we start with each of the teams has a set of questions in here. And you can start seeing the first. And, yes, Jeff, please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. Yes, I think you started at the right place, which is Section 2. I was going to tell people to kind of ignore – the intro language at this point because that's – a lot of that is the last CC1 that we sent out so we haven't really been working on that intro language. So just you started at the right place which is the questions and then there are some other materials in the appendix.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. Do you want to walk through this or should I walk through this? We probably should walk through the questions that we've got there now and either I can do it or you can do it.

Jeff Neuman: I'll start and then…

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: …turn it over and then just – yes, and then we could just any specific questions we could just refer to some of the work – or work group leaders that are here.

Okay, so does everyone have the ability to – does everybody have the ability to scroll themselves? Yes, good. Okay, I'm going to actually be looking…

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Great. I'm going to look at the Google version so, Avri, if there are any questions or if you could just like interrupt me and let me know that there's people on the chat?

Avri Doria: Certainly.

Jeff Neuman: So – thank you. As you can see there's, you know, this is still very preliminary. And our goal is to get the questions finalized in the next couple weeks so that we can send this out by mid to late February and get responses back, you know, we'll do the normal – I believe it's now 40-day public comment period or whatever the normal time period is now. It used to be 42 days but then I got lost after that so I'm not sure exactly how many days it is.

                 But the plan is to put it out for the standard comment period. And also to solicit input from not – I mean, all of the constituencies, stakeholder groups, advisory committees, supporting organizations, etcetera, basically anyone that wants to respond.

                 And as you can see, the questions are more detailed than they were for – or at least the topics are more detailed than they were for CC1. So each of the work teams has been discussing individual areas and have come up with a set of either topics or questions that they'd like to ask about.

                 The – you see Work Track 1 has got some questions on applicant support, application fees, variable fees, application queuing, application submission period. And hopefully after the next call they may have one or two questions on systems and communication.

                 The – I think – sorry, just going back to kind of general. I think the way that we are going to put this out is by – you could comment specifically by work team's questions. So we'll have them each in different comment areas. So, you know, kind of almost like the – if you remember the way the Guidebook

comments were received, it was by module. And here I think it might be best if we can get comments in by work team numbers where the questions are. This way we won't have such large document back.

So the – the questions are not the final wording at all. They are just brainstormed questions. So if, Jon, I see so one of the questions is a little leading, if we can – if you want to take and do some edits on Google docs, that's great. There's no pride in authorship here meaning that none of us really will get bothered by anything just the wording, if you think it's leading. As long as we can maintain the thrust – the crux of the question I think that's the important part.

And if you have additional questions that you want to add, I believe everyone has a suggestion, the ability to make suggestions in there so that we – the work track leaders and the leadership will see those. And then discuss those with the individual work track team as well as ultimately we would love to have the entire group – the working group sign off on all of the questions that are being asked.

So right now you'll see some questions from…

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Yes, please. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay yes, you have two comments here. We have a Kavouss comment that says may we take it – I assume that's paragraph by paragraph – please. I'm not quite sure I understood the abbreviation, "pra" and – "by pra" but I believe it's by paragraph. And the Jon Nevett also wrote, "The application fee question seems to be pretty leading," in his opinion. So thanks. And Kavouss does have his hand up.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, Avri, thank you very much. Paragraph by paragraph is more straightforward because we cannot jump from one to the other, from Paragraph 1 introduction I have no comment. On Paragraph 2 you say it is allowed, I may have some comment, so but it depends you agree to the paragraph by paragraph or not, that is my suggestion. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Well we'll certainly going through it the list of questions but we've decided that at this point those first paragraphs there are basically just placeholders and they haven't been worked on yet. What we're focusing on is where we start the questions and not actually talking about the front material yet. So that wasn't what we were going to discuss. So we've jumped over those paragraphs directly to the table where we're in the Work Track 1. So that – okay, I'll pass it back over to you, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Avri. Sorry, took me a second to get off mute. Yes, so on the – I was just going over kind of the overall format of the document and then how we'll receive comments. If we do want to go back and look at some of the questions that came up from Work Track 1 we can do that. If we just want to brainstorm some additional topics we can do that.

So for Work Track 1, I'll go back and even though accreditation programs is listed there, there's another group that was being formed by ICANN to discuss accreditation issues. So it's blank at the moment depending on that what that goal is constituted to do. And what gaps there'll be for us to fill in. So I don't anticipate any questions on – sorry, on accreditation programs. But to the extent that there are gaps we may decide to ask a few questions there.

On applicant support, we basically have a question there about two different suggestions that were made to the group. One is broadening support for IDNs or other criteria; and the second is focusing applicant support on the middle applicant defined as developed but struggling regions as opposed to underserved or underdeveloped region. And so there's just a general

question on whether there's value in those suggestions or if there are other areas in which the applicant support programs could extend.

I guess I'll just stop there. Kavouss has – is your hand up or…

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, hand up for the…

Avri Doria: It is a new hand from Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: No, yes, is a new hand on just application support – sorry, applicant support. Whenever we ask the question saying that, for instance, broadening support to IDNs or other if – I think we should add here a standard word if yes, and we should add the reasons. Because just somebody saying, yes, you have to broaden without any reasons, would be difficult – sorry, we would have difficulty to understand. So if somebody performs some diversions or some departure from what is today so give the reason.

So I would suggest then we say broadening support to IDN or other criteria and then we add comma or whatever you want to add if yes, please give the reason and describe. So that should help us to follow up because as far as GAC is concerned, for instance, if we want to send it to the SO/AC I would like to propose the GAC to discuss it in the Copenhagen meeting or between now and Copenhagen to comment. So we need to ask this question, if yes provide the reasons and describe how and why. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Kavouss. Back to you, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Yes, thank you. That's helpful, Kavouss. And we will – we will rewrite those questions to make it a little bit more clear and then to specify if yes, add more detail. Were there any other questions that – sorry, Kavouss, you have a new hand?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, Jeff, I am sorry. Please beg me your pardon that why we say that concentrating on the middle applicant versus the underserved? Why we make such selection? I know you want to go to the middle, not high, not low, but why it is this? It give the things that you have decided to forget the underserved or other underdeveloped countries and so on, so forth. Why we make such a selection? Why we want to put on the middle?

Do you think that there would be no problems in the underserved or underdeveloped countries, that we ask this question, Jeff, I want to have the reason. I'm not opposing that, it gives some impression that underdeveloped or underserved countries would not be very happy because we have in the GAC many sessions about this and ICANN also devotes some session about underserved or underdeveloped countries or non-developed countries. So why we take this middle as one of the options? Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Kavouss. If you don't mind, I am going to see if one of the work team leaders, Sara, I think you might be the only one on here. Sara, can you answer that question?

Sara Bockey: Yes, can you ask the question again please?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, so Kavouss asked about the second part of – on the applicant support talking about the middle applicant and he just wanted to know what that suggestion means as far as the middle and how that came about so that we can discuss that in Copenhagen because I'm sure that Kavouss and others will be asked about that.

Sara Bockey: Sure, yes. This is Sara Bockey for the record. So the middle applicant idea came up during the ICANN meeting in Hyderabad and Krista and I attended an APAC session. And that is where this idea was brought up. And a middle applicant, as I show there, I gave the definition of what they proposed as the middle applicant during that session is developed but struggling regions instead of just underserved or underdeveloped.

And it's just the way I think of expanding the program. It was – it came out of APAC. I'm having a brain fart right now, I can't think of anything else regarding it. But that basically was the context of it, just looking to expand the program to maybe encompass some others who were struggling but didn't necessarily qualify as underserved.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I see Kavouss put a question in, "What is the criteria to decide or identify who is a middle applicant?"

Sara Bockey: Hi, Kavouss. This is Sara. That was not discussed. It was very – at a very high level item that was touched upon. And so nothing regarding criteria identifying who that would be has been discussed. It is just a very broad, up-in-the-air idea at this point with no specifics.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Kavouss, I see your hand is up again.

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I understand. Thank you very much. Either we put some note or we put it in the inverted comma, that yet to be defined. But I think I suggest a small amendment. When we say focusing on the middle applicant we should have something while still responding or duly responding to the underserved and underdeveloped countries to remove the impression that they are not forgotten…

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, although focus is a clear word that (unintelligible) but still is better to clear mention that while still the applicants from the undeserved or underserved or underdeveloped would be duly considered. Just try to slightly amend to remove that difficulty if possible. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Kavouss.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay, Jeff I see – oh, Steve, please, I see your hand. I see Steve's hand, sorry.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Avri. No problem. This is Steve from staff.

Avri Doria: Go ahead, Steve.

Steve Chan: And so I was actually at that session with Sara so I'll see if I can jog my memory as well. And so I actually raised my hand initially to make a sort of similar point to what Kavouss just mentioned. And so this idea of a middle applicant was not to exclude support for underserved or underdeveloped regions, but it also to perhaps supplement the program with – for this concept of a middle applicant.

So the – I believe the idea was that part of the issues – or challenges that those from underserved or underdeveloped regions are facing is it's not just financial but it can also be related to infrastructure in the region. So perhaps there isn't a registrar system set up or a network of registrars, maybe the connectivity is bad or whatever the reason may be there's infrastructural problems that they may see and then there's also just business choices, maybe it doesn't make sense in an underserved or underdeveloped region to be undertaking the establishment of a registry.

So I believe, if I'm recollecting this correctly, that so in addition to supporting underserved or underdeveloped it should be expanded to also perhaps look at this concept of a middle applicant. I don't know I remember that exactly correctly, I'm sure Sara will be happy to tell me if I got that wrong. But just wanted to try and provide a little or additional context. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you, Steve. I see no other hands so back to you, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thank you, Avri. And thanks, Steve. What we can do, I think as well is provide some context for that question as Kavouss has suggested perhaps even say, you know, where the suggestion came and so we can give a little background because I think Kavouss's question will be shared amongst a number of other people that want to respond. I see Kavouss has a new hand up so, Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Excuse me, are you on the application fee?

Jeff Neuman: Was just about to get there.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yes.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, if you're on application fees, I have worked for many years on the cost recovery for other areas. I don't think that we could establish a ceiling for cost recovery even saying that – could be limit because that would be totally arbitrary. The meaning of the cost recovery which is different from the revenue or income is that we just ask for something to cover the costs. So I think if you want to change the existing $180K one could say that based on the analysis made to justify we need more than or less than or different value for $180K.

                 I don't think we could establish any arbitrary ceiling. It would not be good and it would be criticized that where this ceiling come from because is no longer would be cost recovery, it would be revenue. So could you kindly consider the situation and try to remedy the matter in a way that the - this (unintelligible) will be taken that if you is not looking for a revenue or not an arbitrarily limit on the cost (unintelligible). But you could say that, based on the examination

or analysis that is getting done or are getting done to see where the least value could be, multiplied higher or lower.

You should try to qualify that otherwise I have some difficulty to argue that in my current situation I'll consider (unintelligible) that the arbitrary (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Kavouss.

I don't see anything in the current question asking about a ceiling. I do see a question about a floor or a minimum meaning that, let's say after the cost analysis it comes out that really it only cost $5000 to review what's required.

The question I think is asking, you know, should there be some floor or minimum that is above a actual cost in order to - well it's wrong to say (unintelligible) allow it, but to basically ensure that the costs are high enough to discourage squatting on domains, on top of what remains, or but use of those remains for an improper purpose.

I do take your point on the ceiling. I see that you have your hand raised again. So, Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. It is (unintelligible) minimum or maximum at the ceiling. But even minimum - if the minimum is not based on the cost recovery analysis that (unintelligible) how you (unintelligible) the minimum?

You could say one on the 1000 minimum. But the cost is $140,000. Where this $40,000 come from - should come from? So I don't think that we could establish minimum or maximum. Everything (unintelligible) on the result of the first (unintelligible) to see that. There won't be this (unintelligible) plus, minus, and it could have some plus, minus 8% and it's been decided by the (unintelligible) given (unintelligible).

So I don't think - I (unintelligible) minimum (unintelligible) maximum without analyzing the cost recovery concepts. That's really based on the analysis and cost (unintelligible) and effective. So we cannot have neither minimum, nor maximum. Thank you.

I'm sorry. I apologize for coming in again, but (unintelligible) very (unintelligible). Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Kavouss.

And I think certainly that would (unintelligible) into an answer. Do you have any comments on the question itself as to - I think what we're trying to focus on now is the wait after question or additional questions asked as opposed to answering it now. Because we'll have plenty of time after the commentary to begin to answer the questions.

So I'm going to go back to a comment that (John) has raised on the list which is that he thought the question was too leading.

(John), can you - I don't know if you can put it straight on this call or speak, but if you could come up with ways to make it less leading and more effective we would certainly welcome that.

And I'm looking at the chat, I'm typing. (Unintelligible) the given. Okay?

So basically without the context. So just say, you know, well we could ask first is, you know, "Do we still believe that the fees should be based on cost recovery?", is one question. "If there is a surplus? How long should that surplus be used?", is a good question. A third question might be, "The cost for this past round was $185,000. Is that - or was that reasonable?" And, Even if we use a cost recovery basis should there be some floor or minimum threshold we should establish to prevent squatting on top (unintelligible) domains?", or something like that.

I think (Tom) said he's happy to do it offline. So that's good. I just gave a couple examples of ways we could make that a little more effective.

On the variable fees -- jumping to the next question -- this is basically asking should (unintelligible) the application be the variable based on - essentially based on the type of application.

And so this was an idea that came up to maybe say, "Well some applications might not require as much review as others and therefore should we have some set of fees that distinguish between those types of applications."

And what we came out with on those discussions basically were - was, "No." We felt that, "Well at least they're working with discussions and leaning towards the ocean of a one fee fits all." So it's asking about whether there's support for that.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Avri, please. Avri (unintelligible)?

Avri Doria: Yes. This is Avri. There seem to be a couple of questions in the chat (unintelligible) should there be some sort of periodical review of cost recovery value? (Unintelligible) had a comment, (Jeff), maybe we could ask a question (unintelligible) of incoming applications. And then Rubens wrote, "I think the recurring fee is more of a deterrent to squatting than application fees move into seven digits."

Let's not tempt people. Okay. Yes. I have - you have your hand up, please.

Man 2: Yes. Yes, Avri. Thank you. This (unintelligible) for the record. Thanks for giving me an opportunity to address the group.

Now I think - my two cents on this point would be that the concept of middle applicant, our concept of (unintelligible) has to be kept in mind in this.

Clearly stating that if it is one fee fits for all we have to now go back to Kavouss' point and find and just a minute back saying, "What is the calculation for cost recovery?"

And then when you bring this up here each and every item is actually interconnected with each other. So the fee would be connected to the entire business model of the registry that is applying for the (unintelligible).

The - and that fee in turn has to be dependent on - and it's a reason also trying to find (unintelligible) in the entire process. There would be customers in those regions and the developing (unintelligible) there isn't that much money.

And so on and so forth. So I think this needs to be grilled down a little more. Further on discussion would need to have more clarity on this one fee fits all. Thank you.

Man: Thanks (unintelligible) I think those - I think…

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Man: …the comments are…

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Man: …to (Jeff).

Avri Doria: At what comment?

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, Avri, go on. I think…

Avri Doria: That a reminder that a…

Man: Sorry Avri, go on.

Avri Doria: Yes. We're having some breaking problems. I apologize. I don't' know if I'm responsible for it.

                       A reminder that a portion of the 185,000 is allocated to the risk fund. Whatever the method to be used in the future should consider how the risk fund should be accounted for. I guess - and this is - on addition for me would - on knowing how is actually fitting in a risk fund at the moment, because I'm not sure that we would need to build a whole new risk fund for each application window. So there's probably a lot in that calculation.

                       And (Ruben) said, "It's seems that part of the (unintelligible) are connected to others with (unintelligible)." Oh okay. That's a comment on the thing. But possibly the (AT) to (Foundridge) link.

                       So yes we are having some technical problems and it may be that.

                       Okay. Jeff, I'll pass it back to you now. Apology for the interruption.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, Avri. I think there is a little bit of a delay between when I'm speaking and when you hear it. I'm not sure why that is, but hopefully we can get that fixed for the next call.

But I think these are all great questions and we're taking note of these in the comment section or the note section on the side so that we can then add them to this list.

And I do agree with the point that a lot of questions are inter-related where the fees might be and then on some of the other questions that we ask. And I think those are great points to make in a response to these questions when they are asked.

If we jump ahead to application cueing, this was a topic I think that was discussed on the last track one call. It talks about - there seem to have been support for the lottery system instead of the - a first come first serve for a number of different reasons. That was talked about on that call.

If rounds are not used though and the methods were just accepting applications then, you know, how is that (unintelligible) work with a lottery system or would it have to be a first come first serve in that type of situation.

There was also a suggestion in the (unintelligible) submission on communities that went into a discussion of whether we should have a period to apply for a string and then another period for others to apply for the same string. I think given that input we might want to ask a question about that particular method of filling applications.

Let's try and look at the chat.

Avri Doria: A couple comments. I can read them.

There's (Alexander Dotgay) who said, "Please also factor in abuse.", in quotes. Whoops I just lost it.

"Portfolio applicants will simply form shell companies in developing countries to save fee." The fees more like an answer to a question than a question.

And (Converse) wrote, "There's more than one cost recovery model as well as more than one method on how to calculate cost recovery fees." And that also points to possible answer space.

(Alexander) again offered another. "(Unintelligible) built in by random number of signs during application."

Fee (unintelligible) channeling (unintelligible) legal. "I would suggest using a different word than lottery."

And then (Jeff) answers, "How about sweepstakes?"

And then (Vot Hovs) says, "Shell companies need to go through (unintelligible) process of the applicant. That is already part of the process."

Gee I just keep reading. (Steve) said, "As long as it's not a lottery and is able to legally to be supported by ICANN." Sure.

(Ruben), (Alexander), "That can be dealt with by dealing registration restrictions that larger operates wouldn't like. If applicant's support requires not (unintelligible) countries that 12 registration (unintelligible) as for communities (unintelligible). No commercial interest doing so."

These are all good possible answers to these questions, but the - I'm not sure how they actually affect the question. And having finished my reading I'll hand it back to (Jeff).

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Avri. And the fact that there's so many comments means that they're good questions to ask. And so we'll certainly appreciate these answers coming back.

And before we close, because I know we only have a couple - we have a couple of minutes or are we scheduled for minutes? Can someone remind me?

Ninety? Okay. Good. Never mind then.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) I believe.

Jeff Neuman: Great. So then the next question relates to the application submission period and it's just talking about the period by - for which when the - at least for when it was around, when around was when the application was made available and applicants could start entering information into the system. That was a 90-day period in the last round. Although it actually got extended for reasons of a glitch. But technically it was supposed to be 90 days.

And so the questions here focus on, "Is that the proper amount of time? Is a fixed period of time for accepting applications even the right approach? Would this have implications on applicant support? And if we have a few next rounds followed by continuous application periods how should the application submission period be handled?"

So these are all good questions.

(Unintelligible) you have your hand up?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. I have a hand up. The first is a suggestion if you (unintelligible). I suggest that we swap application (unintelligible) and application submission period, because the (unintelligible) the application submission period and then go to the application (unintelligible).

And if that is accepted then I have a second proposal. If it is not accepted still I have second proposal on application submission period. You have to be very clear to talk about three possibilities.

One possibility of (unintelligible) the other possibility is first come first serve, and the third possibility would be a combination of both that we propose here.

So I think we should be (unintelligible) open. We will need to (unintelligible) rounds (unintelligible) rounds, subsequent (unintelligible) first come first serve and (unintelligible) would be a combination of some, having some round and then going to the first come first serve. So this one be more logical.

Whether we apply the sloping or not, but the (unintelligible) this is valid, my suggestion is valid for conservation by colleagues in the application submission period which is quite clear of the three distinct options. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Kavouss. I think that's a good - or all of those are good suggestions.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: I don't see an issue with revising the order of those - of these topics. Perhaps we'll take all of those questions for when we have the - all of the questions finalized. Then we can decide on the best order.

But I think (unintelligible) your point. And to make sure that we keep it in mind for when we do have the final order - (Donny) has a comment saying that the application submission period may want to include questions about advertising the submission period.

(Donny) just dropped a topic on potentially the communication period I think, which was in the last round. I think there was a -- I don't know -- was it a six month communication period? It was a long period of time where the - where ICANN was - which ICANN had to wait until the end of before opening up the (unintelligible) opening up the round.

So I think that's a whole series of discussions. I'm not sure if that (unintelligible) I might put (Sher) on the spot here, but that may be a topic that's within communications. Although maybe not. That might refer to other types of communications.

But we will go back and think about some questions we can ask on the communication period as well and to see whether that is - or how the - plays in with rounds versus a different type of procedure like a first come first serve process, how that would pan.

(Alexander) has a comment on there that says, "Portfolio applicants can turn out applications within 24 hours. But if we want meaningful applications, five - - for example -- (unintelligible) or communities they need five put together for - that's just policies."

And, (Alexander), thanks for that point. That's again something that should come back in a form of a response, these questions, but I take your point and certainly look forward to getting that (unintelligible) back when the questions are asked.

So that said those are so far the questions we have and half of the entire work track one. And I'm sure some questions will come out of this week's conversations on system's communications and then applicant guide for (unintelligible) I think really refers to whether the proper way to issue this kind of request for proposals is through the form of applicant guide book that we use.

Whether - or whether we need to create different versions of an applicant I think depending on where you fit in to the ecosystem. So in other words if you are a back-end registry operator would you get some sort of event version of the guide book or, you know, those are questions that came out in the original discussion group on that.

So are we ready to move on to work track two?

Avri Doria:		Kavouss just raised his hand.

Kavouss Arasteh:	Yes. Below this application submission period there are a series of numerical order (unintelligible). What are those? Are they the section of something (unintelligible) of the report? What does it mean (unintelligible)? I - should you have some title?

Avri Doria:		They're…

Kavouss Arasteh:	(Unintelligible)...

Avri Doria:		…they refer…

Kavouss Arasteh:	...(unintelligible). Yes. (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria:		(Unintelligible) work tracks. The numbers in that left-hand column refer to the different work tracks.

Kavouss Arasteh:	But is not (unintelligible). Maybe (unintelligible) we should indicate what is said, because (unintelligible) then I…

Avri Doria:		Okay.

Kavouss Arasteh:	…I saw (unintelligible).

Avri Doria:		Okay. Certainly we will have to put a - it says in the top column at the header of the column. It does say Work Track and then Subject. But we can certainly make it plainer for the reader that that doesn't catch that (unintelligible) from the header.

So certainly taking note that, you know, the number there refers to the work track and perhaps make it more explanatory than just using a header at the top of the first (unintelligible), perhaps repeat the header on each page (unintelligible) you reproduce it. But thank you very much for that comment.

Okay. Back to you, (Jeff).

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Avri.

So she said work track two has some subjects listed, not - no questions yet. They relate to the legal regulatory and contractual requirements.

Those questions should come out of this week's conversations. But just so you could see the topics those are listed in - under number two. So there'll be questions on the registry agreement.

Checking of RPMs is listed there. We don't envision any questions on that, because that's really the subject of this point for the (unintelligible) (VP) that's going on with the exception of a couple of different (unintelligible) thoughts or seeds that were reserved for us like the restrictions dispute, resolution policy, and a couple of others. I'm not sure we'll have any questions on that.

(Unintelligible) means I know that (unintelligible) out of - coming out of there. Other discussions that go (unintelligible) and the second level.

(Unintelligible) protections. That's the - what we - talking about last week or (unintelligible) the last call which was on (COI) and background checks and some other protections in there.

So without going through the full list these are just the topics and work track two is now working on coming up with specific questions to ask.

So we're going to jump onto the work track three unless anyone's got any general comments.

Okay. For work track three I'm going to point everyone to page six I think it is or page seven. Where - it's in the appendix. I'm looking at page six.

So these are some of the questions that have come up from work track three so far.

Kavouss Arasteh: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Kavouss, yes. You have your hand raised.

Kavouss Arasteh: I have one if you might be - I think after the index I would suggest another (unintelligible) saying that all the (unintelligible) other non (unintelligible) come out of (unintelligible). You have some (unintelligible) where it is one page. You have two (unintelligible) the other page.

At the end of that I would suggest for your consolation to add and other (unintelligible) things that the other (unintelligible) other (unintelligible) or non (unintelligible) issues if any. Just leave it open to the people if they have a suggestion. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So we would put in some - yes, a placeholder for those, explain that those are being addressed in other (unintelligible) any (unintelligible) comments. I think your suggestion that they - there's an opening for people to put in some general (unintelligible).

Is that your suggestion?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. (Unintelligible) and (unintelligible) I think (unintelligible) period for the times (unintelligible). I suggest that the tab line (unintelligible) it's possible, because it should not (unintelligible) a possibility (unintelligible) your

comment and input to (unintelligible) preferably a date, but not later than another date.

So you have two dates. One is a preference, whatever date you agree or that you suggested. And the other one is (unintelligible) because it should not (unintelligible) open to other. If you're saying it's possible (unintelligible) it is not possible then. They did not get any of the (unintelligible).

So this is quite - more (unintelligible). So saying that by some date preferably, but not later than another date of an obligation and when that is. So we need to get a reply. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Kavouss. We will take…

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: I'm sorry, Avri. You go on.

Avri Doria: Yes. No. I was thanking Kavouss. And I just wanted to point out that the work track three stuff is on page seven, not six for anybody that was looking for it. But back to you. Sorry.

Jeff Neuman: Oh that's okay. Thanks. So again this is Jeff Neuman.

So so far work track three -- that's the group headed by (Karen Day) and Robin Gross -- have come up with these six questions. There'll likely be additional ones after the discussions next week. But these are the ones so far.

So the first one is a question that came up, and we'll probably have to (unintelligible) hold more context for the question. But these questions

(unintelligible) came up on one of the discussions which is, "Parties had attempted, or there was at least a difference to parties (unintelligible) protection procedures. So we're asking whether there was any evidence that they're aware of that party -- that a party or a party (unintelligible) and to be specific.

There was a question - and, Kavouss, I'll get to you in a minute after I go through these. There is a question - actually after the second question I'll come back to you - whether the responder believes that the use of an independent objector is warranted in future rounds. If not why not? If that's (unintelligible) you believe. That (unintelligible) for the independent objector. Would you prefer of any restrictions or modifications be placed on the IO for future rounds.

Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. I have just one question. Sorry for misunderstanding (unintelligible). What do you mean by (unintelligible) for something? What is (unintelligible) please?

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, Kavouss. That's a good question and something that I guess different people will define differently.

I think from the hone of the discussions I think what people were talking about on the call was using the objection period is a way, the easy progress of an application or multiple applications for the, you know, when there was no reasonable basis to file such an objection. And so there were people that claimed that objection - filing a objection was a good way to delay that application while parties could either negotiate a private agreement or prevent introduction of that (unintelligible) into the marketplace.

So those were the examples that were used in the discussion. But I'm sure other people may have other definitions of (unintelligible) so potentially providing some context could help.

Kavouss Arasteh: If you just extend that to (unintelligible) make it more explanatory would be very good for the people like me that did not understand what the (unintelligible) is.

And then -- not to asking for the floor again -- but all questions that you have -- all of them are good questions -- then you ask the question and maybe should add after that if yes, please (unintelligible) or why and (unintelligible). So if (unintelligible) not only (unintelligible) yes. Because sometimes you ask a question (unintelligible) that should be changed, if it is a yes they could (unintelligible) why. Why (unintelligible) and how is it (unintelligible)? So (unintelligible) the people will reply. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Kavouss. I think that's a good suggestion. I think we - we'll take that (unintelligible) for each of the questions going forward as well. So we've made note of that.

Question number three. "Do you believe that parties should (unintelligible) dispute, should be able to choose between one and three member panels and should the cost of those sections reflect that choice?"

Context for that question is that some are the types of disputes there was a choice between whether to have one panelist or three panelist. And there was some discussion that where there were three panelist the party felt much more comfortable with the outcomes since, you know, it wasn't just a feeling of one person. But then there was a discussion on how much that would increase the cost of the protection. So this question really reflects on those discussions.

And (unintelligible) I think is what we've done to improve consistency in (unintelligible) facility with regard to - well this question asks about string similarity in future rounds.

I think that question might be extendable to all of the different types of objections (unintelligible) the (unintelligible) similarity review where - I'm sorry - string similarity (unintelligible) where (unintelligible) came out on one side and other cases -- even with the exact same facts or very similar facts came out on the other side. And so this is a question of what do we do to have more consistency and predictability.

And we saw that ICANN addressed two of these situations by doing a - its own review, but there is certainly examples that were left out.

And I think there was a third where -- if I'm correct -- (Dawn) I think (unintelligible) was involved in a (unintelligible) where ICANN agreed to take on a third one or is that still ongoing?

I know that, you know, there were otter decisions that were not for other, you know, other decisions that were made where - which were just inconsistent and not necessarily another review.

The - this question is given the general understanding that community priority evaluation does not provide consistent (unintelligible) in the 2012 rounds. (Unintelligible) needs for community priority and subsequent procedures.

This is a leading question of this channel on (unintelligible) I said I had questions that start with a given, it's pretty leading, so we'll try to make this question more objective. But ask about whether community priority should still play a role in subsequent procedures, subsequent rounds, whatever, however we decide to move forward.

And then finally (unintelligible) community simply be an additional category. That would be in shrink and tension sets on equal footing as a brand or open generic application.

So if Karen or (Robin), can you provide a little more context on number six? Sorry to put you on the spot.

And while Karen and (Robin) are getting ready I'll ask Kavouss to ask his question.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. A question maybe is relevant. But I think in all this process why we have not mentioned anything about auction. Whether auction is a proper or is not proper and so (unintelligible) where it has (unintelligible). Maybe I was not as unique (unintelligible) why it is not part of this (unintelligible) is a very good question. Often you (unintelligible) about auctions. How (unintelligible)?

Man 1: So those (unintelligible)…

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Man 1: …that is in work track three. Although they have not yet gotten to talk about that issue. But probably is - it was not probably. It is a definitely a good idea to ask questions on the auction topic, NCC too, though we'll take that back and see if we can come up with some questions even though we have not yet had a chance to discuss that in work track three.

Karen, I'll give you the floor now.

Karen Day: Yes. Yes. To answer your question about question six. That originally started out as a part of question five. One of our participants then separated -

thought it would be separated out. But to my mind when it was written it was a part of question five.

There had been some discussion at some point about did we need to continue on giving community preference looking back at the rational for that. And perhaps in subsequent rounds community applications should be treated equal.

So that was - the context of the causation -- again -- one of our members felt like it should be split out into two separate questions and certainly it needs massaging, so please anyone take a - help us get that across. But that was the (unintelligible) about it.

Man 1:   Okay. Thanks, Karen.

                Any questions for Karen?

                Okay. So with (unintelligible) we should add some questions on auctions for work track three. And maybe some other subjects that have not been covered.

                We can move on to work track four…

Avri Doria: And not (unintelligible)...

Man 1:   And these are questions…

Avri Doria: …minutes.

Man 1:   Oh thanks, Avri.

Yes. Those (unintelligible) work track four is that these questions have been on the work track four list for a while now. And hopefully there were any comments that were received.

I'm not sure we need to go one by one through these, but perhaps we can just - people can take a look at these, but as (Ruben) said on when he did his update about an hour ago now Rubens basically said that he wanted to finalize these. So if you have any comments or questions please put them into the (unintelligible) doc and get back to us as soon as possible.

With that, Avri, I'll turn it back to you.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Jeff, for going through these.

I see two (unintelligible) but I have a feeling that's a remainder from the last time she spoke. Yes? Okay.

And, Kavouss, please go ahead (unintelligible).

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. I have a question or perhaps (unintelligible) a suggestion on section (unintelligible). You have series of good questions. (Unintelligible) when you ask these questions should we have this or should we have that? This is off (unintelligible) because just saying that I want this, I want that, which will have the reasons. I didn't see the reasons though or (unintelligible) advantage. Otherwise it's very difficult to evaluate the answers that (unintelligible) comes. So I don't (unintelligible) all of these apply to all of them and up to the end, all of the questions. I still believe that the (unintelligible) should be (unintelligible) not be (unintelligible) or could we demonstrate it (unintelligible) or just before contact if the answer (unintelligible) the answer says it should be these reasons or (unintelligible) advantage. That would help us to see what is the temperature of the - of it applies. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Kavouss.

I want to point out one thing that (Cheryl) wrote in the comments which is comment only open until (unintelligible) end of something, end of month I bet.

Woman: End of month, every end of month. Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. It took me a second to figure out what M could be. Did that make sense? Which is (unintelligible) which is essentially the case for all of them though some of them - and then of course we will talk about them again in the full meeting before sending them out. So that won't be the last period, but that will be the last period within the work tracks. We will then have another pass through them before sending it out when we will also go through the introductory text and such that we skipped this time.

So I want to thank Jeff for having taken us through that and everybody for their comments. And I can see that we're going to get a good set of answers to these questions from so many people being very ready with answers to the questions. I'm looking forward to seeing lots of submissions from all over the place when these questions do come out.

That brings us with five minutes left. I believe to any other business. So did any other business questions or issues emerge during this meeting?

Don't see any hands. I don't see any notes. I don't hear any voices. So that being the case I guess we don't have any other business.

In which case I would like to thank everyone for attending this meeting. I'd like to thank everyone for participating. And I'd like to thank everybody for speaking slowly. I don't think I noted a single person - well, perhaps, speaking too quickly, so thank you very much.

And with that I end the call. Thank you and good bye.

Coordinator: Thank you (unintelligible) has been adjourned. (Unintelligible) everyone have (unintelligible) have a good day.

END