

ICANN Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group
Monday, 13 February 2017 at 20:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on the Monday, 13 February 2017 at 20:00 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 also be found at:

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

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-13feb17-en.mp3>

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. I've just gotten notice - stop there raise my volume. This is Avri Doria speaking. I'm starting up the meeting of the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group Team meeting. And maybe I jumped the gun on it slightly but anyhow. So the first thing we'll do is welcoming you all and we'll do a review of the agenda. And please let me know if I'm speaking too slowly - too softly at this point.

So the first thing was review the agenda, then the SOIs, then we'll go through the Work Track updates, then we'll go into a discussion on community comment two discussion. There is a working document. And it is in a Google Document where the URL is in the agenda. And they'll be (unintelligible) other business.

But we also somehow that got stuck in before ICANN 58 planning which we need to do and overarching issues drafting teams reminder with the team and the last - at the sign up list in the last couple of days but when I did there were not a lot of people. And I signed up maybe there are now. I will check it during the meeting.

Is there any changes anybody would like to see to the agenda? No does anybody have any items of any other business that they would like to mention now? I will ask the question again when we get to any other business but if anybody has one now it's good to (unintelligible). Okay none. In which case hearing nothing I guess we can proceed with this agenda.

So the next item is the SOIs. Does anybody have an SOI they want to update at this point of any material changes in their situation? Okay I see none. Just want to remind people that if there are material - if there is a material change in your situation you need to update your SOI. And we'll invite you to mention it at our next meeting especially if it is pertinent to this group. Okay then we'll move into the Work Track updates. I'd like to start with WT 1 which of the leaders of that group would like to take that on?

Christa Taylor: Hey Avri it's Christa Taylor. Can you hear me?

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes I can Christa Taylor. So please take it away.

Christa Taylor: Okay. For just a quick update today we have a call or I guess later this evening. Our agenda is accreditation. Again we'll kind of reengage that topic because it's been on the back burner for a while. We're going to do hopefully (unintelligible_ application fees and discuss maybe some discussion around the cost recovery gap between the fees and any potential floor amount that we are I guess concerned about.

We'll do a quick follow-up prioritization including some information on the IDNs continuing the conversation from last meeting. We'll briefly touch on systems and communications but then jump into the new topic of the week or by week is the application guidebook. And then we're going to get into the CC 2 questions. So for anyone that's running (everywhere) command reading that ahead of time to avoid us reading and a long bedtime stories. So that's about it for Work Track 1.

Avri Doria: Thank you, any comments or questions from anyone? Okay one thing I want to add to almost all of these Work Track updates is to get – is to ask people to really get involved in them at this point. Sometimes it looks like there's just not enough people putting effort into it.

And very worried about the coleaders and a couple people in this group are working really hard but all of the group need more people pitching in to the conversation the calls on the email list. And I'm going to repeat that three more times. And now I still see no questions or comments on W1. Please on WP 2 Work Track 2 who – which of the two coleaders is prepared to give an update on that? Do we have the leaders here? Work Track 2 we've got - so who is giving – okay Jeff Neuman please.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. I'm not sure if (Phil)'s on. I mean I see his name but I'm not sure he's on audio. If he is maybe he can interrupt. But I'll just give a quick from Work Track 2 there is a meeting this week as it is tracks one and two as you heard from Work Track 1. This week the topic will be talking about the terms and conditions which was in the Applicant Guidebook as module five I believe.

So there will be a discussion from a policy level on those terms and conditions. And note that we're not going to rewrite those terms and conditions. We're not expecting growth edits or, you know, lawyers to be on to rewrite this text.

It's really to talk about the concept and, you know, whether we should put anything in there for example, you know, on – there was a case and another case on whether this was called a Contract of Adhesion meaning, you know, should they have excluded certain claims. And there was also an issue of, you know, in terms of use should have kind of provisioned in there about the unauthorized access (unintelligible) peoples' application. So it's more on just contest again not on actual rewriting legal text.

At the second update just to keep everybody in the loop when we - where were we last? I don't remember where we were. Wherever we were for the last meeting it was decided that – it's Hyderabad. We were – had thought that the Cross Community Working Group on use of country and territory names at the top level we thought at that point from a meeting that they were likely to refer some of those or the issues they were working on to our group typically Work Track 2.

To date a group still meeting have not yet come out with their final recommendations although I understand they will come out with final recommendations fairly soon or at least in time for the Copenhagen meeting.

Until then Avri, and I and ICANN staff are trying to liaise with the group and with the GAC and others to see if we can start bringing in some of those discussions or at least set up a framework to having some of those discussions in our Work Track 2 or with a separate drafting team. So we're working on that. We don't have any other news other than we were hoping it would have been resolved by now but we're still working on it. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you Jeff Neuman. (Phil) was there anything you wanted to add? I see you're now connected on audio. And just if you had anything to add wanted to give you a chance? Emily has her hand up. Thank you Rubens Kuhl for alerting me. Emily please.

Emily Barabas: Thanks Avri. This is Emily Barabas from staff. I just wanted to make one small correction regarding the schedule of the CWG UCTN schedule. So the report will be going out for public comment probably in the next week or so. And we'll still be in its public comment period during ICANN 58. But we're expecting that the final report will be available shortly after that once the public comment period has closed. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you Emily. Okay seeing - I'm hearing nothing else again I want to reiterate that Work Track 2 could certainly use more active participants. We have a lot of participants but only some of them are (unintelligible). So once again if the issues in Work Track 2 are important to you and are things that are likely to move you to speak at the end of our process please get involved early in the process. Okay moving to Work Track 3. Who from that group that or that leadership is prepared? (Karen) I see your hand. Please go ahead.

(Karen): Hi everyone. This is (Karen). Work Track 3 we're on – in our – in between week this week. Last week we had a call where we went through a strawman proposal that we have for making some changes to the legal rights objections process. And that is now out on a list for discussion although it is a very quiet discussion at the moment. And our next call will be on the 21st. And on that call we will be tackling the issue of confusing similarity objection process. So if you have any experience with that from the past go around please do join us. We'd love to have your input on that. And that's where we are with Work Track 3 right now.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much (Karen). Anyone have any questions or comments? Jeff Neuman I see your hand. Please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. And I know you were going to say this anyway Avri but, you know, again it's important to contribute on this. There have been some pretty novel ideas that have been forwarded for some of this stuff including on the legal rights sections. So, you know, if these items are discussed and then

they're put in email, you know, we need to judge whether people in this group agree, disagree have some opinions on it?

And so, you know, I know that there's been kind of a lax in participation but we do need to move this stuff forward. So if there have been proposals that have been made which there have been and then not commenting on the, you know, they could end up being part of the next application window. So please pay attention to the proposals that are out there. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you Jeff Neuman. And because I said I was going to repeat it on each even though Jeff Neuman did, you know, you've been encouraged by both again. Again please do not take participating to be just we're tracking it we're watching it but not participating. That is the role of observers under that. Lots of people are signed up as participants. It would really be good to see most of them participating.

This goes beyond getting the work done. We've gotten to a point where we may need to notify our liaison to the GNSO (unintelligible) and the council itself that we're not sure that we've got sufficient diversity of groups in terms of stakeholder groups, constituencies, ACS or what have you participating.

And, you know, not that, that is a problem yet but it's becoming one because if at the end of the day we can't say we had full wide diverse participation, every group was there, every group had people talking and participating we will have trouble saying we did our work. So – and I will speak to this one more time but for now I can move to Work Track 4 which (unintelligible) Work Track 4 (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Rubens Kuhl is quick off the mark there. We're looking...

Avri Doria: Yes Rubens Kuhl please go ahead.

Rubens Kuhl: Hi...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'll give you a chance too.

Rubens Kuhl: But I'll defer to Cheryl Langdon-Orr if you prefer.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not at all Rubens Kuhl. I think you can report on that excellent informative and interest meeting of last week.

Rubens Kuhl: Thank you Cheryl Langdon-Orr. We had our Work Track 4 call last week focused on IDNs. And a growing sentiment inside of Work Track of doing two policy changes regarding IDNs. One is allowing one charter on IDNs in specific conditions where one character means a lot that's not be precise there because being precise is exactly what you're trying to do in the Work Track. And the other being allowing for variant TLDs.

But for – in order to allow for variant TLDs require specific policies dealing with possibly confusion that could arise from having some - such variant TLDs. So that's Work Track 4 last week. Next meeting we are hoping to discuss universal chapters but that just confusion on getting UA experts on the call as we had an IDN expert on our last call. It was someone who was saying from ICANN staff. So that's it for Work Track 4. Thank you Avri.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I can just jump in Avri briefly Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Just before we (unintelligible) for everybody to join us. And if they do next weeks' call is the 23rd. And it's at 03:00 UTC.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. I - anybody have any questions or comments? Okay and I'm not to be a broken record here but perhaps this group as well while it's had some excellent discussions and I do recommend that people go back and listen to that IDN discussion again this is a group that needs more participation (unintelligible) to make more recommendations on behalf of all of us that will have comment on. And it will really quite a pretty to get to the point where we've got the recommendations and at that point people start

coming in with their ideas and actions and force us to have to reiterate the process.

So please people start really participating. You know, in our schedule we're well through the schedule. And it's time so please folks hopefully repeating this four times with the help of Jeff Neuman and others can convince some of you to get more involved. But please get more involved. Any last questions on the Work Track reports if not then we'll move to the discussion on Community Comments 2 discussion. And I'll turn it over to Jeff Neuman who is going to leave that discussion. Please Jeff Neuman.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you Avri. And I just typed it in. I guess I'll repeat it too. The Work Track 4 discussion from last week was really helpful. I thought it was very clear explanation in, you know, easy to understand at least for me easy to understand English and explanation of IDN issues that for a while, you know, seemed really complicated.

But a good discussion on variants and other issues that even if you're not at Work Track 4 and just want to know about IDNs and just understand it a little bit better it was about an hour long meeting. Actually it went a little bit over an hour but especially helpful to understand some of the issues we're dealing with.

Now kind of changing gears as introduced by Avri so each of the Work Tracks are working on questions to include in the CC 2 document. But we also want to make sure that we're going over these questions with the full group. Emily has put a link in this deck to the actual document. There's some language in red on there only because I couldn't figure out at first how to show edits.

So I wanted to show that these things have changed. Now I know that I can put it in suggestion mode and it shows up as edit. I will be sure to do that from now on. So if you see some red text on there it's not because it's any

more important than any of the other text it's just I messed up and didn't have it in suggestion mode but I think I've fixed that.

So there is a whole introduction before Annex A. If you want to comment on it please feel free. We meaning the leadership team have not really focused on that (unintelligible) language before Annex A. And so we just haven't paid attention to it yet. So the language that you see there is just kind of filler for now until we can put some language in there but if you have some suggestions, and want to write and help us more than welcome to do that.

So everybody's got control Emily says of the PDF so that's good. Again the purpose here is to not wordsmith the questions. I think each of the Work Tracks will scroll down into more detail but really to get some comments on whether we've missed some subjects or whether we – whether you think we not – we shouldn't ask these questions or if you have any just kind of overall comments. So with that said going to Work Track 1 again these will be discussed in more detail tonight or at least tonight my time tomorrow for many of you.

The first set of questions talks about an RFP program or accreditation program. This has been updated in the last few minutes. I put in some changes to make it sound less than the term accreditation just because I know that firm accreditation has gotten a – had some what's the word I'm looking for some controversy in the word accreditation and it means different things to different people so trying to reword this - these questions as more of an RFP program instead of calling it accreditation.

So we're asking about, you know, whether this is – whether others see the benefit and/or risks of having such a program. We're asking that if there is such a program what are some of the ideas on how to control for scalability if - even if we should control for scalability and other requirements.

And then finally there is – there could be a relationship between the transfer of an RFP for an existing registry to this work? I've reworded the third question so it's not that – it's not should the transfer be in this PDP but more an acknowledgment that work on a transfer process is already underway and should this PDP use the findings for the work done in that existing mechanism to feed into this PDP?

So it's more worded not should we take over the subject but should we borrow some of the learnings from that process that's ongoing? And if anyone has got any comments I'm trying to read the chat as we go along. Just let me know will have to raise their hand.

So on the next area is on applicant support. And it goes into just some of the issues from the last round 2012 and asking whether some of the suggestions that have already been made whether they find value in that? And the second part is, you know, where else other than financial considerations should the I guess I'm repeating the same word. What else other than financial support should we be looking at if anything? And, you know, how to make sure that there's enough notice about this program or more awareness not necessarily notice of the program to bring others in?

Okay I'll move on seeing as how there is not much discussion on this. And then clarity of the overall application process there were a number of areas in which others – which seems to need some revision. And so I think like customer support, application prioritization. And so what is a way to make sure that if there's any changes needed in the middle of rolling this out how can we – should we do that or and/or how can we do that without disrupting the program going forward?

Starting in 1.4 you'll see that the people who made changes there understood the concept of suggestion mode which I appreciate and now will be able to do that. Seeing any comments (unintelligible) on the accreditation.
(Unintelligible) program be factored into the RFP program discussion?

(Unintelligible) I think there is a discussion let's see when we get through Work Track 2 areas to see if (unintelligible) is taking care of there. And if there's anything not covered in there perhaps we can add some additional things as to how it may relate to an RSP program. But let's keep note of that. I think that is - I think there are some connections there. In 1.4...

Susan Payne: Jeff Neuman can I - hi Jeff Neuman. Can I just say - it's Susan Payne here. I'm trying to get into the Adobe room. And I wonder if the operator could let me in? Sorry to interrupt.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Sorry about that Susan Payne. If (Michelle) can you look into that or Emily?

Denise Michel: Hi. This is Denise Michel. I'm unable to get in either and I'm on the mobile app. Thanks for your help (Michelle).

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Sorry Susan Payne we'll try to get this worked out shortly. But if you can let me know in a couple of minutes if we have not gotten it fixed. I know it's definitely hard to follow the conversation if you're not viewing the document so let us know if you have any questions.

So the application fees this comes out of a discussion from I believe that was the last Work Track 1 call where there's some discussions about the mechanism of determining what the fee should be not what the actual fee should be but the process of determining that. In 2012 it was a cost recovery. And so we're asking questions of whether you should still be on a cost recovery model, whether there should be – if you find out for whatever reason that the cost would only be – would be a lot lower than the \$185,000.

Do we then retain the notion of having a floor meaning that there would be - its cost recovery (unintelligible) if it turns out the cost is so low there may be some policy reasons to inflate the price to ensure serious application. So

there have been some that have mentioned that concept. Emily. Emily you have your...

Emily Barabas: Thanks Jeff Neuman.

Jeff Neuman: ...hand raised?

Emily Barabas: Sorry about that just getting off mute. It looks like we're having a little bit of trouble with the Adobe Connect room. If people are having trouble entering or reentering can they just try just doing it one more time and we'll see if that solves the problem. And if not we'll look at some additional IT support. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks Emily I'm sorry for...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: One thing I want...

Jeff Neuman: Sorry for...

Avri Doria: Anyone while we're dealing with this the agenda that was sent out includes the URL for the document. So if you can't while this is being worked at you can bring up a document on your own so you can follow the discussion a little bit more easily. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Avri. And hopefully you will be able to figure that out soon. Okay going back to the document on the fees. There is also a discussion of, you know, a short – or how to bill if there is a shortfall or a sizable surplus. So that's the - there's a question on that.

You know, I'm not reading the questions specifically because I think they're still in the process of being wordsmithed. And really want to make sure that

we've asked the right questions or if there's anything additional to make sure this group is okay with the questions that we are asking because I do understand that the way questions are worded will also affect your views on that.

And then the last question is should we in the - as a policy matter discuss how a surplus or shortage of funds should be handled and that - because that was left unsaid in the last round. There is what we all believe to be a fairly sizable surplus but there's no guidance as to how that surplus will or can be used. So we can't necessarily affect how the surplus is going to be used this past round but hopefully we can affect how a surplus would be dealt with in a future round.

Okay I'm just looking for any comments. And then finally there was a - or not final - but finally on fees there was a - for the variable fees there was a discussion on whether different types of applications should have different types of costs. And, you know, a discussion within the Work Track that led to the thought that there really wasn't that much difference in terms of cost to do those types of applications but asking whether the community agrees with that or not. And - but also we really need to obtain that costing information.

Some things that we talked about as well and that we will be talking about tonight or tomorrow on the Work Track 1 call is the application submission period so it was supposed to be a 60 day period it turned out to be 60 plus 45 I believe because of the - a glitch in the system. So (unintelligible) replication - I'm sorry it was 90 for 45 but it was supposed to only be 90 days.

So that said that, you know, is this an appropriate period? There looks to be discussions within the Work Track about well maybe that's it for the first coming application window plus potentially future application windows might not need as much time. So that's also up for discussion. Application viewing this was in the last round there were a couple issues here.

There was one there was an issue of prioritization of IDNs that happened in this last draw well actually I should say two things. Number one the concept of priorities (unintelligible) as opposed to the what was initially envisioned which was the general (archery). So that was discussed and group seems to be leaning towards this draw being an appropriate mechanism subject to legal concerns.

And so if that's the case, you know, asking about that but also then there was prioritization given to IDNs in the last round. Is that something from a policy perspective should we codify that? Should we do away with that? Is there still a need for it? So those are just some of the questions on the queue in. And on systems this is something I guess we'll get into but there's a discussion that'll happen later on and Work Track 1 on the systems used for the application process, the evaluation process, the communications with applicants versus communications with existing registries.

And so all of those are mentioned in the south implementation report which I am rereading which I encourage everyone to reread as well and same thing with communications that there was certainly a focus on ensuring that there was an – there was equal access given to each applicant as well as existing registry operator in the process.

So there were certain methods of communications that were developed by ICANN staff in implementing the program. And, you know, sometimes the balance of those – of the equal access combined with making sure questions were answered led to some delays and whether there was any improvement that could be made on that process.

There were no metrics for success defined. In the Applicant Guidebook (unintelligible) policy for communications, or customer service or implementation so is that something that we want to put in place? And then finally the last from Work Track 1 is on the Applicant Guidebook and whether that's still the roadmap the right way to go forward?

Okay that's Work Track 1. Looking for any comments or questions sorry going back? I'm hoping Susan Payne's - is Susan Payne back in the room going back?

Avri Doria: Yes Susan Payne...

Susan Payne: Yes I'm back. I'm here yes.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Good thank you.

Susan Payne: Actually it's Susan Payne talking. It's Susan Payne and I was just going to make a quick comment. Sort of wearing my – I'm supposed to be one of the liaisons between this PDP and the RPMs one. And one of the subjects that we seem to be spending a lot of time on in the RPMs Working Group is around sort of the topic of communications/education.

And it seems to be the really what we're concerned about in that group is about we've been talking a lot about whether the trademark clearinghouse as, you know, ought to have an obligation to be – to being more to educate people who are not trademark clearinghouse users. And actually it seems like from my perspective it seems to me and from the perspective of many of the other participants that actually where the communication and the education needs to be happening is in a more general level of about the program itself.

And if there's a lack of understanding about things like rights protection mechanisms or what a trademark claims notice means it shouldn't – it should be coming from ICANN. And so I guess I'm just raising this and I suppose asking the question of whether you feel that this is something that should be discussed in this PDP rather than in the RPMs one?

Jeff Neuman: Actually I think that's a great question. I think that's a good subject for the next Work Track 1 call. So I'm hoping that Christa Taylor and (Sarah) are keeping noted that. I do think that there are - could be in theory audiences or maybe not. So I at this point just kind of gut tells me that it's probably appropriate for both to discuss because of, you know, the potential for different audiences. You had, you know, as far as new gTLD programs versus those that want to protect their rights after the registries launch or at a time. But I do - there is some overlap as well.

Susan Payne: Okay thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. So we'll add that for the next discussion for Work Track 1 later on. And then just to read some of the comments. (Donna) says understanding the audience is important. Can you all still hear me?

Man: Yes Jeff Neuman.

Avri Doria: Yes. I can hear you fine.

Jeff Neuman: Yes okay. My computer just kind of hung up and so I didn't know. I know that if it disconnects me from these well obviously I'll be disconnected from a call. Okay so then there's some comments going back and forth from on Work Track 2 which is probably good because that's where we're getting to right now. So I'm just reading to see if it's related to this.

But okay for the Work Track 2 comments you'll notice that there are a number of topics in Work Track 2 that we have yet to get to. So what we try to do for some of those towards the end is to create questions based off of either the implementation report or to some comments that we knew about from the original issues – issue report.

But the discussions we have had base registry agreement there are some questions in there (unintelligible) registry agreement. For most - for second

level RPMs most of it is really just a reference to the PDP group that's already doing the work as there are a couple areas that have been referred to us like the PRP and the (RRCRP). So we do want to put all of the questions based on those so the ones that are in there now are very preliminary.

Sorry I'm just trying to check the comments. Okay reserve names is a topic that the Work Track 2 have spent a couple sessions talking about. And so there were some questions that are drafted there about aspects such as the string requirements, the reserve names, the strings ineligible for delegation the specification five and some other areas in there. Question Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. Maybe it is not appropriate time to ask this question but I – what's delaying that? I think a lot of good question has been raised. Do you think that during the ICANN 58 will be an opportunity that SO and AC (unintelligible) some of those who requires further explanation of this or clarification?

Could be an opportunity that someone from your group describe or with the same (unintelligible) to some of the SO and AC that not continually or continuously following up this group in order to be able to answer. And that is connected with the timeline of that you require that this question be answered. It's a very general question I wanted to raise it before but I just let you finish your explanation and then (unintelligible) appropriate time to reply at an appropriate time. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Kavouss. I do think that's a good suggestion. Avri do you have your hand raised or did I see someone or Kavouss's hand go down? I imagined it okay. I do think that's a good suggestion. And Avri now you do have your hand up. Yes.

Avri Doria: Yes. I didn't have my hand up at least I didn't think I did because I was (unintelligible). In terms of Kavouss's question I too think it's a good idea. It

may be something that we want to put on the ICANN meeting. It's certainly something we can add under any other business in terms of that.

And it dovetails into something that I have been searching on the reserve mailings. And I think I brought it up in the meeting but it may be wider question. I don't know how many people here follow the work done in the IETF but there is work going on now that may or may not have an effect on reserved names both at top level possibly a second (unintelligible) on top.

And I'm wondering whether this group feels it's important for us to get at some point an overview of that work. (Unintelligible) somebody that participates in that work also or we could ask one of the IETF experts to come in and talk to us. So I just wanted to put that on the table so that that's not an issue that sort of it more completely. If you decide that, you know, that's their business and none of ours then - but I do think that's something that we need to at least pay some attention to. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Avri. If anyone has any thoughts on that just wait and see if anyone wants to get into the queue. Okay moving on there are some questions as well on registrar protection. This is – relates to an area we have been discussing Work Track 2 over the last couple of meetings things like the continuing - continued operations instrument, the data escrow, registry performance specifications. These were all listed by ICANN as registrar protection. And so there are questions here about the COI about (EBRO) and also about this is where the issue of background checks comes in.

And if you look there were - this was considered by ICANN to – so we don't have a question on it yet this is the area where ICANN included background checks to ensure that what they had said was to make sure that there were no cyber - no known felons, or criminals, or cyber squatters or others that would get – would run a TLD. (Kavouss) (unintelligible) you might be a mute?

Kavouss Arasteh: Again I said perhaps this is a little bit qualify your question. We could not think there is no cyberattack or cyber malicious or so on so forth. There will be a minimum or less because (unintelligible). Today I was discussing in some other meeting outside the ICANN and I said well a lot of complaints about this issue. But this is not my question. My question you talked about protection of the (unintelligible).

And I have an indirect question which is the following. Some registrar we have restrictions to major contact with ICANN in some particular gTLD. And what is your answer to that question? Why there is a reception because ICANN before providing that access need to go to sort of contact with registrar and access to some of gTLD I don't know too much (unintelligible) in a specific case (unintelligible) to have access.

And that is contrary to the access to the people and okay non-discriminatory access. What you can do with gTLDs? Why a particular country should put reception so (unintelligible) of other country or countries to have access to a particular gTLD? Is it something that you could at least listen and address not completely but to some extent as I think that this is very good questions? I have received some comment on this that the user from certain (unintelligible) they have problem difficulty to have access to some gTLD. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Kavouss. I think that does relate to if we scroll down in Work Track 2 one of the subjects that we haven't yet got to is a discussion on registrar - registry registrar separation and nondiscrimination. And what you bring up is an issue of registries that may prohibit registrars from operating within that top level domain and in this case by country and in other cases by other factors. And so I think that does relate to the Section 2 point scrolling down here 2.8 of these questions. So I think perhaps we could take that question and draft something that seeks to answer your point about registries discriminating against registrars and in your example by country. So I'm just reading the sorry I'm reading these comments.

Kavouss Arasteh: (Unintelligible) to kindly if possible put down my question in the notes of this meeting and (unintelligible) if possible? Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I see in - thanks Kavouss this is Jeff Neuman. I do see that it's been noted on the right-hand side of Adobe. So we will make sure that, that is in there and in the action items.

Kavouss Arasteh: Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: And (Julie) if she has not captured it correctly then just if you could help her with some of the text? Okay.

Kavouss Arasteh: Excuse me. And my question is not why they do. I don't want to know why. I want to (unintelligible) in case that a registrar has restrictions to have access to particular gTLD what course of action is required to remove that restriction? So - because if you go for a while you may have another dimension I don't want to go to that dimension. I want to just change the questions what are the ways and means to remove the restriction of registrar to have access to some gTLDs in certain countries? That is my question if it is possible to put it I would much appreciate it. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay Avri. Avri you may be a mute.

Avri Doria: Yes. This is Avri. Yes I wanted to ask Kavouss whether without getting, you know, into naming named stuff whether it would be possible for you to give us some examples of the TLDs if it's happening and not necessarily the country or the registrar but if you - and at a later time not necessarily taking up this meeting but I'd love to ask if you could give an example of TLDs this is (happening). At the moment I would just be guessing at (unintelligible) but perhaps knowing what TLDs this happens in could help us drag down - to track down what the answers might be. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks Avri. And looking at kind of a time check here we're almost up against the hour and I'm just trying to see do have an hour or an hour and a half for this?

Avri Doria: We have a full meeting.

Jeff Neuman: I'm sorry.

Avri Doria: We have an hour and a half, one full meeting full group meeting.

Jeff Neuman: Right. Okay good. That's what I was hoping. Okay Kavouss you have another comment?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. So further to the suggestion that I made and you kindly positively replied to that is it convenient than when we have when we say GAC. When GAC has a meeting with GNSO would it be possible that some of the main issue of this question or questioners be put in that meeting instead of some traditional question which may not be so yes urgent?

So what I would say that at our next (unintelligible) ICANN there is a meeting between GNSO, and the GAC and perhaps some people like you, and Avri and others could participate in that meeting and clarify the questions that you have made and answer to some of the other request (unintelligible) that would help. The reason that Jeff Neuman I'm asking this question is the following. I am trying very rigorously to mobilize GAC one to participate in this group and two to reply duly and timely to any questions has been raised and have active or interactive participation at the meeting which helps us you and me and others to have a good PDP. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you Kavouss. And I know I appreciate it. I'll let Avri speak yes?

Avri Doria: Yes. Basically I think that I certainly would support that idea. I think it's a request and we should probably note it to be ICANN specific a request we

would have to make you as well as us to our respective chairs who are the ones that schedule that meeting and such to let them know that we would love that and we would love to do that. So I don't think we can unilaterally say sure we'll come do it. But if it's just that Jeff Neuman as well as myself are more than willing to do so. And if our chairs schedule it that way, you know, our GNSO and GAC chairs schedule it that way then it's can happen.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Avri. I agree with you 100%. Okay going back to the question. So try to get through two section or Work Track 2. I think we left off at the - I could really sort of skip a little bit ahead. One of the subjects is that - or 2.5 talks about the IGO, INGO process. But we note that there's already a PDP going on and other discussions that are going on between the GAC in the GNSO. So we may or may not ask any questions related to that depending on where all of that is going. Two point six is questions on closed generic.

We have not yet talked about this in Work Track 2 but it is coming up in a future session. It is a question that the - or there's a number of questions related to a topic that the new gTLD program committee of the board had decided in the 2012 round that we would not allow those that have generic terms to operate closed top level domains.

But it was not a policy decision. And so we need to visit the subject to see whether we agree with the board or we make some recommendations to save that. So this is a policy subject that should be addressed by our group. And so we have some questions in here try to give us some information from the community on that subject.

The next area deals with applicant terms and conditions which we will deal with in the next Work Track call. I'm not going to go over that right now. And then the two topics after that we sort of started with the registrar nondiscrimination, registry registrar separation and questions about the way in which the closed conduct operates, when the code of conduct is raised or, you know, when someone has a right to have an exclusion from the code of

conduct. So there are certainly questions that we have – we have a few but we certainly can come up with additional ones.

Okay the - I don't want to go through each of these because there is a lot of them. I want to kind of move on to so after mentioning the topics there's a question on contractual compliance on the rollout of top level domains. And then the – a difficult one we all try to do this within our group is how to take into consideration the global publication and specifically with this Work Track is always in the nature of (picks) and whether that is our public interest commitments and whether we should continue with that or whether there are other ideas of how to accomplish serving the global public interest.

Okay and pausing just a minute to see if there's any questions? Okay no questions so going on to Work Track 3. Most of these questions were in the last version that were – that was sent around for our last call. It's really discussions on the different types of objections. And really I see for this Work Track more well I shouldn't say more so not say more so than others but certainly for this Work Track we are looking for those that have participated in the objections process or the evaluation - for the evaluation processes to give us some additional information.

While certainly the discussions within the Work Tracks have been helpful and we look forward to more discussions via email a lot of the discussions really didn't feel complete because they were – there was not that much feedback from those that went through the different types of exceptions or files, you know, filed those objections or responded to those objections whether they won those objections or not. And so we're really looking for some feedback on a number of different areas within those objections as you can see in Section 3.1.

3.2 deals with the balance we have to make in each of our groups now which is really balancing the inspections and the (pension) or solution. And all of the other processes with the notion of applicant freedom of expression. So for

those of you that will recall one of the explicit policy recommendations in - or principles, principle G basically set forth that we should ensure that the rights of applicants are balance and that, you know, that we should make sure that we do not unduly restrict freedom of expression.

So there was a concern during the application process or during the policy process that there were some concerns about scandalous top level domains or ones that (unintelligible) effective to be within certain countries or certain communities. I don't really believe for the most part that materialized. There were a couple examples but to the extent that it did materialize, you know, that - there was processes taken into consideration freedom of expression.

And then a topic that we talked a little bit about but certainly will talk a lot more about are community applications and the evaluation process. That's Section 3.3. Three point four deals with the string similarity evaluation which we will we have not yet talked about. Just to point out that also deals with you'll see the plurals versus singular issue which were certainly a lot of groups that had very specific opinions on whether plurals and singulars should be allowed and then accountability mechanisms of how these were dealt with.

So in the last process there was reconsideration process was available. And we all saw how those reconsideration decisions were structured. There is of course the independent review. And so how does - how do the new bylaws effect the accountability mechanisms for the new gTLD process?

And then Work Track 4 I know I'm moving a little fast through these and everyone can read -- and these will be discussed within the individual Work Track -- deals with the high end universal acceptance complication evaluation more from kind of how they were evaluated and, you know, things like scoring, things like the criteria. That's what they're looking into and then looking at name collision and some federal security stability questions.

And finally there were some points, there were some miscellaneous questions that don't necessarily fit into Work Tracks that are on there that we have at the very end of that document. So please everyone review this - review the documents. Please help contribute. As Avri implored on everyone these questions, you know there are a lot of questions. Having your input into the questions are very helpful to make sure that we can get clear responses and really feed into our process. Avri?

Avri Doria: Oh thanks. One thing I wanted to add on this, one of the things that I think suggesting for readership and the Work Track and that's this. Now we take another pass through these, do some cleanup, do some work and I think that basically that we make an end of (unintelligible) track. And next time we bring it to the full group that would essentially be a first reading of it (unintelligible) this group and we move the wordsmithing and the sensitivity editing of these questions to this group.

So again encouraging people to get involved with the Work Track but I'm pushing and suggesting that we get these back to the full group real soon and then they'll become an issue for these meetings. So the more you've done at the Work Track level the less we'll need to do at the full meeting level.
Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Avri. All right, it took me a second to get off mute as well. I know we're losing some people. So Avri why don't we hop on to the next agenda item which is it says any other business but I think we would move on to ICANN 58.

Avri Doria: Yes makes sense to me unless somebody has an item of any other business that's critical that they want to add at this time I'd love to get to ICANN 58. And yes, just letting people know that these full meetings are always 90 minutes and probably should note that in our meeting invitation just so people know. But I appreciate that everybody has too many meetings to attend at the moment.

Okay in terms of ICANN 58 we will be having a full I guess a three hour session of this group as the first schedule will come out. We see some possible scheduling program problems that we're dealing with. But we'll also need to determine what is the most successful way of organizing our work in 58. Jeff Neuman I don't know if you or Steve wants to talk about anything specific on this ICANN 58 schedule at this point. Mostly we'll be done with these questions that we were just talking by then and we'll be able to sift through some of our substantive issues, some of the substantive issues that would benefit from face to face discussion especially with the wider group than necessarily attends our meetings or is even a (parcip) or observer in our PDP. So I don't know, Steve or Jeff Neuman was there anything specific you want to dive into on that at this point?

Jeff Neuman: Yes this is Jeff Neuman. I think that I think you covered - I think there may be some additional sessions that we're trying to set up during the meeting as - or sorry, during the full eight days or seven days of the meeting. But we don't have anything on the schedule yet. I know that it may be that some of the Work Tracks might want to meet either informally with people that are there.

But I know that we have a bunch of people that will be there so, there may be some additional things we try to set up. But, looking at the calendar already in place it seems like there's a lot of conflicts and we're trying our best to reduce conflicts but I think there may be some inevitable conflicts that we have but we're trying our best. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. Yes I mean, we'll obviously also be doing a (unintelligible) to the GNSO I expect. I can't imagine that we wouldn't. And then of course there's the meeting or the part of the sessions that Kavouss mentioned that we'll need to take back to our respective chairs just to see how that can work out whether there is a possibility for a GAC new PDP subsequent procedure discussion at some point within the timeframe that they're already scheduling.

So those are obviously two additional (unintelligible). And I see from Steven Chan I will circulate and in the group the details of the meetings that are currently requested hence to be rescheduled. So that'll help. Is there anything Steve that you want to say about that now just to give people a general view. But while asking that question I see Kavouss has his hand up. Please Kavouss? Kavouss did you not hear this?

Kavouss Arasteh: I have a general question whether you take it now or you take it at the end of the session I hope that you would kindly allow me to raise that question. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay I'll go back to Steve and then I'll come back to your question. Okay Steve please?

Steve Chan: Thank you Avri. This is Steve from staff. Yes I just want to note that there is - there's at least two sessions, the one that you already mentioned on day one. There's also a meeting scheduled for day five which I believe is the 15th of March. It's a 90 minute session. It's runs from 1700 to 1830 local time. It's more of a - so as opposed to the first session on day one which is a working group face to face working session.

The intention is that the second meeting on day five would be more community facing, so more we're able to present (outwards) and also have a dialogue with other parties that are rather than just working group members. As I said I'll send an email around after this meeting to provide everyone and those that are not on this call with a understanding of what meetings are expect at ICANN 58. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Steve thank you. Okay Kavouss back to you and your question.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes my question Avri you and maybe Jeff Neuman also are attend a meeting of the human rights. And you remember that there was a question raised by some of the people in the drafting group for the review not the revision of the

favor of interpretation. What I heard and it was written in the draft was that the PDP of the GNSO is not subject to human right. I think it should be. Whether this issue would be addressed at some time within the process of notes that any PDP at least initial check must be made which to be consistent with the human right as described in the framework of (unintelligible).

I think there should be no discrimination between GNSO and GNSO and GAC because GAC advice should be subject to the human rights should respect that. We do it in the GAC and put now in the strength to the operating principle that all the GAC advice must be from the GAC point of view they're in line with the human rights and bylaw all of them but in particular human rights. And the board also needs to check that.

But I saw in this draft that they say that no GNSO PDP is not or are not subject to that. And I wonder why it is - it should be like that and whether you want at least at the next step somewhere sometime address this issue it would be very consistent with the entire process. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. This (unintelligible) and speaking on that in terms of I'm not sure I've gotten that same under (unintelligible) but I have to go back. Now certainly this group does not determine what Workstream 2 or framework of interpretation says. So in that respect I don't know that this group has an impact on that.

Certainly as individuals we can have (unintelligible). Now speaking personally I have always felt and I think there's room for I think it's allowed that any PDP should have some degree of impact analysis. I just think, you know, there's a slight difference between being a study of what the impact of our workings and (unintelligible) and a declaration that on a framework of interpretation really doesn't know how to (unintelligible) yet how to include and how to suggest what's be in the laws that and we would argue that that it needs to be from a PDP's perspective.

But I personally think and I believe that at some point in our process we should (unintelligible) a human rights (unintelligible) everything but the framework of interpretation itself and the work that what we're left to doing is not something that this PDP has in its scope. But I certainly do believe that that is a question that we assessed in .(usa) and I'm supportive of that being discussed but that's a personal favor. I don't know if anyone else wants to comment. Yes Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I know that this group does not need to repeat the framework interpretation. That framework of interpretation is interpretations of the human - respect the human rights in the bylaw. And the recommendation of the SO and AC are - which are prepared and submitted to the board should comply with that. So indirectly in an implicit manner we should mention that any PDP has provided need to be checked to be consistent with the bylaw.

So in an indirect application said directly I don't want to add any to the (unintelligible). But I want what some (lectures) should be made sometime and somewhere that because of that explanation that people put two or three paragraph saying that a PDP of the GNSO is not subject to the human rights.

And I have some difficulty to accept. That's just a question. If you don't want to take it that is up to you but this question raised and I want to make it consistently with the entire process that we do in the ICANN, not saying that this is the PDP for the new round. And that is the human rights. That is the frame hold that is bylaw. All of them should be coherent. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you Kavouss and personally I support that statement. And so let's follow-up on that with the framework and interpretation Workstream 2. And let's have on our (docket) that they discussed, you know, our relationship to the human rights and (unintelligible) we (unintelligible) of the human rights as we get further down the getting the work that we're doing done. But I definitely support your statement and thank you for making it.

Any other comments on this topic this time? It'll probably be back on the table again at some point in the future. Okay than anything else on ICANN 58? Okay then I think that takes us to our last item which is the signups for the subcontracting (unintelligible).

We have three topics. We have one of them that's a TLD type. That one we're not doing that. We have six people who have signed up for it. That is certainly a good number for a drafting team. More would not be harm but I think as a group that that certainly has sufficient depth to do some of the work.

We have a charter topic for predictability and community engagement in which we have just one person. One person is not (unintelligible). So I encourage people that are interested in predictability and community engagement to sign up to that group before that (unintelligible) more because I think it's absolutely (unintelligible).

People may think that it could be problematic I don't - look. If you have an opinion on predictability and community engagements and have a little bit of bandwidth to basically work on a (unintelligible) team for the (unintelligible) the normal (unintelligible) is not less (unintelligible) to that would be good. And so there's the signup sheet there, et cetera. And then there's charter topic application assisted rounds. That's something we've talked about a lot. We've had some good discussions, some good recommendations, a bunch of possibilities that have been discussed it.

At the moment we have two people on the drafting team. Two people is minimum for a team but from the number of people that were involved in this discussion I think there may be a few more if something serious to contribute to that discussion. So hopefully there's a few more of you with bandwidth (unintelligible) participate that and need to come up with as a possible recommendation where we go on this one.

This is one of the conversations that can't have a lot of discussion. So it'd be good to be able to bring that together in a bigger fashion. So I don't know if anybody else - I'll go back to the screen now. I see a hand. Yes Susan Payne?

Susan Payne: Yes thanks Avri. Is it possible to clarify how you expect these drafting teams to work? I mean is it anticipated that they'll be more (central) or is that they will be working in a small group of however many there are in - on sort of email and - or shared in a Google document or something? I suspect some of the reluctance to sign up maybe that people don't know how they'll manage to sit and others don't call in. That's certainly one of my hesitations.

Avri Doria: Yes. I think that that is really up to the group. I personally again think that these things could be done completely over email and working inside a common document, sales document, you know, some other format if that's what the people working on it feel is best. I wouldn't predict phone calls but, then again I could see if work - some of the work had been done there was a need for a phone call to hash out some of the issues then that would certainly be possible. But I did not see these as operating (unintelligible) as the Work Tracks which have a steady or, you know, phone call.

So, you know, from a personal perspective of how these (unintelligible) I just think we need phone calls. But it will be up to the people that are (unintelligible). We're not seeing up the work call schedule like we have been doing with the sub team at least not until the point we get to (unintelligible) doing and we have to do something and then we may, you know, bring them into the phone calls. But for now I was hoping that these teams could just sort of work in a asynchronous manner using email, using chat, using, you know, (unintelligible). So hopefully that answers. And I see a couple answer in the chat. Let me (unintelligible).

Okay, first there was the question on different TLD types. And it was categories and (unintelligible) different types of TLDs actually. So those are

some of the discussions that that group needs to have. Cheryl Langdon-Orr says - see I thought we were trying to get others, more people involved, not just the existing rapporteurs list, good point. The rapporteurs are already quite under the - a heavy load.

And then Rubens Kuhl says if a phone call is really necessary? I see that (unintelligible) was not (unintelligible) the most relevant work team (unintelligible) inside the most relevant work team close to that manner that it made a point what the (unintelligible) not all the Work Tracks. So quite possibly it could be done Rubens Kuhl if that was truly appropriate or it could be brought into the (unintelligible).

And any other discussion on that Kavouss has another point to raise on the AOB. We have four minutes left so I want to go to that unless there's any other comment on these drafting team. Please sign up and please and (unintelligible) types one. I think we've got lots of people so let us know if you need any help to get going. And perhaps you're already going and work is already going on that I just haven't seen and (unintelligible). Yes Kavouss? I see no other hands#

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I wanted to raise the following point. The new (round) gTLD part of the crucial and important (appointment) of all of the ICANN. In the last speaking there was a (complete) about the activity of GNSO and among other things the activities of the group are still it was briefly mentioned.

Is it clear how do you foresee or have you foreseen that there should be some very brief summary of the activity of this group to remain available for the entire ICANN that they know in particular for those who will they don't follow this group they know that also what they are doing not going at all in any detail but just as sort of the checklist that these are the areas that we have now dealt with and these are the areas that we are dealing with and

these are the areas that always they will (unintelligible) in figure. But this it will be good for (various) people.

I got a couple of got conflicts on the GNSO colleagues in a very informal manner. And that was very, very helpful. So do you intend to include in the (unintelligible) of GNSO some very brief description of what you are doing in a very, very summary pace? Thank you.

Avri Doria: At least two things I know of will happen. One we will be doing a report to the GNSO on the status of the group and the questions and issues and, you know, (unintelligible) get into some detail if given the time. And then two the policy stance is to get a very Webinar where they do think through the various PDP efforts that are ongoing and discuss the state they're at and the issues that we're going through before every face to face meeting and that Webinar's held at least twice I believe in two time zones and is recorded. So at least those (unintelligible). I don't know if in the last minute staff or Jeff Neuman or anyone else wants to add something else to it.

So I see Kavouss you have your hand up again. So please but (unintelligible) the meeting is (unintelligible). Put your hand down if it was a previous hand.

So yes so there's at least those two. If that's not enough we'll have to talk about what else. But certainly I expect those two things to happen because they happened at each of our (unintelligible) to the public meeting. Yes?

Steve Chan: Thank you Avri. This is Steve from staff again and just to add to what you just said Avri, two other things that the policy staff develops is the policy reports or policy briefings. Those are developed ahead of each of the meetings. What I can make sure that those are sent around to this group to make sure you have it all available.

The other thing is there are GAC early engagement documents that are prepared. Those are developed for the GAC but they're also made public. So

what we can also do is to make sure that the group has access to those as well or I guess the links to that.

And I would add one last thing is that we had talked sort of informally I think about developing something like a newsletter for this group. I think that might be a good thing to rekindle. And so then there are so many Work Tracks I think even for the numbers of this group they might be useful to have something summarized and for everyone to be able to stay turned on what the working group is currently addressing. So just those three points. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you Steve also for reminding me of the (unintelligible) things and early engagement documents and (unintelligible) again. So we'll do our best to make sure that people know what's going on and (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) to do that. I'm one minute past our 90. Does anybody have any last things to say in today's meeting?

Okay I have to just check one thing. Okay no I have nothing else. I apologize. I've gotten one report of me being muffled. I am going through Adobe Connect from Iceland in my hotel room. I did not dial in. I used the Adobe Connect, the answer to why I may be muffled. It says I am always difficult to hear but this one has been particularly bad. I'll start dialing in when I'm talking so much and see if that improves anything though I'm not sure it would have improved it some Iceland (unintelligible) but, maybe.

Sorry for the muffle and I'll end this meeting. Thank you very much for all your contributions and please, please, please get yourself involved in the work especially those of you that have just been watching and have opinions on what we could do better, what we could do right. Thank you all and I'll talk to you again in the various meetings. Bye-bye.

END