ICANN Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group
Monday 10 April 2017 at 1500 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on the Monday 10 April 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/6rDRAw
The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-10apr17-en.mp3

Michelle DeSmyter: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on the 10th of April 2017 at 1500 UTC. In the interest of time today there will no roll call as we have quite a few participants online; attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room so if you're only on the audio bridge, please let yourself be known now. Okay great, thank you.

And as a reminder to all participants please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this, I will turn the call back over to Avri Doria.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you very much. Our agenda is rather monotonic this time. We have one main item on the agenda after going through the SOIs and that's the presentation and question and answer with the Competition, Consumer

Choice and Consumer Trust leadership. And that will be the main item. And then any other business if anyone has any other business.

So we are even going to dispense with the normal reporting of the - of all the subgroups and go immediately into that. But first I wanted to check if there's any other business that anyone knows about that they would like to add and especially if any of the subgroups want to tack on any special mention or consideration at the end of the meeting that they would like to remind people of, let me know now or let me know at the end of the meeting when I get to any other business.

By the way, I neglected to mention that this is Avri Doria speaking, and that we all should say that at the beginning of our speech, not halfway through it.

So anything on the agenda at this point or can we go with that agenda? Okay, and on the SOIs just want to remind everybody that you need to keep an updated SOI, Statement of Interest, and that if you have made material changes on it especially that are relevant to the work in this group you have to mention that at the beginning of the meeting. Has anybody made a significant change in their SOI as it relates to the work in this group? Okay, hearing none I'll just remind people that if you do, please do.

For this meeting and relation to the agenda item, we have three guests from the CCT, three presenters and participants, Jonathan Zuck, Jordyn Buchanan and Drew Bagley, so I want to welcome them to the meeting. And in moving to Item 3, I would basically like to turn the floor over to whichever of them is going to go through. I will monitor the hands. I want to check with them, are you fine with interacting with questions as we go or would you prefer to wait for natural stopping points like after a slide and its explanation? Please let me know how you'd like to proceed with this, and then we will proceed with this. And I turn it over now.

Drew Bagley: Hi, this is Drew Bagley. I think we're still waiting for Jonathan to join? But if he does not come on soon then I'll go ahead and start and I'm fine with interrupting and going along, but just to preface the way that we kind of broke up the work for our review team has been that certain people have worked on certain topics more than others, so Jonathan would certainly have an expertise in some things that I would not and vice versa as we go through these. And I'm absolutely fine with interrupting. So worst case, I will defer to when Jonathan joins for him to better answer a question, there is one that I can't fully answer as we go through.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Steve, I see your hand up.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Avri. This is Steve. What I was going to put out as an option is that (unintelligible) a little bit longer and we could actually maybe do the work track updates just to take some time up. But if Drew is comfortable in proceeding by himself - actually I wanted to mention Jordyn is not going to be able to attend. Actually Jonathan just joined right now.

Avri Doria: Jonathan just showed up, yes. Are you actually completely here, Jonathan? Can you speak and hear yet? Not yet, okay. If you think it's important, Steve, we can. I thought we were going to go through the four subgroups…

Jonathan Zuck: Can you hear…

Avri Doria: …but I didn't see them on the agenda - yes, Jonathan. I'd like to turn it over to you now and we will come back to the subgroups at the end if there is anything to cover. So, Jonathan, we already went through our agenda review, our SOIs. We've got presentation that you guys, that basically was used when we talked in the leadership meeting that you guys have updated. I have not seen the updates so I'd like to turn the floor over to you.

What we've said is that I'll track the hands up, I'll interrupt you at opportune moments if I have hands up of people that want to ask questions. And please, if you're ready, please jump in.

Jonathan Zuck: All right great. Thanks, folks. And I'm sorry for being a little bit tardy here. I always pay attention to whether one appointment overlaps another one that sometimes don't pay attention to the logistics of two adjoining meetings so I had to get someplace where I could get on the call.

Thanks, everyone, for collecting for this conversation. Thanks for your questions regarding the CCT reports. As you know, we are talking about it as a kind of interim report because there are still some studies that are in the field. One is a DNS abuse study; one is a INTA survey of trademark holders; and then there's been some additional research and numbers done on the impact of things at a reasonable level and also trying to understand the impact of parking.

So those are some of the things that are under discussed in the current draft and that will hopefully become clearer as that data presents itself to us. We're currently in a public comment period that ends at the end of April. And then we will be convening in Johannesburg to go over those public comments.

So what these slides are, Avri - as Avri said, is slides that you use to talk about these things. And I've asked Alice to kind of merge into them the questions that you asked so that they could potentially be all in one place. And I'd love to just sort of open this up for discussion and get your questions answered as best as possible.

As an overarching theme I think we've regarded our job as perhaps providing some topic prioritization as opposed to, you know, actually setting policy which we definitely regarded as your job, and so we wanted to try and maintain that distinction which is why your name comes up quite a bit in the recommendations.

Do I have control of the slides or should I ask somebody to advance them? What's the best way to proceed?

Avri Doria: At the moment they are unsynced so anybody can move them. So unless you want them locked I would just sort of tell people which slide to go to.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. Perfect. Thanks, Avri. So I'm going to go to the - I'm going to go through the macro questions, which is the next slide. And this question has come up quite a bit about it expected that the PDP working group would accept the recommendations in the strict sense? And I think the answer is no. I think our task actually is to submit our recommendations to the Board and that technically they're the only body that's going to accept or reject the recommendations.

And so when we made these designations, it had more to do with who'd be implementing them or, you know, so who they were aimed at, if you will, more so than any kind of a strict acceptance of the recommendations. So, and that also helps to explain why there's sometimes more than one group associated with the recommendation if it was a more high level recommendation, sometimes it was not entirely clear exactly how to allocate the implementation of the recommendation.

One of the things that is different about this particular review, there's a number of things, but one of them is that the ICANN staff have asked that at least a subset of the review team remain intact after the final report in order to be around to help talk about implementation because there's been some complaints in the past that these recommendations were sort of thrown over the transom and then the implementation criticized by the review team and so it makes sense for the review team to remain engaged in the implementation.

And so I think that that begins to speak to your second question, which is that it's our intention as a review team and certainly the leadership of the review

team, to remain engaged and try to keep the lines of communication open and keep the discussions open, so as you say, policies that are designed to meet the spirit of the recommendation I think are definitely within the scope and that, you know, where the high level recommendation meets the details of actual policy development and implementation, it's inevitable that some change will take place. And so I think that's a very reasonable approach.

Avri Doria: Comments or questions?

Jonathan Zuck: I'm sorry?

Avri Doria: Okay, I see nobody. I was just checking to see if there were any comments or questions before…

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: Oh okay, yes sure. No problem. And, you know, I guess I also see the possibility in that - I'll have to look at that on a case by case but I see the possibility that there could be a conflicting outcome or something like that as well. I'll have to think about what an instance of that might be. But for the most part I think we imagine that that will lead to changes in implementation rather than direct contradiction to the things that you're - that you're assessing.

                 There was the high level comment about usage of words like should, must, may, etcetera, and may need more precision in their usage and so we will take that as feedback to go through that. I haven't gone through that exercise by any means with the team, but we can - anything that you guys identify as topics of concern where you see that problem then make sure that it's part of feedback that you give us either through official or unofficial channels and we'll make sure to take it into account when we're producing our final report.

And recommendations end with multiple parties, been more precise, so, yes, the second - that last paragraph we'll take into consideration as well. We ended up with a lot of recommendations, and I actually suspect that the net result of our discussions in Johannesburg and going through the comments will be fewer recommendations in a way that are merged together and things.

But we thought that keeping them more granular would make it easier to - for people to talk about things that, you know, at a smaller level. So I think there'll be some changes in that way, but we will try to make them as specific as possible and maybe break some of the recommendations down into what we thought were at the responsibilities of different groups for implementation.

So any questions about the high level sort of macro view? Okay.

So just going through the - these are your slides to which we've added your questions. None of this would be new to you. Slide Recommendation 10 looks like it's again, there's this notion of which PDP will be the right one and we're facing the same kind of confusion as we write the recommendations, but it's (unintelligible).

Right, so Recommendation 14, you know, came out of the Consumer Trust Sub Team of the review team. I know that Drew is on the line but I don't know if this is a topic for him. But broadly speaking, the surveys of end users revealed a kind of a risk and an opportunity. And that was that there appears to be some expectation in the public of a - of some kind of relationship between top level domains and the usage of those domains.

And so that expectation is interesting but it also means that, you know, when the next review team is looking at the impact on consumer trust, that if there's a complete disconnect between that, and a much less sort of semantic web, as is expected, that it could have some negative consequences to consumer trust.

And so we were talking about trying to create some incentives to match user expectations in that regard which is about sort of matching, having restrictions on TLDs because there is a post-association in the surveys between, you know, using that top level domain as a way to navigate the Web and to understand it better and the restrictions that were enforced were also sort of the preference of the end user.

Again, we tried to talk about this in less of a must type language, as you said, and more of something to be cautious of because the extent to which we're looking at consumer trust down the road we identified this as a risk.

Drew, are you on the call? And do you want to add anything to that?

Drew Bagley: I think you summed that up well. Yes, I would just say that, you know, examples we were thinking about when we first began analyzing this issue were that end users going to TLDs that ended with dotPhotography would likely expect the Website to have something to do with photography whether it's a photographer's Website or whether it's a blog about photography or, you know, a store selling photography products. Based on just the Nielsen data and our analysis of this topic, that that's what we had in mind was that that's where that trust relationship probably exists.

But as Jonathan indicated, this is the way this recommendation is, is to create incentives rather than to create mandates or any sort of hard handed thing that would, you know, ultimately alter the marketplace.

Jonathan Zuck: Are there other questions about that? And, I mean, again this may be a good opportunity for something that is in the spirit of the recommendation rather than the letter of it, I don't know, as that conversation moves forward. I think as much as anything it was identification of a risk in consumer trust associated with having something that appears to be a semantic web as a result of this big expansion, but it turns out wasn't. And I think that's - I think

it'll be, you know, obviously higher stakes in areas that people consider more sensitive even than dotPhotography, dotDoctor and things like that.

A couple of hands are up. Avri and Alan.

Avri Doria: Yes, I put mine just to make sure that we had hit the questions. So if I understood correctly by user expectation in terms of responding to our question how it could be defined, it was almost a - you know it when you see it type of definition and was there something beyond that? And also, there were concerns on how the expectations perhaps not - and such do move into the territory of content and is that what's being said is that there's an expectation of content managing the expected definition of a TLD word?

And so I guess there's - there were those questions and I just wanted to make sure that those came out and whether I had understood correctly when you were saying user expectations you kind of know them when you see them. Thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: Right. Thanks, Avri. And I guess when we say that - if I understand your question it be that the end user would know it when he or she saw it was the user expectation. And so, I mean, I think that - and again, the survey - this was part of a larger survey on trust as opposed to something where we delve deeply into this particular topic and could understand it better.

But there were a number of questions that came back in that survey that suggested that there was a user expectation that the top level domain would be an indicator of use. And I don't know that that applies as much to - I mean, I guess it comes down to the definition of content. I don't think it's meant to apply so much to content as it is to the who, if you will. I think it, you know, it might come down more to services and things like that.

But it's a - I think there's an expectation and for better or for worse that I can use the top level domains as a semantic, you know, categorization of the

web, if you will. And that they were in favor of restrictions like dotBank and dotPharmacy. And I suspect that you and I both could guess the kinds of areas where that would be more a useful and more important than others, right?

You know, so dotPhotography, as an example, probably isn't the highest priority but there's going to be others where they want to kind of trust that that top level domain is an indicator of usage, I guess, I'll say more so, than content. But I'm not saying it isn't tricky but sort of pointing out this risk. Alan, go ahead, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. It seems to me that when we're talking about - expression of like user trust, consumer trust and user expectations, and you're using the term semantic web where you have some presumption based on the name of what the contents might be or who the suppliers are, that's almost playing a cruel trick on users.

That is you've set them up, you know, with, you know, dotBank as an example, of something you can trust but then you come to the next one and it's a complete blank slate. You don't - the user doesn't have a real clue as to whether it is trustworthy or not or what their expectation should be. And that's almost like playing a cruel trick. So how can we use the term "consumer trust" when there is such an unknown ahead when the user comes to a new TLD they haven't seen before?

Jonathan Zuck: And, Alan, that's an excellent question. And I think one that deserves further consideration because I think that cruel trick is exactly what we've identified as a risk given the survey responses. And so the question, and maybe, you know, given one of your macro questions about the spirit of the recommendation, it could be that consumer education is a component of this as much as incentives to adhere to a more semantic web so that people - so that we help people to understand or we come up with a way to signify that

there is some sort of enforced PIC associated with a particular domain because they are going to vary.

And I think that there's high downstream likelihood of a degradation of trust, which we found has not yet occurred, right, but that - but see it as a real risk going forward and how do we then try to mitigate that risk going forward is the real sort of spirit behind this recommendation. So I think we're in a - same place philosophically, Alan, and the question is what the right thing is to do without getting ICANN into the, you know, content management business and what is the best model to try and give the user what they're expecting from this rapid expansion.

I see Alan, did you raise your hand again? Did you want to follow back up or should I go to Paul?

Alan Greenberg: Just a very quick one. I'll note last time around a little bit belatedly, before the TLDs were evaluated but after they were already applied-for, the GAC made a pretty strong statement on TLDs associated with highly regulated industries. I'm going to presume that they are going to say something like that again earlier this time. And I'm wondering to what extent…

Jonathan Zuck: That's right.

Alan Greenberg: …you expect that and consider just how that could be implemented or what the impact would be on the program?

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, thanks, Alan. And they did say that and I think they'll say it again and I think that there will be, as I said, I think those comments are now reinforced by end user expectations. And so I think it is something that we're going to have look at hard in highly regulated industries. So there's some talk about trying to engage those industries in addition to whoever is, you know, applying for a string. I mean, everybody applying for a new string is not going

to love this news, but, I mean, I think that trying to make sure that something like that is in place is going to be a part of enforcing consumer trust.

Paul, go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady for the record. I guess I just don't understand at a basic level how strings become more trustworthy if ICANN gets into the content space rather than how it's being handled now and use dotBank as an example, when the trust comes from who the registrants at the second level are. There's no - the reason why people trust dotBank registrations is because on the second level, they correspond to the same as trademarks of well-known banks that people trust; not because people aren't using dotBank TLDs for things unrelated to banking.

So I guess I don't know how - what was, you know, what in this survey got us to leap from a well-qualified group of second level registrants as a mechanism of trust to gee whiz, now we're going to get involved in how, you know, how people are using them to, you know, police and enforce trust at compliance, you know, upon pain of compliance? How do we get there from where we are which seems to work where we're going which seems unyielding? Thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks, Paul. And I think that's a good point. I mean, obviously we need to get beyond well-known brands, right, even in the banking space for that TLD to be successful and for everybody to be able to - for competition to remain alive and well in the banking space. And so there are some commitments that dotBank made and adhering to those commitments is a function of ICANN Compliance today.

So I don't think anybody is talking about anything different from that. And the recommendation is about incenting, making those kinds of commitments that do have ICANN as a ultimate enforcer, if you will, to those commitments. But, I mean, they are ultimately - it is ultimately about the applicant and the

framework they put in place for allowing people to buy (unintelligible) and having restrictions on those - on those applications instead of just making everything into a generic, you know, again, particularly in regulated spaces.

So, I mean, I think that that's something that we need to think about from a policy perspective without maybe making it mandatory because we don't know where to draw the line. But I think there's going to be an end user expectation there on pharmacies and doctors and things like that where it's not well known brands but is, instead, you know, some qualification that, you know, they've passed the bar if it's a dotLawyer or something like that.

So, I mean, I think that's the - that's the implication rather than having ICANN review, you know, and being the ultimate enforcer of things, I think the idea is that they're the last defense by having the ability to tell an applicant that they have to keep the promises that they made when they applied basically.

Yes, Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Thanks. Avri speaking. One thing I wanted to say that I had written into - in the chat just to make sure that it said that the comments and statements put out by the GAC that have gone before are already part of the set of issues that we need to address. So I assume that it will be - things will be said again but they - things that have already been said in comment are on our list of things to consider.

The other thing I wanted to say is that I want to make sure that we have time to go through all of these and that while it's important to mention the comments or the questions we have to make sure we understand exactly what they're saying and where they're leading, the actual comments that we need to submit by the end of the month would be a separate exercise and don't necessarily only get made in today's conversation.

And then I guess I'll read - we had John Laprise that said, "Are we distinguishing end user from organizational/system trust?" Oops, it just went away.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, it's right there on the right. It sounds like we're…

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Okay. That's right.

Jonathan Zuck: So and this is…

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: …basically Paul had a comment - okay, please.

Jonathan Zuck: Sorry, yes, so I don't want to have this one topic take over but I think it'll be an ongoing discussion for sure, which is why we didn't have, you know, all the answers in our recommendation. And we are talking about end user trust and end user expectations, not institutional. And I think the answer to Paul's question is, is that we see this expectation as a risk for future trust.

And so finding the right answer to that I think is the - a key to maintaining or holding steady as Paul said on trust. So but anyways we'll keep this conversation going. I mean, we don't need to just wait for formal channels, please feel free to reach out if a particular area of interest and we'll talk about it more because we want to make these recommendations as useful as possible.

Should I move on, Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, probably.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay thanks. The Recommendation 33 is about data collection. And you are right, this is something that's aimed more at ICANN. And there are a lot of recommendations about more data. I mean, there's a - there was definitely some frustration with data availability for doing the competition analysis, for understanding the role of individual safeguards, etcetera. And so there's a number of data oriented recommendations for the team that are hopefully - will be useful to everyone going forward and not just future CCT reviews.

So, you know, the idea will be to make data available to whomever could use it and hopefully in time for your use. And again, some of this is going to require refinements and implementation as well.

Avri Doria: Yes, so…

Jonathan Zuck: Okay.

Avri Doria: …this is Avri. I've seen hands on that one. So it was only, you know, the consideration we came up that we're not sure that that data would be available by the time we needed to make our decisions but acknowledged that. Thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: That's right. I mean, and it's up to control for time. One of the things that I guess is worth mentioning at a high level that we mention in the report is that we came up with this priority level system. The new bylaws that came out of the IANA transition accountability framework suggested review teams need to say whether or not the recommendations are prerequisites for further activity or not and it was more binary and we included that in here but then wanted to come up with something for things that weren't considered prerequisites but had a high priority, etcetera.

And so we came up with a high, medium and low priority that had a time associated with it. So the high priority items have about an 18-month turn around for implementation that will help address that to some extent. But I

think you're right, there's going to be plenty of things that happen too late for you to consider and it'll have to be part of the ongoing process.

So DNS abuse, again, is about, again, ICANN…

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: …moving to Recommendation 34 would be good.

Jonathan Zuck: I'm sorry, go ahead. I didn't hear what you just said, Avri, sorry.

Avri Doria: Sorry, I must have a terrible lag.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay so, yes, we're on Recommendation 34. I apologize. I might not have even said that.

Avri Doria: Just go on. I must have a terrible lag because I was telling you to move on to 34.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. Yes, Recommendation 34 is the one we're talking about, repeating the DNS abuse survey to keep track of whether or not abuse is, you know, increasing and where it's increasing. And so this is something that I feel we'll understand better ourselves once we get our first DNS abuse report. Drew, I don't know, do you want speak up and speak to this particular recommendation quickly?

Drew Bagley: Sorry, I was on mute. Yes, so with this, as Jonathan said, we're going to know a lot more once the data comes in, and I'm sure this will develop into a much more specific recommendation. But just based on all of the research we've done so far, based on all the conversations we've had, there's obviously a lot of opinions in the community about the effect new gTLDs have had on DNS abuse.

And there's so many variables that go into DNS abuse, whether you're looking at safeguards in place or looking at price and promotions, you're looking at the policies of a particular TLD or just the way - how good they are at enforcing their policies or how well they implement existing ICANN policies.

And so with all that said, along with many other recommendations, we think this is an area where it's necessary to have ongoing regular data to inform policy decisions not only with regard to what recommendations we ultimately come up with but going forward with the community we think this would be very wise and important for the existence of the current new gTLDs as well as any potential expansion to have this data coming in regularly and tweaked and nuanced and the study improved upon.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay, any questions about Recommendation 34? All right, seeing no hands I'm going to move on. I think, to Recommendation 35. This is, again, speaks to the other issue about voluntary restrictions, etcetera, and look at the costs and benefits of implementing various registration restrictions.

Again, this goes back to this idea of consumer trust and trying to do a kind of cost benefit that as you say, may lead to a different outcome that once you've had a chance to analyze the cost benefit associated with this. And we are just identifying a risk associated with it. Drew, is there anything you want to add on the description of this, answer these questions? They're similar high level questions.

Drew Bagley: No, similar to the last one. I think you covered it well.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. So I'm going to move on to Recommendation 36. Yes, I think - I'm not - I'm going to take this back as a recommendation from you to clarify what "undue" means because I don't have a good definition for you here. So let me just take back 36 and I'll get back to you on that since Jordyn's not on the call.

Thirty-eight you guys are good with. Drew, do you want to speak to this? This had to do, I think, with PICs not being reviewable in time so it was about stating up front what your PICs were going to be so that there would be enough time for everyone to review them as they weren't added on at the last minute without an opportunity for review by the public or the GAC. Drew, do you want to speak to this?

Drew Bagley: Yes, so the way that the voluntary public interest commitments came about in the first place, you know, was in a somewhat complicated way so that applicants at the time really - they had fewer than 30 days to even come up with voluntary PICs are part of their application and what not.

And so our suggestion is going forward and to the extent that voluntary PICs are used, the proper mechanism for ensuring that they are actually in the public interest would be to provide enough time for all members of the community to weigh in and that would provide the safeguard to ensure that these commitments are going to be binding and enforceable, that they are actually in the public interest as determined by the community. And so we want to make sure going forward there's plenty of time for that.

Jonathan Zuck: Any questions about that? Okay.

Paul McGrady: This is Paul. Not a question so much as a statement that says that's terrific but what that will require is that at some point everybody quits tinkering with what the obligations and rules are. In the last round we had tinkering up to the last minute. And you can't do all your PICs up front if somebody else is entering this new obligation later in the program. Thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: You're absolutely right, Paul. So I think that - I think that's understood. So down here on Recommendation 43, this is a - a particularly open ended in a way because we - one of the things we were asked to do was look at the quote unquote effectiveness of the application and evaluation process.

And one of the observations of the review team was the particularly low application rate of - from the global south. And we did made some attempts to understand that low application rate and in some instances there were some inequities. For example, the applicant - the Nielsen applicant survey revealed that most applicants made use of third party support when doing their applications and it wasn't clear, you know, that these services were available in the global south.

And it was also - there was a kind of focus group of applicant cohorts in the global south that reported that information did not reach them in a timely fashion because of the mechanisms that were used for outreach. And so there's some recommendations for improving the outreach program and a couple of the other programs so that - to level the playing field a little bit.

But I think we also wanted to take a step back and in essence ask the same question that you're asking, which is should our objective be getting more applications from the global south or should our - that could be making sure that everyone in the global south that might apply finds out in time to do so, you know, and should outreach efforts be focused on second level registrations that are still quite low in the global south.

And so I think that the community making a priority around applications from the global south would dictate what actions should be taken going forward. And I guess we weren't ready to make the decision that applications are the priority. And so we think that that's a further discussion that needed to be broader. And if the decision is made that application themselves are the priority then I think that leads to a different set of recommendations about building our case studies and things like that and doing a great deal more hand-holding to generate applications from the global south.

So I guess we considered the objective itself to still be something to which the community needs to commit. I hope that makes sense. Alan, go ahead please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I note that you say that the global south needs to be defined. And I'm certainly not the one to define it. But let me use a different term that is somewhat relevant to this discussion and that's the developing world or the countries with developing economies. IDNs…

Jonathan Zuck: Right.

Alan Greenberg: …to a large extent overlap with that a fair amount, not 100% but a fair amount. Was there any attempt to look at who the TLDs were targeted at even if they were applied for by someone who doesn't fit into the global south definition but the audiences targeted that because acceptance of those in second level registrations might give some interesting data.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, thanks, Alan. We didn't go into great detail there. And this particular recommendation is not about targeting the developing economies but was based on an observation of applications by businesses in developing economies, to use your terminology. And so it's a separate kind of issue because again, one solution is to make sure that companies in the developing world are putting TLDs in place that are designed to meet the needs of end users in the developing world but this question in particular was about applications from businesses and entities in the developing world .

And so I guess the question again was deciding whether a priority to get those applications and then there's a set of recommendations that would sort of come into play if the decision was made that getting actual applications from entities in the developing world was in fact a priority. I hope that makes sense.

Any other questions? I have a feeling this is something I'm going to end up staying engaged on past our final report.

Avri Doria: Looks like you can move on to 46.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, that's where I'm moving onto. I'm just reading it quickly. The whole slide doesn't show up at once on my screen and so I'm sort of scrolling around to make sure I'm reading your comments again. You're absolutely right, it's inconsistent terminology and so for that I just apologize. That is meant to be the same as global south or developing economies, etcetera. And the - and again, I think that this is one of those recommendations that's contingent on a community to try to promote actual applications from entities in the developing world.

And so I think the question is a valid one about whether it should pertain to more than just operating costs, as you say, but even if it is the application it was a very unused or underused program in the previous round and sort of put in place in the last minute. A lot of people weren't even aware that it existed and so I think that that's a conversation - it almost goes without saying a conversation for the - going forward if there's a decision that we really want to spur applications from the developing world.

And so it could be that it needs to go beyond the application. But if nothing else we want that issue and that issue may become less relevant if application costs come down (unintelligible). But for the most part, you know, what we've found is that there are entities in the developing world that have the money to do this, and that it was a fairly low rated obstacle to entry - the money. It was more about knowledge and understanding, successful business models, etcetera, for entry into this market because, you know, demonstrating that the ROI was a bigger priority than subsidization of it.

Avri Doria: See no hands.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, I don't see any hands so I'm moving to Recommendation 47. And so the part of this recommendation that was aimed at you guys was in the creation of the Applicant Guidebook providing a kind of template or guidelines for the submission of advice by GAC. It was about facilitating, you know, more clarity

from the GAC by kind of dictating the format you wanted to receive advice in the first place. That was the - that's the answer to your question. Does that make sense?

Avri Doria: Seems so. I see no hands.

Jonathan Zuck: All right. So I'm moving to 48. Already being considered, no questions, excellent. Forty-nine, already being considered. No questions.

Avri Doria: And I see no hands.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes. So now I'm on Recommendation 50, and again, I think this is going to be - given the priority level of this recommendation, might have completed this work, this recommendation needed to be directed at a different party. Okay, I'll take that back as advice to us and we'll look at your comments of Recommendation 50 and who they're directed at.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: Thank you.

Avri Doria: And that's the last one. So again…

Jonathan Zuck: Okay.

Avri Doria: Yes, I'd like to ask, does anyone have any questions at all, even if they occurred earlier in terms of this? I guess our next step now that we've gotten our questions clarified will be to decide on a comment that are more substantive should we have them. And that we can talk about further. And I want to thank, you know, Jonathan and - so Jordyn didn't end up here, okay, I was just looking at the names before.

Jonathan Zuck: You got Drew though.

Avri Doria: Yes, no and very much appreciate it, yes. And just wanted to get a chance for anyone else that had a last question, a last clarifying question before we thanked and they could leave if they wished. Okay, well thank you so much. And people are dropping off now. But thank you very much for coming and for having the several meetings with us to try and get clarification on the stuff both in person in Copenhagen and since, very much appreciate it. Thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: No, Avri, thanks for having us. And let's just keep the lines of communication open.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks.

Drew Bagley: Yes, thanks for having us.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: All right. You're welcome to stay because of course we'll be happy to have your participation in getting it done. But, you know, that's up to you. Thanks. Okay.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks.

Avri Doria: So going to AOB, we basically, since we didn't do a quick go-around of the subgroups and it feels sort of bereft of having done so and then probably should say a few words about the drafting teams just to have said a few words about them. So on the work team, is there someone from the Subgroup 1 that wants to give an update or remind us of anything? Do we actually have the chairs of that group with us? I don't think we do, do we? Don't see Sara. Oh, Christa, I see your hand up. Sorry, I was scouring through the thing. Please, Christa. Am I the only one that doesn't hear you? Okay.

Well we'll come back to Christa. And from Subgroup 2, anyone from that group who's got a mic? Yes, I see Michael so please, Michael. And please remember to give names.

Michael Flemming: Yes, my name is Michael Flemming. Thank you, Avri. So this week on the Work Track 2 call we will have a meeting on Thursday at 21 UTC. And this week we will be continuing our discussion on closed generics. Last week we discussed closed generics to look at the pros and cons from the public comment that was requested by ICANN and whether or not to establish criteria for closed generics. Much of the feedback on the call was oriented more so towards the pros of the closed generics, I believe.

And this week we'd like to actually look at the cons further to establish the potential harm and give analysis to see if we can address it. I welcome and look forward to speaking with everyone on that call. Thank you very much. Have a good night.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Michael. Kavouss, I have you next.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I have to leave the Adobe Connect, to other meeting but I continue to listen on audio. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Christa, do you have your microphone - oh, let me first check and see if there are any questions for Michael? I see no hands. Now, okay, Christa, do you have your microphone working?

Christa Taylor: I think so. Can you hear me?

Avri Doria: Yes I can.

Christa Taylor: Awesome. So tomorrow we have a call at 2000, which is noon Pacific Standard Time. Our topics are pretty basic, we're going to be going back and further discussing costing as per the last conversation we had and taking a

little bit further on floors and ceilings and the potential there. And then we're going to get into the registry - or the program - the RSP program and some of the requirements there. We'll be discussing some of Donna's proposal and getting further into that discussion. So really only two topics but that's where we'll be going tomorrow so hopefully everyone will join us. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you very much. Any questions? I don't see any. So then move on to - okay, Christa, did you put your - oh no, okay. So then - and I guess your other one hand up is sort of a remnant from before. Okay.

Anyone from Subgroup 3? Robin, are you the chair on call? Yes, Robin, I see your hand. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Hi, can you hear me okay?

Avri Doria: Yes I can. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Okay, great. So our Work Track 3 next call is today at 2000 UTC so it's in just about five hours from now. And I want - of course want to encourage everybody to participate. What we're going to be talking about today is we're going to continue with our discussion of the community issues, community objections, community applications, the community priority evaluations process. We're going to continue discussion of the report, the Council of Europe report which had some ideas with respect to community issues.

We can - we're going to continue discussing some of the issues that were raised in our last call on March 7 and in particular a discussion about do the people see the costs of community applications outweighing any benefits from the concept. So I'm hoping that all of you will be interested in discussing these topics in about five hours from now and will join the call.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much. Any comments or questions? Seeing or hearing none, and I do encourage people to attend that one. And we'll move on to Subgroup 4. I guess Rubens left but I see Cheryl has her hand up. Cheryl, please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Avri. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. This is another sort of non-update for Work Track 4. We (unintelligible) meeting of late last week and our next meeting is scheduled for the - for me it's the 21st so I guess for the rest of the world it's the 20th of April at 2000 UTC. And at that meeting I'm relatively confident that we will be as planned for our last meeting, continuing our conversation with name collisions as one of the primary topics. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you very much. Any questions or comments? Okay, seeing none, so that goes for the subgroups and the meetings continue. In terms of the drafting teams, we've re-stabilized on who's going to participate. The email lists are activated and first draft, first thought drafts for the - each of those will be appearing over the next week or so. Steve, I don't know if you want to add anything to the update on those teams since I guess you've been monitoring them and such, but I'll pause for a moment. Yes, I see your hand. Please go ahead.

Steve Chan: Thanks. Thanks, Avri. This is Steve Chan from staff. So I would clarify that the update from those drafting teams I think first thought draft would probably go just to that group at this time. So staff is trying to put together at least some initial thoughts on those so that the members of the drafting teams have something to react against. Of course we welcome any thoughts that they might have already, but the thought is that we'll get initial drafts out to the drafting teams so they have something to react against and refine so that can be shared with the wider working group. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Steve. Thanks for clarifying. I did mean that they were going to the drafting teams, not that they were coming to the full meeting. And if I gave the wrong impression I truly appreciate that you corrected it. Any questions or

comments on those? Okay so we should be seeing further reports and further activity on those in the coming weeks.

I guess the last thing I have before I call this meeting over, but I will ask for any other business, is just to remind people of community comments 2 and the need to help whatever group you are in try and get responses to the questions that they feel they have an answer for.

So I've gotten some feedback already on some people telling me that the questions are well put and so hopefully that will help people come up with answers. And I don't have anything else. I don't know if anybody has any comment on that process. And I'll ask again if there is any other business. Otherwise we can end this call a little early.

Oh, Donna, please, I see your hand up.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Avri. Donna Austin. Would it be possible for you to provide an update to this group about what's happening on the Geographic Names Webinar? I'm interested to understand how many people you think might be speaking during the webinar and how we move forward into the session for Johannesburg. So any update would be appreciated. Thanks, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Actually thank you for reminding because there really should have been update on that on the agenda. So I apologize for having left it off. So we've passed the deadline, which I believe was the 7th, for speakers. There is a list of speakers on one of the wiki pages. I don't happen to have that open in front of me. But perhaps someone from staff could quickly put it in the - there it is, list of presenters is available. Thank you, Emily. Thought I had it open before the meeting but I didn't.

So the list of presenters is there in terms of the groups and the individual presenters. They now need to have presentations by the 18th. And basically as suggested, attend the initial presentation and then be available to answer

the questions. We're suggesting a maximum of five slides per position. So that's where we are on that one at the moment. I don't know if there are any questions, let me go back to our page.

And yes, Ed, the last piece of this is that we are in the process or perhaps Steve can add, Steve or Emily can add to that, we're in the process of requesting the sessions for Johannesburg in order to do the third, you know, the next step in this. So there is a - I guess a draft of a request to ask for this meeting to be - the meetings in Johannesburg to be scheduled. I don't know if there's anything add, Steve or Emily, to that.

I either don't see a hand or I have lag in seeing hands. If there's a hand that I don't see please just speak up.

Kavouss Arasteh: Avri? Do you hear me?

Avri Doria: No, Steve has nothing to add. Yes, who's speaking?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, Kavouss is speaking. Just…

Avri Doria: Okay.

Kavouss Arasteh: …on the list of presenters, Luc's a presenter for the Geographic Names, is there anyone from GAC or not? Because we are (unintelligible) and there are people doing the job on that. Just I want to know whether there is anyone from GAC (unintelligible) or presenter list. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. We do have listed the GAC Working Group on the Protection of Geographic Names. I'm not sure - and Steve, correct me, I'm not sure we've nailed down exactly who but we've got a commitment from the working group to speak.

Kavouss Arasteh: I suggest that please send a reminder to Olga Cavalli who is leading this team in GAC and (unintelligible) ask her whether herself or someone else would be speaking on this issue. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Yes, we have been following up with the people that are speaking and will follow up. Thank you. Yes, it was Susan Payne is saying that Olga gave the expression of interest. So but we're not sure whether she's actually the speaker or not but we'll get all that worked out over the next week. And okay and I see Donna, the level of presentation was adequate so that's good.

Anything else on that - anything else that should have been included in this meeting that I forgot about? Any other business? If not, I thank you and I adjourn this meeting. And I encourage you all to use the time for CC2 encouragement and getting ready for the next subgroup meeting. So thank you all and the meeting is adjourned.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Avri. Bye.

END