ICANN Transcription

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group

Monday, 15 May 2017 at 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group Meeting on the Monday, 15 May 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/CNTRAw

Audio may be found at: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-15may17-en.mp3 AND

https://participate.icann.org/p178uck7kt0/

Coordinator: The conference has started.

Michelle DeSmyter: All right, thank you (Nicole). Well good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to all. Welcome to the New GTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on the 15th of May, 2017 at 1500 UTC.

In the interest of time today there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. So if you're only on the audio bridge would you please let yourselves be known now.

Gertrude Levine: Yes, I'm on audio only. This is Gg Levine.

Michelle DeSyter: Thank you (Gg), we'll note that. Hearing no further names. I would like to remind all participants to 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: Thank you very much and hello to all. Welcome to our meeting. Hope everybody had a good and productive week off from all new GTLD subsequent procedures group meetings. And welcome back to the meetings again.

First I want to mention the - actually no, let's go through the agenda. So the first thing will be the welcome. And the SOI checks. Then there's the work track update. Then we'll have a GDP Summit recap. I know a fair amount of you were there so we'll not only ask for recap but we'll also ask for the views of others who attended.

Then talking about the drafting team update and we're going to be looking at the different TLD types and the initial doc that was put there. And then we go to community comment to update on where we're at on it. Then ICANN 59 planning and then any other business.

First, does anybody have any other - an item of any other business they'd like to see added to the agenda? I don't hear or see anything. So and any changes or objections to the agenda? Any comments? Okay, fine. Seeing nothing, I'll go with that agenda.

Okay, just wanted to check on statements of interest, want to make sure that everyone has one, that they're keeping it updated. And want to ask if there's now anyone that would like to a (unintelligible) to a change in their statement of interest that's especially relevant to this working group effort? I see none, I hear none.

I still see people are coming in. Greetings to people. So the next thing on the agenda is the work track updates. Who do we have from work track one that's willing to give that agenda? I mean give that update.

Christa Taylor: Me.

Avri Doria: Christa Taylor yes, I saw your - that you're speaking.

Christa Taylor: I'm sorry just a quick update for work track one. Tomorrow we have a meeting at the same time, different place. We'll be continuing the discussion on the register service provider accreditation program. And later today I'll share a link to the document that we were discussing last week that has developed a little bit more. And I don't know if we have some (unintelligible) to a secondary project but that will be the primary. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much. Any comments or questions? Okay, seeing none. Work on two - work track two. Who would like to speak to that? Yes, Michael Flemming, please. Michael Flemming? I don't know if you're muted but I don't hear you. Am I the only one not hearing? Michael Flemming you can't be heard. I don't know if it's your microphone or...

Okay, (Phil) are you able to give it? Or should we continue and come back around to Michael Flemming. Okay, thank you (Phil), I'll continue. Work track three. Who can give that update please? Karen. Please go ahead.

Karen Day: Hi Avri, hi everyone. This is Karen Day for the record. Work track three (will be) having our next meeting next week on Tuesday the 23rd at the 1500 time slot. We have been focusing the last couple of meetings on applicant freedom of expression. And as well as the geo-names and the community issues.

I'm going to be - we're going to be sending out some emails to the list this week to hopefully get some feedback on where we want to focus in our next

meeting. If we want to stick to our agenda and move on to our next topic or if we want to continue to dive in on these current issues. I've seen some comments this morning on the main group list with regard to communities that I think we're going to get into when we start talking about the different drafting team updates.

So that may be that it - people feel like it's a good time to go back to that topic after we talk about it today. So anyway look for some email coming in the next day or so. And we will get back to work on the 23rd. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much Karen. Does anybody have any questions or comments? Okay, I don't see any so I'll move on. Work track four?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Avri, Cheryl here.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Please Cheryl go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Avri. Cheryl Lindenore here for the record. And (Revan) says tendered his apologies for today's meetings. So just me I'm afraid. Our work track four meets on Thursday the 25th of May at the 1500 time slot for 60 minutes. And we will be continuing our conversation regarding name collisions.

But it's rather rewarding I think to know that we will be having Patrik Faltstrom -- Chair of SSAC -- attending this next call. And we will be looking specifically at the SSAC - the various SSAC advances regarding name collisions and a few other matters at this call. So it's - if you've got an interest in this particular topic it's a very worthwhile call to come along and join us. Even if you're not a listed member of work track four.

And to that end those of you who are on work track four list there's been an excellent little primer of preparatory reading links sent to you. And if anyone who isn't on that list would like to benefit from those I'm pretty sure that list is

on our wiki space. But I'm sure staff would also forward that reading list to you so you can bring yourselves better up to speed on this very important topic. That's it from me Avri, thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much Cheryl. Any comments or questions? I see typing - no there was no typing. Okay, in which case I'll go back to work tree - work track two. Michael Flemming, are you able to speak at this point? Yes, I hear you.

Michael Flemming: You can? Okay, perfect. Thank you very much and apologies about that little technical difficulty. For this week we have a meeting at 21 UTC on Thursday the - which day of the week is that -- there's 15 so I'm going to assume that's the 18th or the 19th if I have my math correct. But we will be speaking about the registrar non-discrimination as well as the registry registrar standardization I believe.

Big interest on this is the vertical integration (where we'll view - we'll be) opening up and providing a bit of history on the subject. And then we're going to kind of see if we want to go into this more in-depth. We're going to have - the leadership is going to be doing some time to plan for the upcoming meeting but where it's - we're looking to have (Phil) leading the - this call.

So it's going to be an interesting one I think. But I look forward to having everyone on the call. Thank you very much.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much Michael Flemming. Any questions or comments? Okay. There was a question from Susan Payne asking whether non-members of the work track can join the calls. And I believe that -- and please correct me anybody on the leadership team if this is not correct -- but I believe anybody in the main group that has an SOI in place can indeed join.

And others can also sometimes join but we need to make some sort of special arrangements for, you know, guests and others that have a specific

expertise to join. But I do believe that if you have an SOI in place you can join the call. I don't know if there's any comments on that. Yes, Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, this is Jeff Neuman. Just to add to that (on) certain calls we do invite people to attend as well. For example, on the last call we had for plan - - I'm sorry for work track two -- where we talked about brand generics. We invited certain people that we knew had expressed opinions in previous comment periods. So for example we had Milton Mueller. And I think we had (Cathy Klyman) attend, but she formally joined the group. So there could be others depending on topics as well. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay, yes, thank you Jeff. That was indeed what I was trying to say and thank you for making it so much clearer. But as I say, anybody that's in - has an SOI in the main group. That's part of the reason we talk about them, if -- even if you're not interested in actually full time as it were on one of the work tracks and sometimes it almost does seem like full time work for some people -- you're welcome to join the call without making a full commitment to the work track.

Okay. Seeing no more on the work track updates. Last week the GDD Summit was held. Jeff and various other members and participants of this working group were there. I'd like to ask Jeff to start off a recap. And then after that I'd like to open the floor and get other people to mention other things that they thought were important about that meeting that people in this group should know about. So Jeff, please. You're first. Jeff? Okay, now I need to make sure that I'm being heard.

Jeff Neuman: Well...

Avri Doria: Oh there you are.

Jeff Neuman: ...okay. Thanks. All right, so, yes, sorry about that. So the first thing I want to do is caveat the discussion with a lot of the people that attend - well GDD

Summit is intended for contracted parties. So registries, registrars, their consultants. And so a lot of the people that participate in the GDD Summit are obviously not members of this group. Some of them, you know, don't pay attention to the policy processes that go on. And so they come with their own individual agendas.

So I only caveat that with the fact that -- or because -- there were things that came out of the meeting that -- in theory -- could not necessarily be counter to what our work - we're doing, but at times were a little frustrating because they were not aware of the work that we're doing. So, with that said there was some discussion on the first day.

There are a number of contracted parties that would like to see subsequent procedure sooner rather than later. So there was some discussion on the first day that some registries wanted ICANN staff to set a date by which the next (card) round or window opening would be. So there was definitely a number of people asking for ICANN to just set the date.

A number of people believe that if ICANN sets a date that would give more incentive to groups like ours and the other reviews and things going on to finish up our work on time. And you know, so long as keep our eye on those - (that) date. Obviously there are a number of issues that I don't think they're resolved. And so, you know, making that date -- if they do set a date -- which I'm - I'm not convinced that they will.

You know, if they did, if ICANN staff did set a date (over the fourth) you know, there'd be a lot of work to do by then. And I'm not sure how realistic setting such a date would actually be. That said, there was also a comment made by (Akram) who said that - well, just (say) there was also some discussion of whether (Akram) and ICANN staff could in parallel get implementation discussions.

And, you know, writing the next version of the guide book, they were developing its systems, preparing its systems in parallel with (unintelligible) work going on. (Akram) -- I believe rightly -- said well there are a number of items that I think are gating items. In which, you know, we can't even begin to start rewriting any procedural aspects or implementation aspects until we have certain items decided.

For example, is it going to be a first come first serve? Will it be in quote rounds? Or will it be some other mechanism? And then he also discussed a few other items -- that may be what I call gating items -- before they could even (join) to think about parallel processing or parallel, you know, trying to draw up implementation.

It's understood -- and I think agreed upon by a lot of the community -- that, you know, we don't want it to wait until the policy process is completely over before ICANN staff starts its implementation discussions. Otherwise we could be looking at a number of years after we finish our process.

That said, when the - when implementation work can start is obviously a matter of debate amongst members of the community and I'm sure even amongst members of this group. So getting this big agreement on a precise definition of when that should begin would be difficult.

That said, I did ask (Akram) -- you know, since he was saying there are a number of gating items -- I did ask (Akram) if he could produce a list of what those gating items would be or could be. So that we as a group could consider them and in theory prioritize them if that's something this group wanted to do. Without knowing what the items are -- at least in (Akram)'s mind -- you know, we could have no way of prioritizing what he would deem -- or ICANN staff would deem -- to be essential in order to start parallel processing.

Again, there's no policy that's decided on in the GDD or any of these types of summit. It's really just a discussion between contracted parties and ICANN staff. It's not meant at all to replace the policy process. And so, you know, we'll look to see if (Akram) produces this list. Also we can then decide -- once this list is produced -- whether we want that to help set a priority for those issues.

And, you know, if anyone wants to listen to these sessions they were all recorded I believe. And so they - we can - I guess (Emily) did send some notes around to everyone. I know it was initially only intended to be for the leadership team but she accidentally send it to everyone. Which is good because now everyone's got the notes anyway. And we weren't going to change any of those notes. So it's actually good that she sent it out to everyone.

The other thing - and there were some other subjects that were touched upon that we - that relate to the work in our group. Things like application fees and whether there should be a (bonus) applied really to the last round in terms of whether there should be a refund of those excess application fees. In theory, you know, those discussions relate to future rounds or future application windows as well.

There was some discussion on transitioning ICANN registries or assigning registries from entity to another. Although those issues related to existing registries and did not per se relate to the issue we're discussing in work track one, it's the RSP program. You know, there are some parallels that can be drawn between those.

So those were just some of the issues that were discussed at the GDD. Again, it was not to set policy, not to supplant work that we do. It was just an expression of a number of contracted parties that, you know, want to see a process move forward. I'd be happy to take any questions. I know that there's some questions in the chat, so I'll go back.

There's a question that says, you know, could -- (Martin) says -- could GNSO set a target date? Yes, I guess the GNSO council could set a target date if they wanted to. I'm not sure that they would without our input. But I'm sure the GNSO Council has managers of the policy process in theory could set a date.

And let's see. Just going through here. Trang Nguyen says that there will be - they're working on that list of issues. So that they can get that around. (Jorge says thanks to the recap. Sounds very much like important policy discussions but without some important stakeholders being there. Yes, (Jorge). Obviously there were items that touched on policy, no decisions being made.

I think, you know, this was just a forum for contracted parties to express their views. Much like there's a non-contracted parties summit or whatever that's called where they can express their views. Much like the GAC expresses its views separate from everybody else. I think it was just a forum for contracted parties to express their views on these (subjects).

But there's no decisions that are made -- as (Donna) says -- and everything that's policy related is brought back to this group. So I hope I prioritize things. You know, you can't stop people from expressing their opinions whenever and wherever they want to. And we're an open community and a multi stakeholder community where we should be encouraging these opinions.

And I did stand up to the mic several times -- and if you listen to the recording you will hear that -- about trying to get everyone who was concerned about certain issues to participate in this group if they want their thoughts heard and discussed. So that's my initial feedback. And if anyone's got questions I'm happy to answer.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you Jeff. Trang Nguyen I see your hand is up so please go ahead.

Trang Nguyen: Thanks Avri and thanks Jeff. This is Trang Nguyen for the record. Yes, Jeff thank you. You're correct, (Akram) did speak about a few items that we believe would fundamentally change. But based on the outcome of the discussion with either fundamentally change the implementation at the next round or not. And so those are the list of items that we're working on pulling together for the group.

And I just wanted to make sure that the group understands that -- from and ICANN perspective -- we don't view those items as gating factors to starting implementation. Or to open the next round. They're really items that, you know, it would be really helpful for us -- from an implementation planning perspective -- if we have some clarity as to what the policy direction may be.

But I wouldn't necessarily call them gating factors. You know, obviously there's always some level of implementation planning that could occur. But, you know, we wouldn't be able to get too far with that planning unless we have some more clarity around those items.

And then (Phil) -- to answer your question in the chat room -- in terms of implementation costing. Obviously that, you know, we don't have that right now because we don't know what the next round is going to look like. Obviously if it's a first come first serve versus round that's going to fundamentally change, you know, how the execution of the program will be structured. And so it's too early right now to say that, you know, we can start costing the implementation of the next round. So that's it. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you very much. Jeff, please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, Trang Nguyen, thank you for that. And I just want to respond to a number of things on the (SAT). So again I really want to stress, there were

no decisions made at this meeting. There only - it's only provided an avenue for those contracted parties to express how they feel on these issues.

Again, it's no different than the GAC having a meeting with the board on telephone conferences -- which I know happens -- where the GAC expresses its feelings to the board without anyone else on it. It's no different when the ALAC has meetings with board members and expresses how they feel on certain subjects. Everything will come back to the policy process.

You have my word -- as one of the co-chairs -- that nothing will happen that impacts our group without bringing it back. Okay? This is why I wanted to have this open discussion here. But please, if you do have concerns let us know. And you know, we'll try to address them. We're not trying to shape decisions.

So whatever I can do to - so no, if - you guys tell me. I know there's a lot of typing. (Jorge), (unintelligible) and others. If there's anything I can do to address any of your concerns, please let me know. I don't want people leaving here to assume that there were any decisions made or that there was any further steps taken on these issues. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. All right, Nick Shorey was hand up but I do want to first get to (Michael Fleming). Also made a comment about, for example, the non-contracted (house) have inter-sessional meetings where they discuss important policy issues. All that took place is discussion amongst parties with common interests. (Jorge) said one-hour call is quite different to a three-day meeting. Decision spate - shaping is quite important. And Annebeth Lange said even if decisions are not taken it gives a feeling of parallel ICANN. Nick please go ahead.

Nick Shorey: Hello, thank you. Can you hear me?

Avri Doria: Yes, thank you.

Nick Shorey: Okay, hello everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. I hope you're well. I had the fortune to actually attend the GDD Summit last year. Just for a day whilst I was still at GAC. They didn't kick me out at the front door, which was very, very nice of them. So I do appreciate that. I won't get into the debates as to, you know, who should be allowed in or who shouldn't be allowed into those meetings.

But I'd just like to say that -- from a - the standpoint of a government individual who was at that meeting just for a day -- I found it incredibly useful to get a much better insight into the practical and operational challenges and priorities and concerns for contracted parties. And I personally felt it sort of increase my awareness, understanding, of all of those issues. Which hopefully would sort of help improve my ability to consider all points of view when looking at policy issues.

So I definitely found it a really, really useful exercise. I won't comment on who should be allowed in the meeting, but all the reports that - any reports that could feed out of that as much as possible I know would be really helpful for the rest of the community. In particular, the GAC, you know, who have sort of, you know, particular focus and areas of expertise. But those operational issues and concerns that do get discussed it would be really, really helpful for the rest of the community. So encourage as much sharing as possible. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. And I do believe that all of those meetings -- as someone was saying earlier -- were recorded. While it's not yet posted I do believe it will be, though I would need somebody from the staff to confirm that. But I do believe that's the case. I think it's been the case in the past. So yes, please Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. And thanks Nick. You brought up a point I should have raised, that the summit was about I think two and a half days. And of those two and a

half days there maybe was an hour -- at most two hours -- on new (unintelligible) type subjects. The remainder of the many hours were spent on operational issues. For example, should there be standardization between registries and registrars and EPP protocol on how premium pricing is (unintelligible) We talked about implementation of something called (ARGAF). We talked about a whole bunch of operational issues that had nothing to do with new TLDs or anything like that. Really the bulk of it was on - was between contracted parties on an operational basis. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you. This Avri again. I want to read some of the comments that we've received in the chat. Kavouss Arasteh: Everyone should be given the opportunity to express his or her views freely, openly and timely without being faced with group objection. Oops. My cursor moved on. Sorry. I'm very sorry. All of a sudden I got a whole influx of other ones and I lost what I was reading.

Okay yes. So everyone should be given the opportunity to express his reviews freely openly and timely without being facing with group objection or preventing him or her by any means whatsoever to stop commenting. I don't believe that that occurs. If it does it's on the oversight and never intentional and as soon as it's noticed people do move to - we really are making a quite concerted effort to reach as many people.

We have (Paul) saying we need to move on and I will as soon as I finish the comments and then (Susan)'s repeating the point that was made by (Jeff) that most of the three-day meeting was talking about topics entirely unrelated to this. I think the conversations with (Akram) could be seen as not dissimilar to the session at least year's ITU where (Akram) made comments about the timing of future new gTLDs and which were widely reported and was questioned by attendees at that meeting.

Martin Sutton: GDD was operationally focused. At times it would touch on policy inevitably. And Martin Sutton also: Good to hear (Nick)'s feedback. I'm sure others could attend if they really, really wanted to.

Okay so I see no other hands on this. Call the subject for the moment. Once there is a posting of the - of where to find the sessions for people to listen, that will be available and of course there were the notes that were sent out by (Emily) which are quite helpful. So at this point I will follow the advice in the chat and move on.

So the next thing is the drafting team update. First I want to mention that we have not been doing well on the drafting teams except for the work that was done by staff and especially Steve Chan in terms of giving us an initial document in each of the three there has been very little work either within the documents. We haven't held any meetings yet. That may be partially my fault and (Jeff)'s fault for not actually calling meetings but we were hoping to see some discussions on lists and in documents before moving to another set of meetings for people.

But basically - so we've decided that since we really do need to resolve questions that we would bring the discussion back to the full meeting to get the discussion going. So I've asked (Steve) to basically walk us through the initial document that he's got there, sort of explain its structure and point of view and then perhaps - and I've already seen some discussions on the list based on just having gotten the pointer to the document. So hopefully we can also get a little bit of discussion going on this topic.

So (Steve), if you're ready I'd like to hand the floor over to you.

Steve Chan: Sure. Thanks Avri. This is Steve Chan from Staff and as Avri mentioned this is one of the (unintelligible) drafting teams that are currently underway and she also mentioned struggling a little bit to make some work - make some

progress. And so the others are on the framework for predictability and as well as the rounds or the mechanism for accepting applications.

But for now we'll talk about the different TLD types. This first page of the document should look familiar. It's the types that this working group had identified as potential types. This is probably about six months ago as I think Kurt had mentioned in his email. This discussion had at least taken place to some degree at that point and these are the categories that had come of those discussions and exchanges.

So from that step what we tried to do is to - on the second page of this document is to try to identify the characteristics or attributes of each of these categories that were identified. So part of the reason for doing so is to try to determine the commonalities between the different types and so what that helps possibly do is to determine, you know, whether or not all these categories that were identified by the group, whether or not they should be distinctive types or really whether or not they have a close intersection with another one. So that was the intention of pages 2 and 3 which are really one sheet from the worksheet, the Google Document.

And so if you proceed to page 4 of this document what we had tried to do is all the attributes and characteristics that were identified in that previous step, they make up the horizontal axis on this particular page. So some of the things you have are whether or not there are specific application submission requirements, whether or not there's restrictions for registration within that registry, whether or not the registrant pool would be limited, et cetera. And so all those attributes and characteristics that were identified are (unintelligible) across the top axis. And then as Kurt had called them there's tic marks here for each of these characteristics or attributes that apply to each of these types.

So this document isn't intended to - well I guess a few things. One is staff may have not gotten this perfectly right in making these assessments. Two is

this document was not developed to present conclusions. It's just one piece of analysis to help drive the discussion. So the working group would go in any number of ways from here.

As was seen on the email discussions right now there's divergence of positions. Some may want to look at this and determine that there is a need to develop separate categories. Others may determine that there should be a standard base from which there are exceptions or exemptions similar to spec 13 or there could be something completely separate that's extremely clever that this working group wants to develop.

So that's what was developed. Actually I'll just move to page 5 real quickly of this document and so this is currently blank but what would eventually go here is to try to determine from those attributes what would be required to be changed in the application processes. So if there's a restricted registrant pool would that effect the application submission process? Would it effect the evaluation process? Would it effect the contracting process? And then there's a last column here that (Jeff) had added which is if you want to change to a different group what are the - or a different attribute what are the requirements for doing so?

So that's where it stands now. This is an introductory statement and hopefully what this does is help spur people to either join the drafting team or for those that are already part of the drafting team to participate and to help develop a proposal or proposals that can be shared with the working group. This is merely a first step and hopefully people will want to help contribute to this. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you (Steve) (unintelligible). I guess I'd like to add one more possible activity for people and also want to invite anybody with questions or comments to contribute them is that weed through this for people. I mean, this is group that - this is work that while it's been sent to a drafting team is really work put on the full teams' plate.

And so I would really request that people read through this document and make comments, whether it's in the document or on a list about the categories, about the ones listed, about the things that's being measured about, about any of the shelves and the tables that have been filled. Do they accurately reflect - is there an aspect of them that needs to be added? I mean, I did a readthrough and I didn't find that much that I wanted to add in my first readthrough and I think that's good. Others should basically do the same and, you know, perhaps in doing the readthrough you'll be motivated to say something that'll help move the drafting team on.

In terms of the people that are on the drafting team please use the lists to start discussing this otherwise this really does end up back on the full meetings, the full working groups' plate because it's really never left that plate and the drafting team is really just supposed to sort of help us get the work done. But if we have to do it in the full meeting in order to get it done then we will eventually need to do that.

This is - it seems very important to me in that we really do need to close off the CC1 and get to our preliminary notion of recommendations on some of these major issues. As we heard in the previous discussion some of these things while perhaps not called "gating" are indeed key decisions that we need to make in order for the implementation work to go forward because they really do frame the whole program and certainly, you know, by the time we get our draft recommendations out, you know, these things need to be sort of set in our at least initial draft recommendations.

So I see no hands up so I guess there are no comments. Okay let me look at this - the thing. I got - okay. Please go ahead (Jeff).

Jeff Neuman: (Unintelligible) some of the chat I guess - sorry. Can you guys hear me?

Avri Doria: I can hear you now. I couldn't when you'd first spoken. There obviously is a lag.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Sure. So (Donna) asked the question of how does this - the subject categories come up for (Steve)'s (unintelligible) response and - or sorry. (Donna) asked if it's come up within the workshops and (Steve) answered - sorry. (Unintelligible) that. He said that it - oh where it is? Here we go. Come up as a related issue and that categories may impact other topics but are the (unintelligible)? I don't believe so.

                   Yes I would just - to add to that, you know, we kind of definitively decided that we would keep the community as a separate category but, you know, we obviously discussed that in work (unintelligible) three for objections and for CPE and so we didn't directly (unintelligible) those just as he's said. But this is a real group that needs to try to decide if once and for all whether we're going to recommend having different categories.

                   (Unintelligible) says Avri, can you send out an email of this table - on this table the CLD types and establish a deadline for feed (unintelligible) well Avri, if you want to address that.

Avri Doria: Sure. Well it obviously doesn't need to be me sending that. Certainly we can send out all of the - there are three forms…

Jeff Neuman: Okay. That's…

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: …topics. And yes there really is a lag. I don't know if other people are hearing. I'm on the phone connection as opposed to the online connection so perhaps that's causing the lag.

But as far as setting a deadline certainly can. You know, I basically would say that within the next two weeks everyone should take a look at these and come up with any comments on the list. At our next full meeting we'll put the next of the drafting groups on the agenda. I believe that's the flexible versus predictable or flexible and predictable set of issues on the agenda for this meeting. So hopefully people will also have taken a look at that one before we get to that meeting. But certainly could do a two week - now that this one has been presented to the whole group do a two week please get it read and commented on in the next two weeks if no one objects to such a deadline for this first one.

I see no one objecting. Let me see if there are any comments. Oh yes one of the comments was were the other work tracks discussing these issues? And I think - and while they do come up in some of them as was mentioned by and large they are waiting also on these decisions to be made and - or at least initially made to have the provisional decision making so that they know what space they're working in because making the decision about what categories there are is indeed not one of the tasks of the subgroups, although in some cases like community it's definitely tied up on it. So there really is a dependency there on the overarching issues having sort of been put to rest in order for the work tracks to be able to do the work.

Anybody have any comments at this point? Any other questions? I see Christa saying categories could impact the development of application fee setting. (Steve) had mentioned we shared the link to the Google Doc in the agenda but we'll send it around as a PDF as well. Yes and I think it's probably worth sharing all three of them upfront for the three drafting teams so that everybody is reminded of all of them. Thanks.

(Donna) says Christa has the potential to impact fees, applications, evaluations, type of contract, and more and that is indeed the point of them being overarching issues. Thank you. (Flora) reminding us of how they do effect, (Donna). And we had a couple indeeds and yes.

And Kavouss says what would be the status of a provisional decision? And thank you for the question Kavouss and basically the way I understand these groups as working is we take provisional decisions in the group where we're perhaps not at consensus yet but we're close to consensus, we start working those through, we start looking at how they impact all the other stuff. We come back and review the decision in light of further discussions and further, you know, knowledge, et cetera. Maybe provisional decisions get changed, maybe they don't.

As we work our way towards our initial draft we basically have to come to group consensus on those provisional decisions as they go into our draft recommendations but at that point they really become draft decisions because then we go to comment, we come back from comment. We review our draft decisions to see whether they are indeed the recommendations we are going to make. Go through the whole process of seeing how everything ties together where one change ripples through, et cetera and at the end of the day come with our final recommendations.

So until the times that we actually get to our initial draft everything remains provisional but we start working on it and building on it and seeing whether as a foundation it supports the work we're doing or whether the rest of the work starts to point out issues that we hadn't quite considered when coming to a provisional first place.

I hope that explains how I view it and it meets with the views that other people have about how we cyclically get through starting to make decisions, checking them for sanity and consistency, hardening the recommendations as drafts and then eventually finalizing.

Any comments on that?

Okay I got more questions. (Paul): I'd like to think of provisional decisions as breadcrumbs to keep track of where we came from when we get there. Yes (Paul) but hopefully they're also sort of a foundation we can build the (unintelligible) of work on because as we see in the various sub-teams without having a provisional decision on, you know, rounds versus first come versus hybrid, without having a decision on are there categories and what are they and what are the elements of categories that need to be worked on, the working teams in some cases are just sort of spinning their wheels because they don't have firm footing. So hopefully the provisional decision also starts to give a bit of footing. It can change but it gives us a solid context to work in.

Kavouss said how and when these provisional decisions are converted to more definitive as well as other impact on any provisional decision on other provisional decisions and I think if I understand what you've wrote Kavouss, that corresponds to the cyclical nature of the process I was talking about at this point.

And Kavouss again: if the provisional decision making prevents to reach consensus I have difficultly to accept. Personally Kavouss, and from experience I see provisional decisions as the first step in reaching consensus and certainly shouldn't be a barrier to reaching consensus but are indeed the process one uses to find the consensus points. So hopefully that is the way it works.

Okay anyone else want to comment on that before move on? I do see that Kavouss is typing. I see (Phil) is typing. Okay Kavouss: if it is part of consensus building I have no problem. Thank you Kavouss. Yes indeed consensus building is a good term for it and thank you.

Okay I'll stop for a second to see if there's any hands or comments or let the typing finish. Okay thank you Annebeth for letting us know. Thank you for being here this far.

Move on now to community comment two - and (Kristina) is also dropping at the top of the hour. Thank you. To community comment two update. (Steve), can I call on you for that one?

Steve Chan: You sure can. Thanks Avri. This is Steve Chan and this will be a really short agenda item. It's merely a reminder to all the working group members that the comment period for community comment two will be the 22nd of May. So it's just a reminder to you all and then by extension to all the people that you also work with, the groups you work with to remind them of that deadline and to try to make sure that they get their comments in beforehand.

And as Avri has mentioned in the past you don't need to wait till that deadline. You can do it earlier. It's helpful to the working group, it's helpful to staff so we can start getting those comments organized for the working group to consider. So (unintelligible) the earlier the better but be mindful of that deadline of the 22nd. At this point there's just a handful of comments so I think we're probably going to see a bit of a rush at the end. But to the extent we can avoid that that would be great. So that was it. Thanks.

Okay thank you (Steve). Any comments or questions on any of that? I see we have several people that are leaving at the top of the hour. Thank you for letting us know. Thank you (unintelligible).

We've mentioned and we probably need to make sure everybody know that these full meetings are planned for 90 minutes so we won't be going that much over an hour today.

And thank you (Jorge) for indicating the (GAK) is working on input. I hope all of our groups are indeed working on them and - yes.

I see no other comments so then moving on to ICANN 59 planning. (Steve), is that me asking you again?

Steve Chan: Perhaps it is. I'll - sure. This is Steve Chan from Staff and I'll open up the discussions and maybe it'll inspire other discussion. I would just note the sessions that are scheduled for this group. One is the - we have a (unintelligible) a couple of geographic name sessions planned. It's broken into two portions. There's a 90-minute portion on Tuesday of the meeting and that would be followed by a Thursday session for 180 minutes. I don't know if you want to into any more detail on that but I think (Jeff) probably will.

But I'll also note that we have a face-to-face for the Bravo working group. That's scheduled for Wednesday at this point. So the geographic names cross community session is not at the expense of the face-to-face session. We'll have both. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. (Jeff). (Jeff) you're still muted as far as I can - yes.

Jeff Neuman: Everyone's invited to that session and I - or the sessions. I should say plural. And everyone's welcome to participate. This is a continuation of the Webinar that we had in late April for to hopefully develop some proposals and to, you know, walk through those. And we are looking at trying to have a professional facilitator/moderator come in and help us with that since there are diverging views and potentially with the help of a facilitator we could find a common path forward. So we're - Avri and I and the ICANN staff are in the process of trying to find someone who that is neutral or is neutral and who also could get or has an understanding of the issues and sensitivities involved. So we'll be updating you throughout the next few weeks on the progress we're making on that.

And with respect to the face-to-face sessions, hopefully by then we will have had not only all the CC2 comments in but a staff report that summarizes the comments or compiles the comments so we can discuss those during the face-to-face. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Is there anyone else that would like to comment or ask a question or - and I have one question: the PDP face-to-face is at what time? (Steve)? I don't have the blog up. (Steve) said he believes it's Wednesday from 8:30 to 12:00 local time. Bright and early.

Okay. Any other comments or questions? Nope. Okay then we'll continue to have this as an agenda item in the lead up the face-to-face meeting in Johannesburg. So we will talk about this all again and again.

Okay that brings us with no other comments to any other business. Does absolutely have any other business at this time? I see no one. I see a little bit of typing. Don't know whether it's the goodbyes or in any other business but - oh and so (Jorge) has indicated that they'll probably have (GAK) meetings at that time which is unfortunate. It is unfortunate the way these things wind up overlapping even in the policy meetings where we're supposed to be less siloed and more working together but we all do feel and to still spend a fair amount of time meeting within our own groupings.

So with that we're only a little over an hour but we did have 90 minutes scheduled for the call. But if there is no other business I see no reason to prolong it and I thank everybody and the meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much. Bye.

Woman 1:   Thank you.

END