MARIO ALEMAN:	Well, thank you very much, and good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Capacity Building Program 2017, our fourth webinar on the topic of new gTLD subsequent procedures and the importance for At-Large, taking place on Tuesday, 23rd of May, 2017 at 21:00 UTC, with 90 minutes duration of the webinar.
	We will not be doing the roll call as it is a webinar, but if I could please remind all participants on the phone bridge, as well as computers, to mute your phones when not speaking, and please do not forget to state your name before speaking, not only for transcription purposes, but also to allow our interpreters to identify you on the different language channels. We have available now English, Spanish, and French interpretation for this webinar, and I would like to thank you all for joining. I will now turn it back over to you, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Chair of the At-Large Capacity Building program. Thank you very much. Over to you, Tijani.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you Mario. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the fourth webinar for 2017. You know that each year we establish a program for the year, and now we are on the fourth webinar for the year 2017. Our topic today is New gTLD Subsequent Procedure and the importance for At-Large. For this topic, we chose two, I would say at least one of the most involved person in this working group, which is the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure working group.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

And she is one of the co-chairs, I think, Avri Doria will make the presentation about this topic and before that, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Chair or EURALO, will make the introduction to this topic. Olivier has been involved in the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure at the beginning, but now it seems that he is not in the working group anymore, but I am sure he is aware about what happened before, at least this stage. So I will start by giving the floor to the Staff for any housekeeping announcement. Mario?

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you very much, Tijani. Welcome everyone again. Let's take a quick look at the housekeeping presentation. It is currently displayed in the Adobe Connect room. We will have a question and answer part during this webinar. As you can see, it is located on the left hand side of the AC room. So if you have any questions, we do encourage you to type them in here, and then they will be directly to the presenters.

We also have a public quick session at the end of this call, and I do see it, it will be located on the right hand side of the AC and after the presenters or speakers' presentations. Please be ready to answer question posted on the pod. And finally, we will have user experience part, which is a survey. There will be six questions at the end of the webinar, so please stay around for extra few minutes, to complete them. Back over to you, Tijani, and thank you very much.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you Mario. I would like to remind you that this webinar is for 90 minutes so that's time for the presentation and for the questions, also. I give the floor immediately to Avri Doria. Avri Doria is from the GNSO, she is also from At-Large. She is member of an ISOC, I think, in New York. I am not sure, but she is member of an ISOC chapter, and she is member of an ALS in NARALO. Avri, please go ahead.
AVRI DORIA:	I think Olivier was going first.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Ah, excuse me, oh, I'm sorry, you're right.
AVRI DORIA:	That's quite alright.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	I am getting old. So, I said Olivier will make the introduction, so how can Avri be starting? Olivier Crepin-Leblond the Chair or EURALO will start and will make the introduction to this presentation. Olivier, go ahead please.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much Tijani, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And you know, a lot of people make that mistake between Avri and I, I mean, we look very similar, so, it's obviously a simple mistake, but it's fine, and

thank you for joining this webinar everyone. I am going to talk to you not about the subsequent procedures, but you know, talking about subsequent procedures, obviously there must have been procedures before that, and there must have been rounds of new gTLDs, new generic top level domains happening before the one that we're all talking about, the future one, the one that might never happen, or the one that might happen sooner rather than later, or even later rather than sooner.

It really depends on what the work of the subsequent procedures working group is going to yield. So in my presentation, which is very brief, actually, today, I will be speaking to you about three things. First, what is the new gTLD program, what happened afterwards, and what's next? Three simple things as such. The first thing that you need to know about is what the New gTLD program is.

Well, gTLD is the generic top level domain, something like a .com, .net, .org, .edu, it's like those three character domain names, or used to be three character domain names, and now with subsequent rounds and with other rounds of new generic top level domains, you've got some whole words that are now being used as generic names. Is this thing synched at the moment? Can you see it as being synched?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I'm on page 3.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, okay, perfect. So, looking at this, we have to look at a timeline of the new gTLD – somebody else is moving the screen around now, I have no idea who is doing that, so let me just move down.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Mario can you please give the control of the screen to Olivier and Avri only, please.

AVRI DORIA: Apologies, it was me.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, thanks Avri, thanks for making a mess. Okay, everyone, come on, let's go back to this. Before ICANN even existed, in 1998 there were a number of generic top level domains, .com, .edu, .gov, .net, .org, and then ICANN was created. The first years of ICANN there were a lot of discussions about adding some new generic top level domains to this list, and so they worked pretty hard, and had a round that came out as being the 2000 round, so that was because it was in the year 2000, where they created .arrow, .biz, .coop, .info, .museum, .name, and .pro.

With the amazing success of some of these, maybe not all of them, but with the success of some of these, there was pressure to get some more generic top level domains created, and therefore the community worked and in 2004 there was another round which came up with .asia, .cat, .xxx, .jobs, .moby, .tel, .travel, and .coast. So, you would have thought, okay, well, that's enough generic top level domains, we don't

need any more of these, that's it, everything that ever needed to be invented has been invented.

But of course not, obviously, it was shown that there could be an interest in having more generic top level domains, and so the new gTLD program, Policy Development, started in the Generic Name Supporting Organization, and it was roughly between December 2005 to September 2007, that this work took place. It gave rise to an enormous amount of work, and with various versions of the Draft Applicant Guidebook.

You will notice there are here I think four versions shown. If you go into the GNSO, the Generic Name Supporting Organization website, or even better actually, you go into the website of the New gTLD website, newgtld.icann.org, it will show you a historical archive of I think we're talking about nine versions of that applicant guidebook. Things that just got added to it again, and again, and again, and another version came out, and things were changed, and the PDP, the Policy Development Process took place, and so on.

Anyway, it was just a huge amount of work, which then came up to – if you look at this – the ICANN Board approving the policy itself, and the guidebook being drafted, and that took us all the way down to the Board approval of the final guidebook roughly in June 2011. That, at the same time, coincided with a large amount of work in the communications [inaudible] that was launched worldwide, and finally, the final applicant guidebook was published shortly after that, and the program was launched from the 12th of February to the 12th of April 2012, depending on what part of the world you were looking at, there

was a road show that took place, and basically the program then went into implementation. So, that's how it was prepared.

What happened afterwards? Well, after the program was launched, so you had all these applicants that applied for new generic top level domains, and you had the process by which they were accepted or not accepted, et cetera, they were filtered, they were checked, and all this, cutting a long story short, the new generic top level domain applications that had succeeded, started being contracted. And you can see here a graph of the contracting, where the fourth quarter in 2013, out of over 1200 applications, only 222 had an assigned registry agreement. The registry agreement here is shown as RA; RA is the registry agreement. So 222, a small amount, were assigned.

Then in the fourth quarter in 2014, so we're talking about November 2014, 782 had been signed up. In the fourth quarter in 2016, 1218 had been signed up and allocated, et cetera, and delegated, and all this stuff. And you can see that ever since, now you're looking at the first quarter 2017, and April 2017, we've got 1241 new generic top level domains that have been allocated, that have had the fact finding of the registry agreement, and I would imagine that the majority of these have been launched. There are statistics in the new gTLD website, but of course, the numbers change as we speak.

So, then what happened? Well, what happened is that there is a contract called the Affirmation of Commitment, that ICANN was operating under with the US government, when the new generic top level domain, the new gTLD program was launched, that was called the

Affirmation of Commitment. And one of the points in that contract, one of the clauses, Clause 9.3, mentioned the promotion of competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice, and being something extremely important.

And so if we look into this specifically, you will find out that it says that ICANN will ensure that as it compensates expanding the top level domain space, the various issues that are involved, including competition, consumer protection, security, stability, resiliency, malicious abuse issues, sovereignty concerns and rights protection will be adequately addressed prior to implementation.

So, that was one thing which they found was particularly important, and so the whole vetting of the strings and so on was done with this in mind. But in addition to this, immediately after that it says if and when new gTLDs, whether in ASCII or any other language character sets, have been in operation for one year, ICANN will organize a review that will examine the extent to which the introduction or expansion or gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice.

And it also goes into that ICANN should use that review to check the effectiveness of the application evaluation process, SID guards put in place, and a whole number of things to make sure that what it intended to happen with the new gTLD process, actually happened, and if it didn't, then try and find out why. And this is how they launched the consumer trust review, which is one of the reviews that were therefore mandated before anything else could happen to launch a new round in the future.

So, how does it all fit together? Well, you've got the new gTLD round, and let me take that little green arrow here, if I can make it work, we got the new gTLD round which was the round that we've just seen, that I've just explained to you, and immediately piggybacking on this, you've got the consumer trust review, which is a process that has taken place, and it's nearing completion, and in fact, I think we're currently in the process of public consultation on this consumer trust review, but then there are also other groups that have been set up to follow up on the implementation of the new gTLD.

One is the gTLD marketplace health index, looking how healthy the marketplace is, and if the addition of all these new generic top level domains has done, you know, some good, and has that been something that has happened for the public interest. One is the internet technology health indicators, that effectively looks at the stability of the net and the technology of the internet, and tries to find out if the internet is still as stable as it used to be, the DNS has been affected in one way or another.

And then there is also analysis of DNS abuse that is taking place, these new generic top level domains being launched out there have made more malware and spam, and whatever other bad things happen, where there has been an increase of this, and a whole lot of other processes that are probably too numerous to list extensively here, I'm sure somebody has done tracking of all of that, and maybe Avri knows some more of these.

But what's important is that all of these different processes, all of what's going on at the moment, is feeding into a policy development process working group of the generic top level domain organization called the GNSSOPDP on Subsequent Procedures. That's the working group that will ultimately provide recommendations as to whether there should be a next round and if there should be a next round, in what way that next round should take place, and make some recommendations to that.

So, you've got a few links for the processes that are taking place, the consumer trust review team, the PDP Subsequent Procedures, the gTLD Marketplace Health Index, and the Internet Technology Health Indicators, and I understand that all of these groups are open for anyone to take part in, so if you're interested, please put your name forward for this. And since now we've looked at what's happened so far, and we're feeding into the PDP, the Policy Development Process, I guess I can hand the floor over to Avri Doria, although I note that Sebastien Bachollet has put his hand up.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I don't know if I am allowed to speak, but it's Sebastien Bachollet.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, I don't know if I have the authority to let you speak, but since you're speaking, perhaps you can answer questions.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I wanted to add one thing to understand, I will say, a little bit better the history of all that. And if you can go back, because I do not have the right to scroll, if you go back to your timetable, this one here, in fact, the 2004 round was an addition to the 2000 round. One of the reasons, the main reason, was to allow ICANN to gather data and it was decided that only sponsored TLD will be launched at the 2004 round.

And it happened that ICANN was not able to gather a lot of data, and it's why we started this new gTLD program with some difficulty, because the round of 2000 and the round of 2004 didn't give enough information to better launch the next round. The other point is that there were reviews of the 2001 and ICANN published part of this report, never published the rest of the report, and I think the was also a failure in the understanding of the 2000 round, who missed for the implementation of the new gTLD program. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Sebastien. Olivier, do you want to add a word?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much, Tijani, no I was just handing the floor over to Avri, and I guess I'm done. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Before you change the slide, this is Avri speaking, I wanted to just go to your slide 12, if we can, I guess I can change slides now. Yeah, that one. I just wanted to mention one thing about the drawing which is very

linear, and just wanted to let people know that the whole list of other processes, and I'm not going to talk about them much, which also includes rights protection mechanism working groups, did not have to complete before we started our process. One of the things we decided to try and do to accelerate the schedule a little, was not do everything sequential, but we cannot end until all of those have delivered, and we have consumed what it is they produced, and I just wanted to make that point quickly.

And now I'll take my hand down, because that was a comment on yours, and move to my presentation, is it fair, so – yes, thank you. I hope nobody minds that I did not use the ICANN template. I figure the template belongs to ICANN organization and I'm just a volunteer, so I used a simpler one. And apologies for my typo in the first slide, yes, Top Level Domains all three letters should be capitalized. Okay, now moving to the second, okay, I can do that. My slide does not fit, how come? Oh, thank you.

Okay. So where did we start from? Where we started from, and this is the input that we took going into Subsequent Procedures. And if anybody is curious why we call it Subsequent Procedures, it's because one of the decisions we have to make if we decide that there will indeed be more new gTLDs which is the default position, was we don't know whether it will be rounds, first come first serve, or some new methodology that sort of bridges those two. That is one of the discussions we're having. So not to prejudice the discussion, the Policy Development Process, the PDP, was named Subsequent Procedures. Okay.

So the things we went in is first the final report from the 2007 Policy Recommendations of the GNSO. These were the policy recommendations that the Board eventually approved, and that were sort of the loose basis for the applicant guidebooks that eventually came out.

So then another one of our starting positions is the current application guidebook. And that, as Olivier said, was something that came out, it's relationship to the policy was sometimes rather tenuous, and then after that, there were other decisions made by the Board that were reflected in registry agreements, and some processes. So basically another one of the inputs we have is the current registry agreement.

Then there was over a one year process, where the GNSO basically collected all of the questions and all of the issues, and all of the complaints that we could find about the previous program, and basically put out a document that listed those issues. Those issues were folded into the final issues report. An issues report is what is needed to take off any policy development process in the GNSO. It basically is what defines that the PDP, the Policy Development Process would be, and it is what is voted on when a charter is created. So, that was approved and then we have our charter.

Now, two things I want to say here. One is on the slides. There is an existing policy and an implementation. That prevails, unless we make consensus to change it. The previous policy, for example, included that there would be that first round, then there would be a review, it's turned into many reviews, but there would be a review, and then there

would be a proceeding. There was no question that we would decide whether there would be new gTLDs or not, that was a presumption.

But, in this PDP, we're able to question anything and see whether there is consensus for changing anything. So that is one of the important base things to remember in this, is that we have the AGB, we have the process, we have the contract, and we have the loosely involved policy that led into it. If there is no consensus in the working group to change anything, then our recommendation would be take the AGB and run with it, and continue as we've been going. But we are reviewing many issues as you will see, and we don't have any decisions made yet.

The other thing that I need to say is that nothing that we are doing in this policy development process affects the applications that went before us. They don't affect their contract, even if we change the contract. They don't affect the applications that are still pending. If we were to solve any of the issues that have been problematic to current applicants, it still would not apply to them. Okay, so we're only talking about the future here.

So, the other thing that we have is the many community inputs. So we have the list that Olivier gave, including the rights protection mechanisms, the RPMs, we'll have the recommendations data and analysis from the CCRT, the consumer choice – thank you very much, it's one I constantly stumble. We have a report from the cross community working group on use of country and territory names. There are a number of GAC working groups who will be inputting information. There will be multiple comment periods.

One of the issues, problems that we're taking quite seriously, is how can we make sure that our work is coordinated. And when you look at some of the schedules and the scheduling we've done, it really does look like a medium size engineering project with lots of different ongoing processes that have to come in to each other, that sometimes affect each other, and so on. So, how can the PDP ensure that it ends up with a set of recommendations that has wide community acceptance?

PDPs, policy development processes are very different now than they were in 2007, when the previous one was completed. In the old days, they were done by the GNSO counsel as a task force. And there was comment periods, but there was none of this working group stuff that we've got now, that we're open to everybody. And now they really are open to everybody. So it's a very different situation. Moving on to Four.

So, then the work began. And we really divided it into two pieces, the overarching issues, and the detailed issues. In the overarching issues, we had six subjects, and I'll go through a list of subjects later, but including subjects like are we going to have more gTLDs, is there a demand for them anymore, is this something we should be doing. Now we're told there's a demand of over 10,000, I'm not sure how that's measured, but that's the word that comes out from the registry.

So, will we do it in rounds, or will we do a first come first serve? How do we have more community input when we're going through the application evaluation process? Categories, last time we had two

categories formally at the stop, and at the start, it slowly evolved into three. We had regular applications, we have community applications. We eventually ended up with geographically, even though the policy had said no such thing would be done, and we ended up with brands. So, you know, we ended up with more than we decided on.

Now, we're talking about, do we want categories, and if so, how many, what kind? And are categories just about application or are categories about different contracts? How does category work. Among the six overarching issues was is there any limit to the number of gTLDs that someone can apply for? One company, or something like that. That's one of the few places, one of the two places where we have tentative decisions, where it likes were attempting to – no, no limits, partially because it would be almost impossible to enforce.

So normally at the beginning of a policy development process you go out for community comments, basically to collect the issues from the various SOs and ACs, from the GNSO stakeholder groups, from the GNSO constituencies, on their view of the problem space, and their view of the issues before you've gotten too deeply into this. Again, we decided to move things in parallel and also we decided that there were so many issues that we would do the community comments in two stages.

We did one on the overarching issues and we just completed one on the other issues. We received comments, we're currently working through those comments, and we also established four work tracks, basically

consider the remaining subjects in the charter, and I'll talk a little bit about those as I move on.

So the community and drafting teams. After our initial analysis, we found that there were a couple topics that really needed more concentrated work. And so we've established three drafting teams. When I mention something like drafting teams, there's another opportunity where people can get involved if they think this is an issue that really matters to them.

We have one that's talking about the different TLD types, looking at the categories, looking what it means to be a category, looking at attributes of a name in a category, and trying to basically analyze so that we can come up with how many categories do we want, what categories, how do they affect application, how do they affect the contract? And that is a complicated issue that's still being worked through. Another one is working on predictability and flexibility, predictability and community engagement.

One of the things that we had last time is in the policy, one of the statements is this must be a predictable process. That is truly one of the things we failed at. There was in absolutely no one's universe was this a predictable process unless you were predicting chaos and confusion. So, this time we're looking at, well, okay, part of that was because we had to be flexible. Things had to change when there was a good reason to change them. And so flexibility and predictability need to be balanced, how do we do that? What are the constraints? How do

you decide, no, this is a time to stand firm, no, this is a time to change things, even thought applications have perhaps already been filed.

The other part is community engagement. We saw that once we started having engagement with At-Large, with GAC, government advisory committee, especially, so that would also cause things to change. And for example, there was prohibition against changing applications, but after GAC, there seemed to be some reasons to allow some people to change some, so that part, how do we balance those things? That's one of the teams figuring it out now.

And then the third team is the issue of rounds. Many of us, I think, would like to get to a day when there was a first come first serve, or something like that, but certainly we want to come to a steady state process. So even if we're doing rounds, this is the last time, we're planning to stop. In other words, we did all the experimental rounds, we did our first round to see what our policy should be, but the intent is an ongoing process.

So how do we do that? If there really is strong demand because it took us so long, then we certainly can't do a first come first serve, we certainly don't want to encourage any solutions like digital archery to tell who came first. So basically, you know, that tells us that certainly starting as a first come first serve, even if we do want to get there, is impractical.

So basically looking at the problem of how do we structure this, and that have been several hybrid solutions, such as 6 months of open

application and review, then pause for 6 months, then another 6 months, et cetera, but without the pause we're taking now. So there's a drafting team talking about that. All three of those are open, especially to the people that want to work on them.

Okay, community comment 2. As I said, we have four work tracks to consider the remaining subjects in the charter. Again, even if you didn't join the top level group, the full group, one could just join one of the community groups, one of the, you know, the four work tracks. The four work tracks basically did an initial review of their issues, they derived a set of questions to ask the community to get their input, put that out as community comment 2, that ended yesterday.

I understand At-Large is still working on its response to that. We have one or two people that are, we are not extending it, but you know, if something gets in late, especially from a group like At-Large, we'll try to figure out how to fit it in. The sooner it gets in, the sooner it can be able to fit into the discussion. Where these things end up a real problem, is after having discussed all the comments, you then get a new batch of comments and have to redo all the discussion again, that's difficult on the people doing the work, sometimes. So anyhow, that closed.

There were questions related to all subjects and I'll look at the subjects, but things like registry service providers, applicant support, one of the issues that had been very important to At-Large in the past, reserve names, how many, what kind and why, closed generics – one of the issues that got very bogged down is can a registry have a common language word and use it for their own private purposes. How to

handle objections, how to do community applications or even whether we should have community applications.

One of the discussions we had in a meeting earlier today, in fact, was sort of divided between those that thought community applications were incredibly important and should be maintained, and those that thought they weren't and they should be abolished. String similarity, internationalized domain names, technical financial criteria, as you see, there's about 32 of these subjects. So those are things we asked you all questions on, and we've received the answers and are starting to review them.

So, just quickly looking at the subjects. The first one I already talked about, the work track zero, that's another name for the overarching, you know, and I basically talked about those issues before. Work track 1, we have issues such as accreditation, applicant support, clarity of the application process, fees, variable fees, submission periods, shoeing up when there's more than can be handled immediately, systems communication, and what do we need to do about the guide book.

We have a second work track that looks at the various agreements, it's the one that will be looking at the output from the RPMs, the rights protection mechanisms. It will talk about reserve names, registrant procedures, the IGO, NGO procedures. Now there may be a new PDP on that and how we work with a new PDP on that will be an open questions. As I mentioned, closed generics, terms and conditions, the registrar nondiscrimination policy, nondiscrimination and registry/registrar separation, that was the vertical integration topic

where someone could both be registry and registrar, does that continue, do we wind that back, or do we need to look at the situation in which that occurs.

Registry/registrar standardization, who the two community. Roll out processes and the variety of roll out processes. Do we need rules on some of those. Contractual compliance. Are there new conditions that need to be placed. And global public interest, one of the subjects that came up during the process that still is somewhat of a hot subject, and one that we don't fully understand yet.

We have work track 3, that looks at objections, it's doing an analysis of objections that were filed, how did they turn out? It looks at the independent objector. Did that work? Was that worth doing? Do we need it? Do we need more of it, less of it? New gTLD freedom of expression, how do we maintained those criteria which were part of the policy from the first time. C

ommunity applicants, as I said. The string similarity, that whole issue of plurals that we got into, where we didn't have a policy, we said things shouldn't be confusingly similar, but what does that mean and how do you actually interpret that? Developing the list of string similarity outcomes. Looking at the whole notion of auctions, of contention sets, and accountability mechanisms.

And then our fourth work track, which an At-Large member is one of the co-leads of, is looking at issues to deal with internationalized domain names, universal acceptance, application reviews, name collision,

security and stability. Yes, I was not going to name the co-leader of that, but I see a smiley face. And the reason I pointed it out is not put her on the spot at all in this presentation, but just to say it literally is open to you all, including in leadership positions.

Okay, moving on, one thing I didn't put a slide on here, and I'm going to talk about just slightly, oh no, I did put a slide up, never mind. So coming up in ICANN59, one of our big issues is geographical names at the top level. There is no doubt that between the GNSO and the GAC and the ccNSO and perhaps others, there are very different perspectives on how to handle those names, from a minimalist that says as the previous policy did, no, we will not reserve any names. If you object to a name being used as it's being applied for, you'll have the right to file an objection, so the GAC and governments have the right to file objections, even for free, I believe.

The other people, in fact the Board said well, we accepted your policy, we've gotten this advice from GAC that says no, no, no, this just won't do, so we're going to put in a set of policies and implementation on how to handle that in terms of the permission letters and the clearances, and all of that, on country names, capital names, major cities, et cetera. And now there are others that said that was really way too limited, and we need to protect much more of our sovereign property in the names of our places that are important, so we want must more extensive lists.

And in fact, it's not only in our own languages that we want these names protected, we want them protected in many languages, certainly in all the languages and scripts that are in use in our country. So, the

	range of opinion is huge. We know that we need to bring everybody into this discussion to try and find an acceptable consensus point in this discussion. So we've already done a webinar in preparation for this, it was recorded so people can go back to it. Holly, did you need to ask a question now, or is this just for the end? If it was a quick clarification?
HOLLY RAICHE:	It can be any time, I was just asking where things like pics and compliance pics fit in the work track, but if you're going to have questions at the end?
AVRI DORIA:	I have questions at the end, but the pics basically would fit in the global public interest, because those are public interest commitments, so they would fit in work track 2.
HOLLY RAICHE:	That's what I thought, thank you.
AVRI DORIA:	Okay, so anyhow, going back to the geo names, we have two major sessions planned for Johannesburg, I don't remember the schedule at the moment. The first one is 90 minutes, where we'll basically talk about the various proposals that people have put forward from lists to someone has suggested a geo pic.

A new comment, or basically it's not a geo pic, that's wrong, but it's a dispute resolution over geo names, it's kind of like a geo pic. So we're going to get those presented and also see if we can't come up, what we're working on now in the background is trying to get those proposals. The webinars basically were structured as we invited anyone from any community who had a point to make, a suggestion to make, on how to proceed, to basically make a presentation. So I really do recommend these, because they really do give you the scope of perspective differences.

So, now we're trying to bind those together into some sort of presentation of options. The first session will be 90 minutes on that, then we'll take one or two days in between, we'll have ad hoc sessions, some breakout discussions, we're not quite sure how we're doing that yet. And then we have a three hour session at the end of the week where we will try to bang out some agreement or at least find the path forward for finding a consensus point. So we really do have a major discussion going on geo names. We may do similar things in the future on some of our other hard nuts to crack, some of our other very difficult issues.

So, continuing, and this is pretty much I think where I start ending, is we're going to continue working on the work tracks and complete comment analysis. We've made our first pass through all the subjects, it's almost complete. We have several names for this pass. I tend to call it our blue sky pass. My co-chair, Jeff Newman, calls it the pros and cons pass. But basically we've tried to talk through all the issues, gather the history, document it, get people's pros and cons, and their great

ideas for how to move forward, and just basically talk without trying to resolve.

We have two passes coming. The next pass will be going through all the topics again, this time with the comments from community comments from CC2 in hand, and basically try and see what we can resolve by looking at the comments, going back to the discussion we've already had, and see what it is that can be resolved. And what can be resolved, we'll just set it aside, write it down, set it aside. What can't be resolved, we'll also write down and set aside.

And if there's anything that looks like it's an incredibly hard issue where we need more input, we'll bring it to the discussion of the full group, to see if they can help, and then take it back into the work track. The third pass, after we've completed that, and these happen sort of asynchronously, a work track moves into its next phase when it's ready. The third one will be looking at it point by point.

Okay, do we have consensus to change the standing policy and you know the AGB and all that on this issue? If we have consensus on changing it, do we have consensus on what the change is? And so that would be the third pass, and basically we'll go through remembering our first principle is if there isn't consensus to change or even we can't find a consensus on what to change to, then at a certain point, the status quo remains. That is the existing policy, that is the existing implementation. So they have that existing language, existing code type of weight in this discussion.

But, if there is consensus to change and we can come to consensus on what to change to, then we will document those recommended changes. Once we have collected all of that together for each of the work tracks, it becomes the full group's problem, we'll talk through all of these reports, we'll make sure that there is no inconsistencies, we'll make sure that the whole group buys into the recommended changes, and then once we've got that done, we'll have our draft recommendations to basically put out for community comment.

Community comments will be resolved if we're close we'll go to our final recommendation. If we failed, we'll up perhaps having to do yet another draft that will not be known. So that's kind of where we're at. We're looking at our schedule now. Those dates there are just my expectations.

Okay, I think the last thing I have is – yes, there's just a bunch of information, where to find our Wiki. What we do on the work tracks and our work track leaders have been very good about it. We're trying to advertise at least 2 or 3 meetings in advance of which of the specific issues will be focus of a meeting. So if you only care about name collision that really is the only thing that you focus on, you can have some clue of when that meeting is, and just attend that.

You still need to be a participant, you still need to have filled out an SOI to be a participant, but at least you don't have to attend them all, because as somebody that attends most all of them, you don't want to attend them all, unless you're really invested in all of this. We also keep a meeting schedule. More information, the last thing I've got is monthly

there is a newsletter that's basically put out by our wonderful staff on this project, and basically it talks about what has been done in the previous months and talks about what's coming up in the next month, plus a little bit more information when there is more information. So I think that's really quite useful and really a lot of work goes into producing those.

So, if you're just joining the group now, for example, yes, you can be a true researching and read all the mail and read all to documents and listen to all the call, always a good thing to do when you join a group late, you can also read the newsletters. Okay, that was me, comments, questions, and sundries, and thanks for listening to me. Olivier, I see you have a hand up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Avri for this presentation. It was really useful. And I see that Olivier has his hand up. I don't forget that Holly has a question also to ask. Olivier please go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much Tijani, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Actually I note that the pop quiz seems to be in between the question and answers, so my first question was whether we are going to have the pop quiz?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	No, we have the pop quiz before, but since you raised your hand immediately after Avri, I gave you the floor.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay, thanks Tijani, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I just have one question. I don't want to apply for a generic top level domain, I'm not in the business of DNS and all of these TLDs and stuff, so why is it important to me? Why is all this stuff to At-Large, to me, an end user?
AVRI DORIA:	Okay, do you want me to try and answer that?
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Yes, answer this and then we will go to pop quiz. Thank you.
AVRI DORIA:	Okay, I think that many of the issues you folks care about as users may indeed be affected. You care about the public interest commitments that are made. As citizens of a country you may care about what they do with the name of your country, and that may be something that is important to you. You may be someone that while a user, you work with other users, and you see things that confuse them. You see the fact that IDNs have not made progress as a problem in terms of bridging the network into new regions. So on many of these topics, you may not care about – you care about compliance. At-Large is probably one of the bigger carers about compliance.

So we may decide, hey, compliance, pffh, you know, as long as we're making money, that's good, everybody knows the GNS is just into that. Now, that wouldn't happen because there are others that do care beyond At-Large, but basically on a lot of these issues there's that. Some of you as users are very involved in stability and security. You may have something to say about name collision that may be a problem for your home network or your business, that, hey, I've set out my business using names this way, you're now going to create names and use names that I'm using privately in my business? Why should you be able to do that? Why should you be able to take names out of this space, et cetera?

So, there is an immense number of issues that as users, you may care. You may be one of those users, that wants there to never, ever be another gTLD. This would be a place to make that comment, not that I'm recommending it, as I'm one of those that do want to see millions of flowers blooming. But there are lots of points where users may indeed care, because it's how it affects the internet they use. The people that have an internet they want may care about what it looks like. So that's why I think it would matter.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Avri. Now, to the pop quiz, and Mario.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thanks Tijani, can you hear me well?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, we can.

MARIO ALEMAN: Okay, great, thank you. So we're going to move forward to the pop quiz questions. I'm going to read the first one. Anyone can become a participant in the new gTLD Subsequent Procedure working group, please cast your vote now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, the answer is true, yes.   Mario, we don't hear you. Mario?

MARIO ALEMAN: Hello Tijani, can you hear me now?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Now I can hear you.

MARIO ALEMAN: Perfect, thank you very much, I'm sorry for the inconvenience. The second question in the pop quiz. How is the technology used for the webinar? Very good, good, sufficient, bad, very bad, and no vote. You can please cast your votes now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Mario, those are not the pop quiz, those are the evaluation questions, I'm sorry.
AVRI DORIA:	That's the second one, the first one was.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Yeah, the first one was pop quiz, the second one is an evaluation question. Okay, go ahead.
MARIO ALEMAN:	The second one is the following. Do you need to be an expert in a topic to participate? The first answer is yes, the second one is no.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	And Avri can tell you that the answer is no, isn't it, Avri?
AVRI DORIA:	Yeah, that wasn't my question, but yes, I would say that's the case.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Okay, next one.
MARIO ALEMAN:	Perfect, thank you very much. The next question is the following: The PDP working group can make policy decisions that affect pending

applications from the realm of 2012. And the first option is true, and the second one is false. Please cast your votes now.

AVRI DORIA: I say that is false.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly.

AVRI DORIA: And let me add something to that, for those that think that there may be a second order effect and therefore said yes – if indeed we do change something, it would require a further policy process within the GNSO to make it retroactive, we can't. If, on the other hand, we do something brilliant and they say, you know, we should apply that to the old stuff, kind of like happened with SIC Wiz or things like that, then that would take a separate policy process to make it happen, we can't do it.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you very much for your answer, Avri. Moving next to the other question. The next round of gTLD expansion will be the second round of gTLD expansion, true or false?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: You know why the answer is false? Because it is gTLD only. If you said new gTLDs, it would be different.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Olivier here...

AVRI DORIA: To Olivier's question, but I have a comment on it too, but I'll wait for Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: If I can jump on this, it's Olivier speaking. There have been several rounds of gTLD expansion, and I know a lot of people seem to think that there has been only one first round the current round, and then the next round would be the second round, but it's not really the second round, there have been many rounds of gTLD expansions and Avri also did mention that there might well be not a round but it might be a continuous system that will take place with continuous possibility to make applications.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Avri?

AVRI DORIA: Yes, I think that was the bit I was going to add. In some sense, certainly I agree with Olivier, in some sense I'm not even sure that it's a different round from the previous one, since it is based on that policy, but anyhow, that would be nitpicking.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, the confusion is, Olivier and Avri, is that for the new gTLDs, we spoke about the first round, the one which is now current or which just finished, we spoke about the first round. So there is confusion, people can understand that you're speaking about the new gTLDs and what you are working on now might be the second round. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And that's why I asked the question, to clear it up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, Mario?

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you very much. There is a raised hand at the moment from Sebastien, would you like to respond to his question?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sebastien, go ahead. Not the question, about the pop quiz, please. Sebastien, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, we need to be clear that it's not the first round, it was not the first round and it will not be the second round. Each time we introduce new gTLDs, the question of new, I don't think it's the question. We had run

into an additional round in 2004 and one in 2012, and it's either the second one already or the third one, and it will the third or the fourth one, then we can discuss why it's very, I think it's better to say the next round, even if we don't have a round but a first come first serve way to do it, but it's better, safer to talk about next round. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Sebastien. The difference between 2012 and the previous one is that the 2012 is the result of the new gTLD program. It was not the new gTLD round, it was the new gTLD program, and the first round of the new gTLD program was 2012. This is the difference. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: But Tijani, in 2000 it was a new gTLD round.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah, I am speaking about program. There was a program developed over I don't know how many years. This is the difference. Anyway, Mario.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you very much. Last question is actually applications for how many new gTLDs were received in the last round of applications. Less than 100, between 100 and 500, between 501 and 1000, and more than 1000.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, Olivier, you can go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani, it's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. There were in excess of 1300 applications, and as you've seen, there were delegations that were made to more than 1300.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, the application numbers were 1930.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, I said in excess. More, more than 1300, there were 1900 and something, but there were some which were duplicate applications – in other words, there were more than one organization applying for the same string, so there were all sorts of processes to allocate the string to one organization, rather than the other, and then there were some applications that were dropped, there were some that were refused, and there were some companies that went down, that collapsed before they even launched, so you know, that's business. But there were more than 1000 applications.

And it's interesting, because I'm not sure everyone thought that there would be more than 1000 applications when the current round was launched, and it did surprise a number of people that it was that many, and at the same time, you know, it seemed a lot of people were saying having 1000 new gTLDs was going to get everything to collapse, and it seems that things have held quite well.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, for your information, all the calculations of the new gTLD program were made according to 500 applications. So nobody imagined that we will exceed 500.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, I said they were very surprised, it was surprising to get that many.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah, the calculation of the cost of the program cost was done, the 1800, I forget, the fees for the first round was calculated assuming that we will receive 500 applications. Okay, Mario, give us the final question.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you very much. This was the last question and actually we have another hand raised from Sebastien again.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry about the 'again,' Sebastien Bachollet speaking. Yes the calculation was made for 500, and yes, only very few people were thinking that we will have so much application. But we can't say that no one was suspecting that. Especially the people who came with 300

applications, knew that it will be much more than 500. Therefore we can say that ICANN designed the budget for this round, we take 500 to be on the safer side of the finance for the organization. That's why, I was board member at that time, we decided to keep the 500, even if we knew that it may be more, and even after we knew that it will be more, we didn't change the budget, just to be, once again, on the safe side for the ICANN finance. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Sebastien. Now back to the questions, your questions. Who has a question for Avri or Olivier? Holly? You had a question, I think.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, it's been answered in the chat, so thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you very much. So I have two hands here. The first one is Sebastien. Sebastien, go ahead. Sebastien, I don't hear you. So, waiting for Sebastien, I will give the floor to Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I'm going to ask a question that I've heard being asked last week, actually. I went to a meeting in London and someone in the audience put their hand up and asked this question, and it seems to be frequently asked. So, this

one is for Avri. And the question is as follows; in the work of this working group for the subsequent procedures, and so on, are you looking at the protection of children online, you know, child protection, and basic, all of this hacking that's going on these days, with the malware and all this, so is this part of the work that you do on this?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Avri?

AVRI DORIA: Okay, this is Avri speaking. There has been some discussion around the edges on that. That has a real problem in that it runs to the – I mean, certainly would fall under public interest. But beyond that, we have a real problem that starts to look like content, that is something that is strictly out of scope for anybody inside ICANN, based on our bylaws. So while we are looking at it from a public interest perspective and it comes up perhaps in that context, that is not one of our specific topics.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Avri, and I do agree with you 100%. It is not in the limits of ICANN to enter and discuss and even look at the content. It's not our problem, it is something else. Even if you speak about public interest, you have to consider the public interest and have to say in the DNS, if you want, you don't have to look what kind of shoes this TLD will have, it is not your or our remit, but for the industry, if you want the public interest to not give all the advantage to the rich people, to the

businessman, et cetera, we have to consider the community, we have to consider the poor communities, we have to consider also the underserved region, et cetera. But I don't think any kind of content consideration can be done by ICANN. This is my point of view. I see two other hands, and Sebastien, you are the first. Go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Sebastien speaking. Yeah, I got some trouble with my microphone. I wanted to ask, maybe it was in your presentation but I didn't catch it clearly, where we are, or are we in any discussion about the application support program and any review of what has happened in the last round? Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: This is Avri. Yes, the application support program is being talked about, that is currently part of the existing program. We do have the application support as it was defined in the round of 2012. So, that is definitely part of our existing structure. It's certainly being looked at, it's being talked about. There are disparate views on it. There are people, and many of us who are involved in the joint application support group that we had back in the late 2000s that want to see more and want to see it done differently. There are some that are adamantly against any notion of financial support, and there always have been.

So that's very much at the issue. It was already discussed in one of the work track meetings, and it's one of the issues that we will be coming back to. I do believe there were questions on that also in the

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Avri. I hope that any kind of application support program for this new gTLD round will be more successful than the previous one. I have now Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Holly Raiche for the transcript. Really, just a response to Olivier, you forgot about all of the work that the SSIC does in talking about the security and stability of the DNS system. So when you're talking about questions of hacking and that sort of stuff, do we care, and the answer is yes, and we have the SSIC that has done a lot of work on that, that just released their latest publication 94, which is just a summary of all the advice they've given, that is relevant to new gTLDs and safety and stability, and I commend it to everybody reading. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Holly.

AVRI DORIA: This is Avri, if I can add to that, we'll definitely be taking the effects, documentation into consideration. We certainly invite people from

	SSAC, we have Patrick coming in to talk to us about name collision in the near future. So definitely care what SSAC has to say.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you, Avri. Alan Greenberg?
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much. The discussion about applicant support triggered something, a memory. My recollection, which may be wrong, but I think when the board approved the applicant support program, they allocated a certain amount of money, which essentially capped the number of applicants. How do you consider the funding of the applicant support? It wasn't quite part of the policy, it was some money that was made available at the time, and I'm just curious to what extent, if we recommend applicant support, do we really have it within our power to decide how much gets put into that, or that it be funded from the other applicant's cost, or something like that? I never thought of it in the current discussion.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Avri?
AVRI DORIA:	Did you want to answer that, Olivier? I see your hand is up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Answer this question and then I will give the floor to Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That was not to answer the question, that was to ask a question.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, fine. We have not actually talked about that, so I'm really glad you brought it up, and it is an important issue. I know that there are people that are working in some of the other groups, the auctions group, and such as that. We may be looking at that. We probably at a policy level couldn't get into money, but perhaps we could get into talking about the numbers, the ease, the policy, et cetera. I personally – and this is not me speaking as chair, but personally – am not sure that the financial way they did that is something that I would argue for, and that perhaps when we get to talking about applicant support and decide as a group that we still want to do that, that perhaps we look at the various mechanisms that we could recommend.

But, you know, there have been things talked about like, well, before the application procedure starts or something, that there could be some kind of pre-application to be an applicant without having to necessarily advertise words yet. I don't know, but I think it's a good point and I'm hoping that you and some others from At-Large are around to make sure we cover it, and perhaps it's something you will have covered in your responses to questions, and that would be very helpful.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Avri. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And I'm going to ask the million dollar question here. I've seen in the chat some people asking if it wasn't too late to get involved in this working group and the response was no, not at all, you can still get involved now. My question is when are we likely to see the work of this working group finish, and when are we likely to see if there is a subsequent round, when will that open?

AVRI DORIA: Okay, this is Avri again. Difficult question. Now, as I mentioned in my slides, at the moment I believe that we are going to get our draft recommendations out before the end of this year. Our schedule says October, I'm not sure I'd swear to October, but I really do hope we can get it out this year. I expect that, all things being equal, if we only have to do a single pass on comments before going to our final recommendations, that those would come out in mid 2018.

Now, in terms of when the process that the applications start, one of the conversations we've been having with Staff, and it's something that I've actually put a few brakes on up to now, but basically is when they know enough about what we're doing, to start looking at the application guidebook and start thinking through the changes. Now we've got people like Trang from the GDD, the division that does generic domains, I guess it is, no, it's not generic domains, I forget what the G is, and I

always use the wrong word when I say it off the top of my head, and I won't repeat it on a webinar – so, they're raring to go. They certainly are following the process, they're certainly participating in the process.

My recommendation to them is that once we've got our draft proposal, our draft recommendations published, that is really the time, and obviously they'll see it before it's actually published, because they're part of the group, that's actually the time to start the work and to come back with implementation issues. One of the things that we haven't discussed yet, for example, but will, is implementation review teams have been invented since the last PDP on new gTLDs. So I have every expectation that we will have an implementation review team and who that works with that.

So, I've heard, you know, if we do succeed at making mid 2018, I certainly don't think an application would start until 2019, and I bet 2020, but that's me personally. I can't really predict how long the process after we finish the PDP final recommendation will take. GDD is doing everything they can to be ready to move as quick as possible, but I'm not in position to predict it. So, 2019 or 2020 seems my recommendation of an expectation.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much and the final question from Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Avri mentioned implementation review teams. There in fact was an implementation review team last time around. We didn't use that title, and it was an implementation review team of the whole, essentially, you know, pretty much everyone in ICANN took part in this. And I suspect we're going to end up with something close to a free for all like that again. There's just going to be too much at stake to simply delegate one person, or half a dozen people to go off and do it, so I think it's going to be an interesting experiment pushing our new processes to the limit. I think if we get something ready to go in 2020, we're probably pushing ourselves. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: I hope you're wrong about 2020, this Avri again, I hope you're wrong about 2020 and us not being ready by then, because – but, I do think you are right, that doing the implementation review will be challenging and will be an interesting push on our processes, and that's a good thing.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Avri. I would like to ask Mario if our interpreters can give us a few minutes overtime, because we are already on top of the – at 30 exactly. Olivier, go ahead please.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, and I was just going to do a quick advert, please join the new gTLD working group if you're

interested in these topics, because that's the At-Large working group that will feed, that is supposed to be feeding and discussing those issues on an ongoing basis and feeding into the PDP, et cetera. So please consider this if you're interested. That's all, thanks.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. So, Avri, I have a question. You spoke about making change. You said you will not make change if we don't reach consensus, you said that if we don't reach consensus about making change, and what kind of change you have to make, you will make the current situation. What kind of consensus are you speaking about? Is it the full consensus, rough consensus?

AVRI DORIA: This is Avri. It will be what I call for better or worse ICANN consensus, which is what we use always. It's similar to rough consensus used in other places, and it's, you know, it's the consensus of the full working group, but it doesn't need to be full consensus it has to be the rough consensus that has become the hallmark of ICANN processes. And then there will be obviously a vote in the GNSO, based upon their review and their feeling about what we've done, and then the board also does vote on the recommendations. So, there will be the GNSO vote, there will be the board vote, and in the group we'll use, as it's documented in the working group procedures, what I call ICANN consensus.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you very much Avri, and thank you Olivier for your presentation and for your discussion. Thank you all for coming. I would like to think particularly our interpreters and our staff for helping us, as always. Thank you all for participating in this webinar, and now I give the floor to Mario for the evaluation questions. It will be very quick. I hope that the interpreters will permit it. Go ahead, Mario.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you, Tijani, it's Mario for the record. The first question of the survey is: How is the timing of the webinar? Too early, just right, too late, or no vote. You can cast your votes now, and as soon as you're complete we're going to move forward to the next question.

How is the technology used for the webinar?   Very good, good, sufficient, bad, very bad, or no vote.   Thank you everyone, we're going to move forward to the next one.

The third question: The speakers demonstrate mastery of the topic, and the first option is extremely strong, strong, sufficient, weak, or extremely weak.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, go ahead.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you. Move onward to our next one: Are you satisfied with the webinar?   And the answers are extremely satisfied, satisfied,

moderately satisfied, slightly satisfied, not satisfied at all. Thank you all for your vote.

Moving to question number 5: What region do you live in at the moment? Africa, Asia, Australia, Pacific Islands, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean Islands, North America.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, go ahead.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you, and we're going to go to the last one, it will take less than one minute: How many years of experience do you have in the ICANN community? Less than 1, 1 to 3, 3 to 5, 5 to 10, and more than 10 years. With this I appreciate all of your votes, and thank you for joining, and going to b over to back you Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Mario. So, again, thank you all. This webinar is now adjourned.

MARIO ALEMAN: This webinar has been adjourned. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines, and have a good rest of your day. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]