ICANN Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group
Monday, 24 July 2017 15:00 UTC
Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Registrar Stakeholder Working Group call on the Monday, 24 July 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.
The audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-05jul17-en.mp3
AND https://participate.icann.org/p90p0zr73mx/
Attendance may be found at: https://community.icann.org/x/SnHwAw

Michelle DeSmyter: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening and welcome to the new GTLD subsequent procedures working group call on the 24th of July 2017 at 15:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. We do have quite a few participants online. Attendance will be taken through the Adobe Connect Route. So if you are only on the audio bridge, would you please let yourself be known now?

Hearing no names, as a reminder to all participants, please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I will hand it back over to Jeff Neuman.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you very much. Welcome, everyone. This is Jeff Neuman for the transcript. I will note that there are some people that are out today due to the IGF in the U.S. in Washington, D.C. held today, IGF USA. So Avri is there

and so that leaves me chairing this meeting and if you look on the right hand side, you'll see the agenda which will start with statement of interest updates, going through the work track updates, short recap of ICANN 69, and geographic names at the top level, and then we'll get into some substance on a couple of the drafting team assignments that we're actually taking as a full group now, but may decide based on interest to break that up again into drafting teams.

Then we will get into any other business if there is any. I'll ask now. Is there any other business that we should cover? Okay. Seeing none or seeing no hands, nothing on the chat, I will ask are there any updates to any of the statements of interest that anyone would like to disclose? I'm seeing a note that says the recording is still paused. Michelle, do you know what's going on with the recording? Okay, the meeting is now being recorded so I guess I'll just start over and just say, welcome everyone, to the July 24, 2017 meeting of subsequent procedures, the full working group.

To summarize where we are, the recording started a couple minutes late so we've already covered the agenda. We've covered -- there was no one with any statements of interest updates and right now, I will turn it over to Maxim who has his hand raised.

Maxim Alzoba: Actually, I have small update about the progress of gross working group about user, country, and territory names. It would take two to three minutes and it's any other business just for information.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks Maxim. If you don't mind, maybe I'll put that in with when we start talking about geographic names at the top level. We'll go over what happened at ICANN 59 and then I'll turn it over to you or to Annebeth who has actually posted something in the chat. So we'll come back to that at that point in time because I think that's probably the best place to cover it.

Is there any other AOB? Kavous, yes, please.

Kavous Arasteh: Yes, an IOB, I want to talk about this (unintelligible) that I have heard. I was absent at the last afternoon ICANN 59. I heard that there has been discussions that need to have a separate track for the geographic name. I want to know whether it has been discussed further or not, or where we are whether we continue under which track, the geographic name item or to mix them up with other issue for (unintelligible) sufficiently complex and sufficiently broad and we need to have really addressed in depth.

So I just want to know what happened in the last meeting of the public forum with respect to this. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Kavous. We'll go over that as well in item number three. First, I'll do a recap of the other issues and then we'll get into geographic names at the top level. We'll cover that then. Okay, any other proposed additions to any other business?

Okay, seeing none and no updates to SLIs, I think I will turn it over to each of the work tracks, one through four, anyway, to give an update of their meetings and their next meeting very briefly. So I'm just looking to see who from work track one would like to give the update.

I see Sarah is on here and -- okay, Sara, thanks.

Sara Bockey: Yes, this is Sara Bockey for the record. So we have our call tomorrow, Tuesday, at, oh goodness, I want to say it's 20:00 UTC. That may be wrong. And we're going to be continuing our discussion of the (unintelligible) responses. We'll be covering application submission period and application queueing. We're also going to be having a brief discussion on the registree letter we received regarding the RSP program and so that is where we are and that is on our agenda for tomorrow, and I hope those of you who are on that working group can make it.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Sarah. Work track two, I see Michael and we got a big attendance. I have to scroll down on my list. Phil is also on. Michael, you're up.

Michael Fleming: Thanks, Jeff. Can you hear me?

Jeff Neuman: A little loud but we can hear you.

Michael Fleming: Let me turn down my microphone. Quieter?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, we're good.

Michael Fleming: I'm just going to -- all right, so thank you very much, Jeff. So this week in work track two, we will be kind of summarizing what we talked about in our last meeting, in which we called the CC2 registry agreements, which is about two weeks ago. And this week, while doing that summary and seeing if we can't kind of collect our ideas to move towards our conclusions a little bit, we're going to jump over to CC2 comments for reserve names.

Now, just so everybody knows, CC2 comments for reserve names did actually cover the names in the top level and we did get feedback from individuals in regards to geographic names as well but any mention or any input in regards to the geographic names in the top level in our CC2 comments will be deferred to work track five once that gets kicked off.

So we'll be covering everything else in regards to reserve names on the top level and the second level coming up this week. Thank you very much.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Michael. Kavous has his hand raised, so Kavous.

Kavous Arasteh: Thank you (Michael). I think in ICANN 59 we have been presented or we were presented by a document (unintelligible) on the geographic name and there was a lot of comments at that meeting. There was (unintelligible) meeting for GAC. There was similar meeting for public forum and in those

meetings, several comments were made with respect to the pros and cons of (unintelligible) and I would like to know whether these comments are taken into account, in particular some of the question was raised, which was a prerogative of the country (unintelligible) of keeping or protecting geographic names and those questions asking or (unintelligible) those questions are not -- were considered not to be appropriate. I would like to know whether there has been any discussion on that.

If you want, I can leave you some of those comments but if you are sufficiently aware of the situation, please tell me whether anything has been done to remove those deficiencies, problems, difficulties in particular conditions on a protection of the geographic name by a country who believes that such geographic name to be protected. Just discussion. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Kavous. I'm going to ask that we discuss that in item number three. We'll get to that on a geographic. Work track two right now is dealing with everything but -- sorry -- all the reserve name issues except for the geographic at the top level. So we'll get more into that in item number three. So if I don't answer the question, just bring it up again in item number three if we don't get to it.

Kavous Arasteh: Okay, I will do. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: This is not item three but this is work track number three on dispute resolution, contention, all that fun stuff, communities. (Karen), please give us an update as to where your group is?

(Karen):   Hi, Jeff. This is (Karen). Hope you can hear me okay. We had our last call on the 18th and we started off our CC2 review with objections. We will have our next call on July -- excuse me -- August 1. I can't believe it's August already. And we will be continuing with our review on CC2 input on the subject of objections. We made some pretty good progress so far on legal rights objections and confusingly, similarity objections. We're going to

hopefully have some more conversation on the list between now and the first on that. But that's what we're working on now is objections and community input.

And Robin will be leading the call on the 1st. I will be on vacation. So hope everybody can join. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Karen. A question from Kavous.

Kavous Arasteh: I said that a problem that we have encountered that sometimes but not all the times the community objections will have some sort of political motivations rather than technical or administrative. How we could avoid that because one or two countries might have in particular community some political influence. They may mobilize the other without any really acceptable ground to object to something that make it difficult for the people outside that community to detect the origin of source of that motivation and that will be taken as an objection, which does not really have any ground.

And even if the people are asking the (unintelligible) when they receive the objection to propose sort of solution for that and because of that political motivation that will be rejected and issue remain as it is. I don't want to give a (unintelligible) example unfortunately but it has happened and sometimes these political motivations may influence or may (unintelligible) rather than allowing the normal technical or administrative objections.

This is the question that how we could avoid that. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Kavous. That's a great question and I think it's also one that if there were certainly any examples that we can, in the past round, that we could cite or ones that you can think of may occur, I think that's something that's great for discussion at one of the next work track three meetings.

On this call, we're just going over some updates. They're not really to get too much into the substance of the different work tracks but certainly, we will take note of the questions and (Karen) is on the call, and Robin will -- I'm not sure if Robin is on the call but -- let me just take a quick look here down the list -- no, but we'll make sure Robin has those notes and we'll try to get to that question on the next call, which I think (Karen) said was on August 1. And also, I would note that Vonda has also said that that was a relevant point and difficult to avoid. So Maxim has said on the chat, I'm not sure the GNSO can influence GAC due to quite different level of power.

But certainly a relevant question, I think, in order to give applicants more predictability. It's certainly a question that we need to think about. So Rubens, is that a question on this or are you just getting ready for work track four? Work track four. So Kavous seems to have a question.

Kavous Arasteh: This is follow-up question. I'm sorry, I was misunderstood. I never said GNSO take any political against GAC. I was not talking on behalf of GAC. I was a participant to this group and I did not refer anything with the GNSO as such and GAC. I was referring to the normal application of a name and then saying that some group of countries called themselves community. They may under the community objection raise their (unintelligible). It has nothing to do with GNSO or GAC or with the inter-community or inter-SOAC. That was a general question. I hope it was not misunderstood or should not be misunderstood. I was (unintelligible).

So we have to avoid it. I was not referring to (unintelligible) at all. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks for the clarification and I think you're pretty clear on the message and so we will certainly make sure that it's clear in the notes as well. Any other questions on work track three? Seeing none, Rubens, work track four.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks you, Jeff. Rubens here. Can you hear me?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, we can hear you.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks, Jeff. Last week at work track four, we had some review of (unintelligible) comments mostly related to IDNs. We have been automating looking at CC2 and progressing either language or principal discussions that we're having but some of those are contingent on receiving information from ICANN. Work track four is very technical track and most of the information needs to be delivered to us by ICANN organization.

So we have been doing some on demand scheduling so I can't predict right now what we'll be discussing at August 3, which will be our next work track four meeting. But it will either be rehashing the language that we know that needs to be refined or discussing some principals where we get new information that we can discuss on.

Also on work track four teams, we'll be doing some outreach to some outside ICANN organizations regarding main collisions framework and some inside ICANN organizations regarding regional scaling. So we also have those (unintelligible) in mind but these will mostly not be dealt within our calls unless we get relevant feedback from those outreach expeditions.

So that's it for work track four. Hope to see all August 3.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Rubens. Any questions on work track four? Okay, and then this is actually probably a good lead-in to item number three, which is a recap of ICANN 59 and then also, I'll do 3B is kind of a discussion on the next steps on geographic names at the top level. On the regular face-to-face meeting, the tie-in from Rubens work track four updates is that there was some good discussion at the ICANN meeting on the notion of, well, what if we get more than expected volumes of domain name applications or top level domain applications.

So if everyone recalls, in the first -- sorry -- in the last round, in 2012, I think conservatively, ICANN estimate that it would receive only about 500 applications or that that was thought of as being kind of the highest amount of applications it would receive. That started a whole line of thinking and some (unintelligible) study and other information that came out from the SSAC and SSAC 46, which said that there should be a limit of no more than 1,000 top level domains delegated in any given 12 month period or in any given year.

And that worked well for the last round, because although we had 1,900 applications for about 1,390 strings, between all of the contention sets, and the evaluations, and objections, and everything else, it took longer than a year to process all of those applications. So 1,000 per year did not seem like it would pose an issue at all.

However, now, we're hearing things -- again this is nothing concrete. I've noticed that some people -- there was domain pressed on the statements that are made at ICANN 59 that there would be thousands and thousands of applications. None of us know that to be true. However, we do need to plan for if that were to be true and therefore we are drafting -- we being the leadership team -- is going to draft a letter to send to the SSAC -- the root zone advisory committee. Sorry, Rubens, there was another committee we said we were going to send it to. I think it was -- yes, so the RSAC and then I think OCTO, which remind me what that stands for again? Oh, the Office of the Chief Technology Officer.

So that we would get an update to see if there was a study done by an organization called CDAR, or it's called the CDAR stud, and they came out -- they said there were no issues with the thousand name per year rule. We had no significant impact on the root zone, but the question was not posed as to whether we could do more than 1,000 per year and whether that report would cause the SSAC to revise its thinking in SSAC 46.

Otherwise, as the example we used, if we receive 25,000 applications, again, that's a big hypothetical, I have no information to think that we will, but if we did, you would have to tell certain applications, look, I'm sorry, you're going to have to wait 25 years before we can put your name into the root and that probably would not be an acceptable answer to that applicant. So that's one of the updates. There's a question or a comment on the chat. Jeff, please clarify that 1,000 per year issue as I'm not sure well explained whether that 1,000 applications stems from one of the many sources applicants and where that number comes from.

There was a root zone study that was done prior to the 2012 round that basically came up with and said that the root zone could handle a large number of additions to the root but reviewing that study, the SSAC basically said in SSAC 46, along with some discussions with the GAC, the board had decided that 1,000 would be the limit and that would be safe as a conservative estimate.

I think everyone at that time, when a 1,000 number limit was thought of, nobody thought there would actually be 1,000 or more applications. So that will be -- that's an issue being discussed right now in work track four, as Rubens said -- but we're going to get some official input from the SSAC to see if it wants to revise its thinking from SSAC 46 back in 2009 or 2010.

But as is on the chat, we don't have any reliable source on potential demand so we really don't know if we're going to get 1,000, 2,000, 10,000, 25,000 or just less. We have no idea of the number of applications but depending on which mechanism we choose for assessing applications, which we're going to talk about a little later this call, is going to be an important question that if we can, would like to have considered by the SSAC prior to the next application window.

So that's one of the updates. The second update is -- from the face-to-face -- was a good discussion on the topic we're going to get to later on, which is

how should applications be assessed. Should we do it in rounds? Should we do it first come first serve? Should we do it in some sort of hybrid. I'm going to save discussion on that topic until number four on the agenda because that's really what I want to spend most of the time on this call talking about.

So of the issues, I think those were probably the most talked about and I think the face-to-face meeting that we had at ICANN 59 was good. I think everyone should go back and read the transcripts. I know there were some conflicting meetings with that. We had some pretty good attendance but I think there were some other sessions that were conflicting. So the recordings are available and the transcripts are available and perhaps, ICANN staff could put that into the chat.

The other major item, probably the one that most people have been talking about already on this list and on others, was two face-to-face community wide sessions on discussing geographic names at the top level. With respect to geographic names at the top level and only the top level, I'm going to leave the second level out because there were certainly discussions at ICANN 59 on that as well, but at the top level, the first session was designed to solicit feedback on a straw person proposal -- I'm sorry, it was not a proposal, I knew I would make that mistake again -- it was just a straw person document to just really stimulate discussion and get people thinking about the issue of geographic names at the top level.

That straw person has no status. That straw person is not even going to be the basis for future discussion at this point. It was again just to solicit comments and just to get everyone talking about the geographic names at the top level issue. One point that was brought up by some participants in the first session was that some participants didn't think that there was an issue and thought that the applicant guidebook had really presented the best possible solution and so some people advocated at that first meeting that we should not change anything for the upcoming rounds.

Now, fast forward to the second session. During the second session, it seems like that notion of keeping the status quo or keeping the applicant guidebook the way it is, I think by the end of the second session, I would say that most of the people that spoke in favor of keeping everything the way it was, at some point realized that there were still questions that needed to be resolved and therefore were open to discussing the issues. Now, there were two parts to the second session. The first part mostly focused on a review of some of the information we had obtained or the facilitators had obtained through some face-to-face meetings with a number of community participants to kind of recap where they thought the different groups felt on different aspects of the issue.

The second part of that first half of the session focused on a proposal that Avri and I have made on the creation of a fifth work track, or track five, in which we would invite one person from each of the advisory committees and supporting organizations to serve as a co-leader of that work track in order to promote inclusiveness and to structure as much as we could the work track five very much like a CCWG, but within the GNSO policy development process.

There were -- oh, and one other thing was the proposal basically said that the co-leaders, once they were selected, could then decide amongst themselves how they would conduct the proceedings of that fifth work track. The GNSO PDP fortunately enough has a very flexible provisions in it whereby there's a lot of different ways that working groups and sub-working group can do their work that allows participation from the entire community, and even in this case, leadership from different members of the community representing different advisory committees and supporting organizations.

The result of which is that this week, the co-leaders, Avri and I, are -- and leadership are drafting an invitation letter to the GNSO chair, the GAC chair, the ALAC chair, and the CCNSO chair to help us with the appointment of a co-leader for that fifth work track. That indication will go out, as I said, this

week, and shortly after that, we will do a call for volunteers for the work track five, and hopefully get that work track five started by first week of September. So that's our goal. We would love to hit that goal. It seems to have been met with some very positive reception from a lot of people in the community.

I will say that what Kavous was referring to earlier on is that there were some GAC members during that second meeting, second face-to-face on geographic names, that expressed concern over doing this work within the GNSO. They were of the view, particularly Jorge from Switzerland, is of the view that this issue on geographic names at the top level is more appropriately done within a CCWG and also is more of an issue for CCTLDs and the GAC as opposed to GNSO. There was a healthy discussion on what is a CCTLD versus what is a GTLD.

That issue is far from resolved but as far as this working group, we are proceeding with discussing issues of geographic names at the top level because it is within our charter. Our charter also had us paying attention to and incorporating to the extent there were recommendations from any other cross community working group that was talking about this issue, and I think this is probably a good time to turn it over to Annebeth if she wants to give an update on the cross community working group on the use of country and territory names from their final report to I believe this is something that the CCNSO has addressed as well.

So Annebeth, if you could turn on your mic and give us an update that would be great.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, I will. Just a moment. Can you hear me?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, we can hear you. Thanks.

Annebeth Lange: Good. Hello, everyone and I just wanted to follow-up what I wrote in the chat that at this meeting which was July last Thursday, the CCNSO Council

discussed recommendations in the final paper from the cross community working group and adopted the resolutions. It's two resolutions there and after the CCNSO members meeting in Johannesburg, the recommendations of the CCW (unintelligible) were discussed as recorded.

And unfortunately, we know that we didn't end up with a good result. We couldn't recommend very much to be honest. The only thing we ended up with was that there was no conclusion to much more than two letter codes. However, the format to continue work is still under community discussion and awaiting the outcome of that discussion, the CCNSO Council deferred the discussion and adoption of the final paper to the next meeting and that was the meeting in July 2017.

And now, since they have adopted the recommendations in the (unintelligible) paper, the CCNSO council effectively has closed the cross community working group and supports that (unintelligible) additional work in the area. So the first resolution was that as this meeting in the CCWG decided to continue work on this area, but the format to continue work, since it's still in the community discussions, we will await the outcome of that discussion.

So the decision is that the CCNSO Council adopts the final paper and supports the recommendations one, two, and four in the final report. And the council also requests the CCNO appointed members to the CCWG to keep the constant (unintelligible) of the developments on the next steps. The next resolution is about a letter that it was decided in the study group that it was before this cross community working group. There we had a recommendation from the study group, a letter to the board to request continued exclusion of country and territory names in the subsequent new GTLD round.

In September 2014, the study group recommended that in light of the need for further work on the (unintelligible) country and territory names, the complexity of the issue at hand and the aforementioned inconsistencies

between various ICANN policies, it is recommended that the CCNSO Council requests that the ICANN Board extend the current role in the CTLD (unintelligible) guidebook regarding the exclusion of all country and territory names for consecutive rounds in the new GTLD applications.

However, a better solution is as follows. At the CCNSO members meeting, since we discussed the recommendations there, included in the recommendations for the (unintelligible) group but asked the (unintelligible) to continue work still under community discussions and interest of the CCTLD community and future efforts need to be ensured. The CCNSO Council defers the decision whether to send this letter to its August meeting and requests the secretary to organize the drafting of such a letter, which includes at a minimum consultation of the CCNSO appointed members of the CCCB WG and interested councilors.

So that's where it stands just now and now, we just await what will happen with the work track five so we have time to consider what will happen in the future. If there's any questions about this, I would be happy to answer them.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Annebeth and Maxim has a comment in the chat. It says do we know how the work track five is going to interact with the CCNSO on matters of (unintelligible) at the top level. I will say that, just reiterate that the plan is to invite the CCNSO to obviously participate. Anyone -- all GNSO PDPs are open and we will also ask that the CCNSO appoint someone to serve as one of the co-leaders of this work track.

So that's what we are going to do from the GNSO perspective and I guess we'll see what the CCNSO, how they react to that invitation. Hopefully positive. Does anybody else have a question? I see Kavous and Anne. Annebeth, why don't you just stay on hold and we'll see what Kavous and Anne have to say and perhaps I'll turn it back over to you as well.

Kavous, please. I'm not sure if you're no mute, can't hear you right now.

Kavous Arasteh: I raised two questions at the beginning of your meeting and you rightly
pointed me towards these agenda items. Now, I see that (unintelligible) full
board chat five, work track five. What is this work track five or work track five.
First, before I'm raising my questions, do we have work track five or do we
have work track five? What are these, the definitions or nominations, or
(unintelligible)? Everyone using something -- I don't follow, I'm sorry. This is
one point.

Then the lady presented the (unintelligible) to resolution. What resolution?
Who has adopted that resolution? I don't think that ICANN could have any
resolutions before we address the issue? What resolutions (unintelligible)
included, excluded? I don't understand. Three questions I raise still valid.
Do we have the work track five proceeding with the geographic names all
across the whole ICANN, or we have (unintelligible) today every SO, SE, AC,
or some (unintelligible) and AC they have their own separate working that
might have conflict.

I think two years ago, one and a half years ago, we discuss (unintelligible)
that would be more appropriate and more valid or efficient to have one single
group dealing with this geographic names composing of anyone interested
from any SO and AC. This is my first question, is it somewhere going or is it
just spread over many things, GNSO (unintelligible) CNSOD, GAC. So still I
am in favor of one single group to do this job under any approach, either track
five or anything. But I don't understand the other issues that the work track
five. What is work track five? Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. Annebeth, why don't you address the resolution issue and then I'll
address the work track five?

Annebeth Lange: Yes, that's okay for me. Should I take that first? Yes, the resolution are from
the CCNSO Council. It's then cross-community working group use of country
and territory names on the top level was under the regime of the CCNSO.

That's why, when we didn't finish the way we wanted, there was no actual conclusion in this, we had to stop somewhere to try to put all the different efforts together. As you said, Kavous, you in the GAC have discussed geographical names with other groups discussing other elements of this.

And we in the cross-community working group have only been discussing the use of country and territory names. So it's been kind of a confusing situation. So what we decided in the CCNSO was that we couldn't come anywhere further in this discussion of the cross community working group so that's why we had to adopt the final report, which said exactly that. So now we await what will happen in the next round. I know that there are different views whether we should have a work track five as a special combined group where all efforts can be put together but under the GNSO regime or others wanted a new cross community working group.

But we have been working in this cross community working group for many years and we haven't arrived at a result. So that's why we tried to find a new way forward. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Annebeth. And so from that, Kavous, the GNSO, the group that chartered this particular policy development process included within its charter for this group geographic names at the top level as one of the subject that this particular working group needs to look at. While we initially had grouped that issue within work track two, which you heard Michael Fleming talking about, the whole reserve names issue, after listening to the community, after listening to input from people like Annebeth and other members of the CCTLDs and the GAC, we too agree that one group is probably the best place to resolve these issues, to have it discussed in one particular group.

And therefore we decided, we being the leadership of this particular PDP, so Avri and myself, along with other members of the leadership team, including the existing work track leaders of work tracks one through four, which you

heard giving updates a little earlier in the meeting, all decided that we would create a new work track five to deal only with geographic names at the top level, which includes as one of the subsets country and territory names.

Now remember, there are additional types of geographic names that need to be considered above and beyond just country and territory names. So that is also within the scope of this new work track. And unlike the other work tracks one through four where we have selected leaders exclusively that were already participating in this policy development process, we are opening up work track five to see if there are additional volunteers that want to participate in work track five and do not have to participate in any of the other work tracks but also trying to get a co-leader from each of the impacted communities including one from the governments, one from the CCTLDs, one from the at large and one from the GNSO.

So hopefully between all four of those co-leaders, they will be able to include input - important input from each of the different stakeholders. So Kavous I noticed that you have a follow-up question. So please.

Kavous Arasteh: Yes Jeff thank you for the clarification. I don't mind we start to dress up issue by whom, by GNSO also and support on the work track five. But the question is that I don't understand this one from this one from that it would be difficult to have that one. Okay I don't know. Maybe in GNSO easy to have one from the entire house made somewhat maybe much, much simpler than GNSO may be difficult to have one. What do you mean one person? Just I don't know.

It is definitely it should have more vital participation allowing the people to share their knowledge, to share their views with each other and that one person no matter how knowledgeable that person would be or how impartial that person would be or how familiar still would be biased what his own way of thinking as a human being. I don't think that is correct to have one from - just one from there. I think the best way that you are start with the vote track

five we address the geographic name as I would like to answer (Robbie's) question geographic name is merely and only referred to geographic but not to (unintelligible) or sensitive or cultural and so on and so forth. That (unintelligible) differently. I don't that we should mix up the institution.

But later on perhaps the most appropriate way which has been responded up to now is this cross community structure. This has been worked by the (unintelligible), ability across community for option, cross community for this. So this cross community has no limit for participation and we listen to everybody if they don't have any problem. If you want to limit it to that five, we'd have difficulty at least in some earlier because that person could not represent the views of the entire SOAC that becomes. I do not understand this idea coming from room. So we should be giving a more as liberal, a more open participation across into the main purpose of the identity including.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Kavous Arasteh: So I have difficulty with that one total. Thank you. This is for second one…

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Kavous Arasteh: And then I come to the clause (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks Kavous. Yes. So as you can see in the chat, it's only - participation in the actual work track is unlimited. Anyone can participate. It's open to everyone. I just - what we are doing is just appointing one leader from each of the SOs and the ACs. So it's just to have a leadership team for that work track. But the work track is not limited to participants or to one participant. It's unlimited like any other working group or work track. Anyone can participate in the work track that wants to. So we hope to gain as you said as many participants as possible to share their experience and their knowledge. So it's just one co-chair or one co-leader from each of the SOs and ACs. So I hope that clarifies. And Kavous you said you had a follow-up

and then I know Anne your hand was up but I don't know. I seems to be down right now. Kavous, please.

Kavous Arasteh: Yes. My second question was that this straw man or straw person or whatever you call them document which was submitted by subgroup or by something that not entirely GNSO or the entire group, there has some conditions which found to be not realistic. For instance, if a company wants to protect the geographic names, the - that point is asked what is written for that. And we have thought that there is no need to ask such reasons. I can give you one example of this. I can give my own country. Suppose that you want to keep (unintelligible) as a protectorate. Why they have to give justification for that? There is no justification? Justification is the view of the country who requests that or the entity who requests that.

So there are many others that as was mentioned. I don't want to take the time of 90 minutes to go through that. And I think that this straw man or straw person condition which were put based on the comments made at the forum, you have the transcript. You have the recording. They need to be reviewed and try to (unintelligible) appropriately. And if we want to go ahead with that document. If we want to leave it as it is and don't (unintelligible) it up, I have no problem but if you follow it, it doesn't work under the condition that were written. That was my second question. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks Kavous and just to answer that quickly. Yes the straw person was only drafted by Avri and I and it was not the idea of anyone else. But that is off right now. We are not talking about the straw person. Work track five will not be looking at the straw person specifically. It will be taking up the issue as a whole. And I think the points you raised the countries and their views towards geographic names I think is going to be important to express there. But it's not something we need to worry about here because it's not - the straw person again was only a tool that was to stimulate discussion during the ICANN 59 which it did. And now it's off the table as some of us say. It's no longer being considered. So I hope that's okay. Anne, please.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. Thank you Jeff. You two have answered most of my questions. I just had a very specific question again about the resolution itself which is where was this resolution passed and do we have a link to the text of the resolution? I'd just like to understand the resolution better. I think every other question I had, you've answered.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, Annebeth, you want to answer this?

Annebeth Lange: Yes. Annebeth for the record. Yes that was passed in the council of the first community group of or the country and territory names (unintelligible). But now it's - sorry the council of the CCNSO on the 20th. And it will be on the Web site of the CCNSO. But I could just certainly send it to the link to it to all of you if I could send it to you Jeff and then you can include it somewhere.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes that would be fantastic. Thank you very much Annebeth. Thank you Jeff.

Annebeth Lange: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks and I think (Steve) actually posted a link to the resolutions if you scroll up in the chat.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh okay.

Jeff Neuman: And there it is so.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: There is it now. So that's the link. Just now the GNSO council has not yet decided what to do with the final report of the CCWG on the use of country and territory names. So that will be on the GNSO. I think they talked a little bit about it at the last council meeting but they will decide what to do with that

I think either in their August meeting or September. So that - the GNSO needs to act on it as well. Okay any other questions on this before we jump into some of the substance?

Okay. Seeing none, let's go to the first document of drafting - of the drafting teams that we were supposed to set up. But it seems like we have been making a lot of progress as a full working group on some of these issues as opposed to drafting teams. That said, we can address these issues in a drafting team later on or in a subsequent drafting team if we have some good discussions here.

So if we can bring up the - oh I'm hearing some beeping here. If we can bring up this document. It's - okay. So for those of you that can read it here, you can read it on the screen in Adobe. But there's also a link to the document. I put in a couple of changes since this PDF was created. At that Google Docs link that's in the upper right hand corner under the agenda, it has the Google Doc link. And so basically what we had talked about on this issue both in previous discussions but also in - at ICANN 59 was, you know, how do we assess applications in subsequent procedures or subsequent rounds or windows or whatever term we used to call it.

I think one of the things I kind of wanted to start with in the discussions, although there are some differing opinions on what we should do as a steady state, meaning ongoing, you know, whether we do a first come, first serve, or rounds. I think most of the feedback that we've gotten indicates that this very first introduction in 2000 and whatever whenever we do the next introduction of new GTLDs, I think it's fairly well agreed that that be a quote round meaning that we would collect applications for a period of time and that we would have to have a procedure to deal with string contention and we would have to go through all of the similar types of evaluations we did in the 2012.

I just want to make sure if everyone is on the same page, that at least the very first introduction of the next group of TLDs should be in the form of a

round without talking about what we do after that. So Kavous you have your hand raised.

Kavous Arasteh: Yes Jeff. Thank you very much for the document. I have read it carefully and I think what you're now doing, we are opening yes especially all this university cost to have a Ph.D. on this issue, spending years and years and years to see how it goes. I don't know why we need to go that much in detail of the situations. There has been an issue of 2007. There are some deficiencies, difficulties as always done reviewing that and try to remove difficulties. We tried to go to take a new path which have complete - which is completely unknown to everybody. We do not know how it will go for this - those issues we have discussed.

I think it might be good that you try to look at the first thing that we have, the first round and to identify what are the problem and include those in the same thing. I don't think that we should have a steady application time. It will problems. I don't think that we should have a first come, first serve for the reasons that I have given two times and I said that I have sufficient experience for more than 25 years dealing with first come, first serve in other applications which is similar what we do. So perhaps we should look at the matter to see what are the problems and problems aren't going to the new teams.

We try to have this but we have another round. This round should take six months. We decide on the X. That should be a stop and we should be again taken up after Y months or so on and so forth. And in the meantime we may apply some sort of the I would say hybrid applications in order to really remove the difficulties. Going to the new plan takes a lot of time. It will be similar to the work is being - it will be to the first round because it's completely (unintelligible). We don't know what will happen. Perhaps we should try to address the - this advantage or the deficiencies, problems of that but not introducing a new part that is like the (unintelligible) one, like the first come, first serve, or like a combination of both.

We should address the issue differently. What were the problems that you decide on second round. Open it for X months. Then try to address those within the time that you have and then again and try to address the difficulties and issues. And some of these things that you mention are the clones in this document really are causing problems. And some of the problems is not really a justification that they are problems. I don't want to go further detail but I see that please kindly do not upside down what you already have. Try to improve that. You have a (unintelligible) ten years ago. Don't demolish the (unintelligible) totally and start a new structure and a new building on something that we don't know. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks Kavous and we'll go through this document on those pros and cons that you were talking about and make sure that, you know, where there are cons we can figure out ways to address those. Anne you're next.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes thanks Jeff. I just want to get clarification on where you are on the decision tree in terms of a consensus. And you were talking about the general feed that we should proceed with a round as opposed to just a free and open y'all come forever application process. But I'm assuming that that does not actually get down to the level of whether there will be any priority rounds such as for communities or priority rounds for brands or any of the other suggestions that have come up but that we haven't addressed that yet.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks Anne. Right. So this is really just to put a stake in the ground to see, you know, how we would start the very next introduction of new GTLDs. But it's not getting into issues of priorities or contention or any of those issues which are actually being discussed in individual work tracks. So though I will say that from a number of these other issues that we discussed on categories there did not seem to be a large number of supporters for different categories had different rounds.

Now that could change and we will discuss that again in future weeks. But for now, we are only talking about the overall structure but not issues of priority or whether we should do a round first for brands or for geos or for communities or something else. That's not what we're talking about. We're talking about…

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Well thanks Jeff. Just one follow-up question. Would you consider that topic as under the auspices of work track three? We've had a fair number of discussions on the issue of, you know, community applications, what they're intended for. I didn't know if, you know, priority - what's the right work track for the issue of priority rounds?

Jeff Neuman: So to the extent that it would involve communities - community priorities as a separate round, that's interesting because it's kind of an overlap between work track three and an overall issue - an overarching issue. To the extent that it already is being discussed as if priority applications are - or sorry if community applications, for example, are mixed in with general applications or non-community applications whether to give those community applications priority over the other ones. That is a work track three item.

Whether we should do a round only for communities or only for geos or only for brands or only for a particular group, that would be (unintelligible) issue. Since there are some - there's some overlap obviously between those issues. You know, like what is a community would have to be an issue in both. But to the extent that - I hope that makes sense To the extent that we're giving a priority over applications within a particular round, that's a work track three. To the extent that we're giving any categories a - their own round, that would be an overarching issue and that's for us as a full group to discuss not at the moment but in subsequent weeks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. Thanks Jeff. So that clarifies that, that it's really the plenary that would treat that issue of separate rounds which sort of that was

raised by your comment that folks believe that there should be a round. So I assume that that is still on the agenda of the plenary?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. That topic of categories and whether categories should have special treatment in terms of their own rounds or a different type of round or a different contract or things like that is still an over - sorry not the contract issue but the - whether there should be separate rounds is an overarching issue for the plenary.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great. Thanks. I just wanted to get that confirmed. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Kavous please.

Kavous Arasteh: Yes. Yes Jeff I have been working on similar issues for years. You call them pros and cons. We in those entities call them advantages and disadvantages. This is not considered to be very efficient for the following reasons. Something which is pros in view of one group that may be cons in view of other group and vice versa. So I don't see quite efficient. You go through all of these pros and cons because it's coming from ideas of some people (unintelligible) but I don't think that it is useful to go through that one by one and to see whether to take it as a pros and as all as the cons and later on decide on the pros and cons and then the matter.

I suggest that you reconsider your position as the chair or others and we do not go through these pros and cons one by one for the reason that I have given. Something is pro for you may be cons for me. It depends on how you look into the matter and vice versa while the views of everybody is fully respected and observed - and to be observed. So I still don't believe that it is efficient to go through all of these many items that you have mentioned. To spend some hours to read all of them is very, very difficult sometimes because of the subject of some of them.

There is no real justification to be really pros and cons. And sometimes one pros is mixed up with the cons and vice versa. So I don't know whether you insist to go through this one by one and spend how many sessions to go through that or you take some simple approach to see what are the disadvantage or shortcoming of the existing round or the first round of existing and try to address that rather than going through this very voluminous table. I am at your disposal but as this I have to share views with you. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Kavous. Well let's start with what we've called the requirements and these are again I hope requirements is the right word but it's really some principles that we all - whatever solution we come up with, we should test against these requirements. So if you look at the first bullet point under the requirements, we say that there must be clarity and predictability about how and when applications can be applied for in the future. Right, pretty noncontroversial statement but I think whatever solution we come up with should meet that requirement. Okay I'm seeing a check mark and not seeing any hands raised on that one. It seems pretty logical.

The second one and again so not everyone necessarily has to or not everyone - it's possible that some people may not agree with the second one but it seemed to come out of our discussions that there must not be undefined gaps between the processing of applications to the acceptance of additional applications. So, for example, the 2012 applicant guidebook although it says that a subsequent round should start within a year after accepting or after the application window in the 2012 closed what didn't happen.

And there are a number of people that want to make sure that we do not get into another situation where we run a round or we conduct a round and then it takes us eight years or seven or eight years to get into a subsequent round or subsequent application window. So many people in the group felt like we

should not just do a round, have a break, and then whenever we get to the next round do the next round. So Kavous you have thoughts on that.

Kavous Arasteh: Yes. Jeff is it possible that we have that determination that for instance between the second round if there is a different round and the third round should be each year it could be? Define that because we don't know how many applications will come. We don't know how much they are conflicting each other. On the other hand about the delegations, there are people who say that the maximum number or the number -- I don't know whether it was maximum or whether it was minimum -- is 1000 and then what's happened the - for the remaining. Suppose that that are 10,000 applications and we say that the next round should start two years after the 10,000 has been treated. If 10,000 never reach - treated so that two years was meaningless.

So is it possible to say that or we should have some relative things or we should put some conditions that the second round start after X percent of the round where it's successfully completed or as the Y percent that delegated and so on and so forth. But not when everything was treated because you may not be able to treat that in that period, whatever period we put. But having said that when we had this first round, we had no experience at all. That one year was not meaningful at all because we know that doesn't happen - didn't happen at all 2012 and we maybe a 1000, 2019 or 2020, nine years instead of one year or eight years.

So I don't think that it should be definitely determined a period the clarity for (unintelligible) qualification and also some conditions. It should be clear or determined, clear period by which there is subsequent rounds. If there is a round it could be started. However, it should not be started or should be started if X percent of the first round of - has been implemented or delegated. So we should be some qualification. Otherwise, whatever figure we put may be one side or other side is not applicable. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks Kavous. So let me throw that question out to the group to see if anyone else wants to talk on this issue. Is it possible - Kavous asked a question basically saying is it possible to even define some sort of parameter in between rounds that we could put into the next version of the guidebook based on a certain set of criteria. What do people think? Is it possible? Can we do it or is it a fool's exercise to put something into the guidebook that says we start the next window six months after we close? I know that people have thoughts on this issue because a lot of people came forward in their comments early on and said that we don't want undefined gaps and we want certainties. I'm going to Jami first. Kavous I know your hand's up first but I want to see if we can just prove some other people. So Jami.

Jami A. Gekas: Yes. I'm not sure I have an answer to the question, Jeff, but I pose another question. Does there still need to be additional reviews done between each of the rounds? Because if so, will that add a layer of complexity to being able to have a specific definition or timeline to the rounds?

Jeff Neuman: Jami thanks. This is Jeff. Good question. I think the feedback that this group has gotten on the overarching issues when we go back to the community comment number one was that it was not desirable to have full scale reviews in between every round but to deal with issues as they came up but that should not stall the next round unless it was of such an emergency level or so substantial that we could not continue until we solved that issue. But in general, the comment that we had gotten back was that no that we would not do separate periods of reviews like this one. Again that could change. That's not a consensus finding. That was just the sense of the comments that we got back in CC1. Kavous please.

Kavous Arasteh: Yes. I think my thought was more or less around the line was Jami said, we could fix a period each year but we should also put a provision that at some point of time during that period we need to review the situation and decide to make necessary improvements to stuff to that. Because it may happen that that predetermined period may not work after some time and there should be

a need to just review that to see whether that was the correct or based on the experience that came new with the application period of that each year. And we review that and try to modify that. If we put that that way correct.

What I'm thinking that we need to have a concept of trial and effort to correct the situation but not if we decide on (unintelligible). We continue to have difficulties until that file will expire is similar that we have now. So if we have that. In other way, I want a procedure more or less a dynamic procedure rather than a static procedure. This dynamic procedure has been worked also elsewhere. I have the experience in other areas that we put the dynamic arrangement and this dynamic arrangement has responded to the evolving situations not to have a sort of (unintelligible). Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Kavous. I have Anne in a few and then before I just get to Anne, I know there are other people in this - not to put people on the spot and I won't. But, you know, I know registries, for example, and registrars have come out with comments saying that there should be - it shouldn't necessarily be stopped by reviews. I know that those are comments in CC1. If anyone wants to speak up, now is your time. It seems like we're hearing from just a few people. Anne, please.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. Just very quickly Jeff, I think that the answer to that question of predictability and when we can assume that there will be another round or another opening depends also on a - the ability to process applications. There were two things discussed in the face to face in Joburg. One was the question of well how many, you know, TLDs can we have out there accepting applications at the same time. And so that was - the whole issue of 1000 and is that number the same or different. And then (Kelly) brought up the fact that there's a staff question. You know, how many qualified people are there to process applications?

So I think that the ability to say for the corporate what we're about (unintelligible) a - as a predictability of being able to continue to accept

applications, you know, at certain times. We have to factor in those two things, the number of TLDs that can be processed, you know, technically and the number of TLDs that experienced, qualified staff can process if there's any way to predict those numbers. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Anne. And it seems like (unintelligible) has got his hand raised as well. It seems like we almost have a chicken and egg problem, right. You know, if some people say well - exactly what said, right Anne, that we can't really decide how we can - when we can have the next round so we know how fast it can be processed. And then other people are saying well, you know, processing applications may just be a function of money and resources up to a certain point and that ICANN as long as it gets in additional money should be able to have a plan to scale up in cases where there are more applications than needed. But if we just could…

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Well Jeff actually I wasn't personally saying that you can't do that but I also - it's Anne again. I do have a comment on the issue of it's just a question of money. I don't think that hiring a bunch of un-experienced - inexperienced staff with money addresses the question of application evaluation. I think we have to somehow manage this like, you know, there should be a five year plan somehow toward well, you know, what are our annual operating goals. I shouldn't be oh wow. We got so many applications. We've got to staff up immediately and nobody really knows the organization internally or knows how to evaluate applications because that's sloppy. That - so it's not just a question of money. I think (Kelly) made a really good point. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Sure Anne. Thanks. And just to finish out mine and then I'll go to Martin. It was more a question of scalability, right? ICANN needs to have just like a registry -- I'll go back to my registry days. Registries like ICANN need to plan to scale. And at some point, there's obviously a maximum. But there should be a plan to scale with additional resources. So a registry doesn't know, for example, whether it's going to have one registration or ten million

registrations as (Dowd) said. But it needs to plan on the ability to scale and have a concrete plan and that's what registries are evaluated against.

At some point, ICANN will also need to have a plan like you said and the plan needs to be able to scale up to a certain maximum. What that maximum is we don't know at this point. And perhaps that's a good question for training and for ICANN staff. But, you know, I think we almost have a chicken and egg problem in the sense of, you know, how many can apply. Well I don't know. How many can we process? If - we need to solve for one of those factors in the equation or have a very good plan to scale in case one of these assumptions is exceeded. So let me go to Martin.

Martin Sutton: Hi Jeff. Thank you. It's Martin Sutton here. I just want to pick up on this point because I think this is an important one that you've tabled today which is more or less one of the first in the critical path to get everything else running. The reason I say that if it's not really for us to decide what the recommendation should be in the way that the next phase works but also to enable ICANN. So we've already referred to that in terms of, you know, the resources that may be required. This is going to be really important for them as a decision or recommendation that they can see going through early on to make all the evaluations for how they would support the process.

So I have a question on the back of that. Is there - do we have an - a sense or an idea of what are the real critical decisions or recommendations that we as a group should be looking at but create a sort of a sequence if you like of decisions that will put this on the right path? Because I - one of my concerns here is that we've got a lot of questions. We've got a lot of discussions going but without selling out some of these recommendations and pushing them through early on, everything is just going to end up delayed until the report goes out early next year. So just as a matter of interest, is there any comments regarding that?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks Martin. Whoops. It sounds like - oh cool. This - what - sorry
this is Jeff. This was one of the fundamental issues that ICANN staff had -
they sent an email. (Trang) sent an email probably a couple of weeks before
ICANN 59 that - or maybe it was a week before, that had a - like what were
items on the critical path. One of them was this very issue. This was like the
most important issue. Are we going to assess them in rounds? Are we going
to do first come, first serve? How often are we going to do it? This will
determine what their plan looks like.

And I think, you know, as (Trang) says on the comments, the application
volume has a broad impact certainly on ICANN or for (unintelligible), for
example, the GAC early warning process, the application comment period,
the objection process, right. So this has got a lot of impact. This very
question, we need to decide from a policy matter how we want to do it and
then work from there. Obviously, you know, if it can't be done or it's not
feasible then ICANN staff will come back to us and they will say to us look we
can't do it that way. We understand that's the way you want it. That's your
preference. But we need to modify it.

I think we need to put a stake in the ground and say this is the way we want
to do it outside of all other constraints. This is our preferred way. And then
when ICANN staff come back to us and say we can't do it for these reasons
and then we either try to solve for those reasons or we revise our preference.
But I do agree that we need to and the time is coming near that we need to at
least put a stake in the ground so that others can think about it. So if we say,
for example, and I'm not saying this is what we're going to say. But if we said
yes we are going to do it in rounds but we are going to have one round per
year the - open for three months out of the year and then the rest of the year,
calendar year, is evaluations.

And then the next calendar year on January 1 we start the next round. If
that's our recommendation and our preference, we need to put that in here so
that we can have ICANN and the other groups and the other work tracks think

about all of the implications. But like Martin said if we have - if we just keep it as an open question, then this particular question will slow down the consideration of all of the other questions that we need to think about this issue. So Martin, please.

Martin Sutton: Hi Jeff. Sorry you actually just cut off in the last sentence. I think it is. This has a consequence and knock on it but through the other questions that we may be deliberating over in the variety of work tracks. So hence I think this is a valuable focus of our time to put this out and to come to an agreement on what this recommendation should be. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Thanks Martin. Any other questions, comments? Okay. So then going back to the requirements, sorry Kavous. Quick comment and then I want to go onto (unintelligible). Kavous, please.

Kavous Arasteh: Hello?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Kavous. Yes we can hear you.

Kavous Arasteh: Are we not on top of the hour, 6:30 is the local time here. And then one and a half hour is finished no?

Jeff Neuman: (Unintelligible)…

Kavous Arasteh: Can you beyond one and a half hour?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. You are correct. I totally forgot and lost track of time. Thank you very much. Well it seems like we only got to this first issue. Thanks Kavous and thanks (Steve) for reminding me. But I think these are important questions and I really want to pick this up on the list on getting some answers to this question because this will drive a lot of other decisions. So let's continue with discussions on the list and then let's move forward and we'll do the other item that we have in here the next time on the full call.

So I just lost my Adobe connection. Oh there we go. Is there any other remarks? (Steve) anything I'm forgetting before we end the call? Okay. I don't believe so. All right thank you everyone. Oh Anne you have a last comment? Anne?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: So it helps to look at history. How many applications have we been able to process per year? Presumably we can do it faster going forward. But just trying to understand what workload we've been able to handle would be really good.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks. That's a good action item for staff and that's a good one to close on. Thank you everyone for coming out and thanks for reminding me of the time and talk to you all in a couple weeks. Thanks everyone.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you so much Jeff. Operator, please stop the recording and disconnect the remaining lines. The meeting has been adjourned. Have a great day everyone.

END