

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

Note: 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: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-13nov17-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p13p8og272j/>

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/tpIEB>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Operator: Recordings have started. You may start.

Julie Bisland: Thank you very much. All right well good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. This is the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on the 13th of November, 2017.

In the interest of time there will be no roll call, attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you are only on the audio bridge could you please let yourself be known now? Okay, hearing no names, I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise.

With this I'll turn it back over to Jeff Neuman.

Jeff Neuman: Hello, everyone. Welcome to the call. This is our full – first full working group call since we got back from Abu Dhabi just a couple weeks ago so hopefully everybody had a safe and wonderful trip back. Okay, so we have the agenda up on the right hand side up in the top right corner. So we'll go through that.

And then we'll go through any new statements of interest if there are any, we'll do an update from ICANN 60, an update on Work Track 5, and then we'll go through some – ideas that we've had on the timeline and the full working group timeline and then we'll get into discussions on drafting team documents for the overall group including assessing applications in rounds and I guess if we have some time some more on the predictability framework.

That's a lot of materials to cover in a short period of time but I thought I would ask and see if there's any other business or anything anyone else wants to cover on the agenda for today. Okay, not seeing any hands up, I'll ask again, as we get to that agenda item, or if anyone thinks of anything during the time period just type it into the chat and we'll get to it towards the end of the call.

So with that, are there any updates to statements of interest? Anything new? Anyone get new jobs? Okay, not seeing anything, no – nothing new and people seem to be relatively quiet.

We can then jump onto an update from – oh, Heather Forrest and Phil Corwin have their hands raised. Okay, so Heather first and then Phil. Heather, are you on? Oh, Heather's having some difficulties so let's do Phil first please.

Phil Corwin: Yes, thanks, Jeff. I haven't officially updated my SOI yet but as of a week ago today I shut down my law practice and became an employee of VeriSign and the Legal Department so I'm – I also stepped down from Council because I couldn't represent the BC anymore so I'm now working at VeriSign and aligned with the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Thanks, Phil, and congrats on your new job. Hopefully you're settling in.

Phil Corwin: Thank you. Just settling in.

Jeff Neuman: I bet. Okay Heather, are you still battling the audio or are you – oh it says you're on now, so Heather, please.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Jeff. Apologies. Just to note that I too have updated my SOI to reflect my taking up the position of GNSO Council Chair at ICANN 60. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Thanks, Heather, and congrats to you as well. We look forward to you in your new role and are glad that you can – even in your new role – stay with us and help participate so that's great, so thanks, Heather.

Anyone else have any updates to their statement of interest? Christopher Wilkinson, please.

Christopher Wilkinson: Hi, good evening, everybody. This is a minor – my SOI recorded the fact that I've had a very small temporary advisory contract with the EURid.eu Registry; that has come to an end so I recently deleted that interest such as it was with the – with EURid so I'm clearly emotionally and personally proud of EURid and dotEU but I no longer have any financial or any other formal relationship with the – with that registry. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Thanks, Christopher, and duly noted. Okay, anyone else with any updates? Okay, not seeing anybody else so let's go on to an update from ICANN 60. And there were – although there was no cross community wide sessions on Subsequent Procedures at this last ICANN meeting, there were a number of sessions where the topic of subsequent procedures and new gTLDs, additional rounds, came up.

There were two sessions that we held, that we sponsored. The first one being to go over different issues from Work Tracks 1 through Work Tracks 4. And during that meeting we covered a number of open items from – everything from applicant support programs to outreach, to the notion of communities and its importance in the ICANN environment, to talking about Work Track 4 items like financial – the need for financial evaluation and the differences

between financial evaluations and business model evaluations and whether one or – and/or both were needed.

So there were a number of good topics we discussed. Those were all taken note of by each of the individual work track chairs. And throughout these next couple weeks we will, through the work tracks, be talking about those particular items. And I don't know if any of the work track chairs want to – Work Tracks 1 through 4 – we'll get to 5 in a second – but if anybody from Work Tracks 1 through 4 has anything they want to add on any updates. And I'll give them a couple minutes to just think about it because I'm sort of putting them on the spot.

But the other interesting meetings that took place for Work Tracks 1 and Work Tracks 3 were topics covered within the Government Advisory Committee meeting. So there was a session about an hour and a half long session with the Government Advisory Committee where topics came up ranging from applicant support programs and outreach as well as the importance of communities and even potentially dividing up different types of communities so that, you know, you could have in theory different processes for let's say nonprofit communities versus for profit communities or industry-type communities.

And so there's some good transcripts if you want to listen to – or, you know, you can listen to the recordings from that session or look at the transcripts. I think there were some interesting ideas. And again, in the Work Track 1 and 3 meetings coming up they'll, I'm sure, go into or at least include those materials in their discussions so that we can thoroughly vet them within in the individual work tracks.

And a final meeting that we had was a meeting directly with the At Large Advisory Committee, and during that meeting we talked about similar issues with the applicant support and the role of communities. It was kind of a theme that we wanted to get – because we couldn't have a full cross community

session set out in the agenda, we decided to try to go over those with as many of the groups as possible.

And so we got some good feedback from the At Large members. Again, those will be incorporated into the upcoming meetings of the individual work tracks.

Anyone from Work Track 1 through Work Tracks 4, do you have anything you want to add? And then we'll get to Work Track 5. Karen, please.

Karen Day: Thanks, Jeff. This is Karen for the record. I know Robin is trying to dial in. I think she's having some connectivity problems. But I just wanted to build on that and say that Work Track 3 will be having a meeting tomorrow and we will be picking up with the discussions that we had with both the GAC and the ALAC on communities, community priority applications.

So if you were not able to yet listen to those sessions if you weren't in Abu Dhabi, and you have a chance between now and 2000 tomorrow afternoon, to listen to those sessions or read the transcripts, I would encourage you to do.

There were some interesting proposals on communities that were put forth that we're going to try and pick up on tomorrow, 2000. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, great. Thanks, Karen. Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Jeff. Since you mentioned the ALAC session I wanted to just take my hat off. We requested sessions at – on rather short notice, I should add, on community support, community applications, applicant support, and string confusion. And I also did one on –myself on closed generics.

And on the three we asked for presentations of, we had absolutely superb participation from the team leaders of those working groups and great

presentations and a good discussion. So I wanted to say thank you. Although we were a little bit late in making the request it turned out just marvelously. And I think it's worth noting. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Alan. I probably should have thanked them but I'm glad you did. And, yes, I think they did a great job, again, with short notice and I think that's probably something we should try to keep doing as the ICANN meetings in the future is really to liaise with the organizations.

And even I'll put a pitch in there, if any of the – within the GNSO if there are any constituencies or stakeholder groups that want to meet with some of the leadership to just go over some of the questions perhaps you all may want to build in some time into your schedule and as we go over the timeline in a little bit, after we go through work track, then you may want to see or see the need in perhaps getting further discussions moving so that we can make sure that the input of all the groups are considered, not just in these calls that we have but in other sessions that we could potentially have with your groups.

So with that, are there any questions on an update from Work Tracks 1 through 4? Okay, not seeing any and Karen brought up initially there is a Work Track 3 call that will be held tomorrow at 2000 UTC time. And there was originally supposed to be a scheduled Work Track 4 call scheduled for later this week.

We were waiting for some data that I'm not sure that we have yet so just pay attention to the – to emails. We may end up canceling that Work Track 4 call simply because we are waiting for certain data.

So stay tuned. We should probably know by the end of the day today, I will say, and that be the end of the day today California time. I guess Cheryl is just saying I should just call it off now. So I think Rubens and Cheryl are saying let's cancel it.

Okay. So we are going to cancel Work Track 4 at this point for this week because we don't have the data, but stay tuned, we will be making up those sessions so hopefully we will get the data that we need and then schedule that next Work Track 4 call.

And just as a reminder, next week we will have Work Tracks 1 and 2, those meetings are set on the calendar. And we are going to talk now about Work Track 5 which we do have a meeting this week.

So but first on Work Track 5, we have – and I think we have many if not all of the Work Track 5 leaders, let me just take a look down the list here, but we certainly have a number of them. We have the leaders on this call.

But I think the only one – we don't have all of them but we do have Annebeth, we have Martin, and we do have Christopher Wilkinson. So I will start going over some of the items and then if they want to jump in, feel free. We had a session that was on the Wednesday of the ICANN meeting, so just a little less than two weeks ago, and really got started talking about just kind of the – how GNSO working groups operate and to talk a little bit about the scope of what our group was going to – is going to cover, what Work Track 5 will cover and to get a good kick start on the terms of reference.

It was not an official work track meeting since we just issued a call for volunteers a week or so before the ICANN meeting. But it still was attended by a number of people that signed up. So far we have, at the last time I checked, we had 105 or so full participants signed up for Work Track 5 and about 50 or so signed up to be observers, including a number of GAC representatives, again participating in their own capacity but still are GAC members in their own right, as well as members from the ALAC, GNSO and ccNSO.

There is a meeting this week, this Wednesday, for Work Track 5. It's the first official list – sorry, first official meeting, even though the list of volunteers are

not finalized until I think we have November 20 is when we asked for expressions of interest. It is also – okay, it's 2000 UTC as Cheryl has put down on there. And if you click on that link that Steve just put into the chat, you will see the list of members and observers so far.

It's a really good list and we will always take additional people. And welcome your participation and think that it will lead to some great discussions. So that's just a reminder that Work Track 5 will be meeting on Wednesday this week and during that call they'll be talking about just, again, some of the rules of the road on GNSO working groups and then a good kick start on the terms of reference.

Also with respect to Work Track 5, Cheryl and I, as the cochairs of the overall working group, are working on a draft response back to the ccNSO, the ALAC and the GAC on some of the concerns that they had expressed or conditions that they expressed.

And we will be sending that to Heather and to the GNSO Council leadership and Paul McGrady as our GNSO Council liaison, to get some comments to see if they agree with our approach and the language. And hopefully that being the case, we should be able to get our formal response back to the – to those organizations shortly within the next week or two. So that is our hope.

And so I don't know if there are any questions at this point on Work Track 5 or anything that – let me invite Annebeth or Martin or Christopher or Cheryl, if you want to add anything on Work Track 5 at this point. Annebeth, please.

Annebeth Lange: Hello, everybody. My voice is better now so I can attend a little more active than I did in Abu Dhabi. You hear me I hope?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, great.

Annebeth Lange: Can you hear me?



((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: Yes, okay fine. I just wanted to add that I sent out an email to those I know from the ccNSO and encouraged them to attend the communication tools class that will be tomorrow. We must remember that a lot of those from at least our camp they have never done these meetings before and it's very interesting that you do these kind of tool – or education to make them understand the system better. It's quite often to – it's difficult for those who have never done these before.

So when we start these telecommunication – teleconferences with all these different people from ALAC and GAC and ccNSO and GNSO, it will be extremely challenging to get all these people in and to get a disciplined conversation. But I really look forward to the – especially the first meeting to see how many of the almost 150 people signed up that will really actively attend.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Annebeth. And I think it'll be interesting and as Tom just said – Tom Dale just said in the chat – more and more GAC members are signing up as we speak. So it will definitely be an interesting group and a good experiment, so let's see how this works.

Let me turn it over to Martin, please.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Jeff. Martin for the record. I was going to cover both of the points that you and Annebeth just raised, but really to stress the importance for the first call on Wednesday that, you know, for those that are joining this fresh to GNSO policy, it will be good to the idea will be to review the policy process that we're going to undertake and how the group will work as well as focus in on the terms of reference where we had quite a bit of feedback at the session at ICANN 60. And the support staff are going through the comments and

figuring that into a draft terms of reference that we will begin to review on Wednesday. Thanks, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Martin. And Christopher, please.

Christopher Wilkinson: Hi, Christopher Wilkinson for the record. Jeff, thank you very much. I agree with Annebeth that there will be a certain amount of education and habituation of the new procedures. For some of you these are well established procedures; for many of us they are completely new and I think it's important that WT 5 sooner rather than later has the opportunity to discuss the substance of the matter rather than purely the procedural aspects.

That being said, my main point would be, after all it's Monday night here, the – 48 hours before we have this first meeting. It would be very nice if by tomorrow morning we could have the updated draft of the terms of reference for discussion. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks, Martin – or thanks, Christopher and Martin, for those comments. And on the updated terms of reference, I will caucus with Steve and Emily to make sure that the link is put out there for everyone to – and I understand it's just 48 hours from the meeting, so we'll get that handled.

And there's been some chat – just to kind of go back on the list – about for those new to the process of working groups, there are – there is a – there's two sessions I think it's tomorrow. One is at 1000 am UTC time and one at 2100 UTC time that are called Communication Tools Classroom which really are just to help those that are new to PDPs, policy development processes and working groups to understand the various tools that are out there in order to operate the tools that we use like this Adobe Connect and some of the other tools.

So I'm sorry, the 1000 UTC session is next week; tomorrow is the 2100 UTC session. Thank you, sorry, Emily, I got that backwards, but thank you. So those will be the sessions to help the new people understand some of the tools.

Okay, Martin, your hand is still up. I'm not sure if that's leftover over a new one.

Martin Sutton: It's just a quick add on, Jeff, if I may?

Jeff Neuman: Oh yes, please, sure.

Martin Sutton: Yes, it's just regarding the process and the encouragement really to participate in the – tomorrow's session at 2100 UTC because I hear Christopher mention the fact that, you know, a lot of people outside the GNSO may not be familiar with the process. But in fact I just want to remind everybody, there's quite a lot of people within the GNSO that may not be familiar with the process as well.

And it may be their first time joining the policy activities so it's worthwhile to come along and also to refresh. These things are evolving all the time so policy as we know it developed 10 years ago has probably evolved in that 10 years since. So, you know, it's an opportunity for those that are coming back into the policy process even within the GNSO to understand how that process works and the tools that are used. Thanks, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Martin. And I notice a question in the chat as to whether the webinars will be recorded and, yes, Emily is confirming that both of those webinars on the communication tools will be recorded.

Okay, so the leaders got together – the last meeting that we had at – in Abu Dhabi is that the leaders got together and had a session to talk about timeline, work plans, and how we can get to the next steps. And the first

deliverable or the main deliverable is going to be a preliminary report from each of the work tracks and the overall group.

So up on the screen now you will see a bunch of balloons, and this is the timeline that we have – the leaders have each agreed to work towards. And so we thought we'd go over with you and see if there are any questions on this timeline. So we have said for a while now that we would be getting a preliminary report out for public comment in April of 2018.

That is actually rapidly coming up and especially when you take into consideration the holiday season and the summer vacations coming up in the – in Australia and New Zealand and our friends below the equator or the Christmas winter vacations for those in the upper half of the world.

Then you obviously know that these dates are going to come up fairly quickly. So if we have – working backwards from an April publishing of the initial report, and I think the date is kind of in mid-April is what we were shooting for, that means that each of the work tracks need to finalize their work – this is – I'm sorry, let me go back a step. This is for Work Tracks 1 through 4, not for Work Track 5, so Work Track 5 I'll discuss in a minute.

But Work Tracks 1 through 4 a preliminary report would come out in April. But in order for that to happen, we need each of the work tracks to complete their sections by March so that they could forward it to the full working group because the process that we work with is that the full working group gets some time to review the positions and the recommendations of each of the work tracks.

So that leaves about three or so months or a little bit over, I guess four months, to work on – four or five months to work on this and get this done. So each of the work track leaders have a work plan that they are working through to get to that March date. And one each of the work track calls they'll talk about how you're going to – we're all going to get to that date.

So assuming that we get out the preliminary report in mid-April or so, we estimate a – about a 40, 42, 45 day public comment period which would close the comment period for Work Tracks 1 through 4 on or around June 1 or so. That's on the preliminary report. And what that means is that hopefully all of the comments will be in prior to the midyear policy meeting in Panama, and can create some discussion topics at that point.

By July would be when ICANN staff would come out with their summary of all the public comments and then we would work towards a November 2018 for each of the work tracks to work through the comments and any additions or changes they would like to see in their sections for the final report which would need to get out in December of 2018. And that's with respect to Work Tracks 1 through 4.

I don't know if any of the work track chairs want to add anything to this. I'm seeing – Mike says “Why the gap four months from July to November?” Hopefully I answered that. The gaps would be for the work tracks to discuss the comments that were received and whether there were any changes that were needed to the report that came in through the comments.

In addition, although in the preliminary report it is not necessary for us to achieve any form of consensus on the recommendations or discussions that take place in the preliminary report. Certainly in the final report we have to go through a period of measuring consensus levels on each of the recommendations. So the – so we have to go through that during that time period as well.

Now if you – I'm just looking at some of the comments here, just checking the original timeline of the final report to be delivered to Council in July. We understand that, Donna. I think we've had a number of additional issues that were added and I think this is a much more realistic time period for us to get stuff out. So I think we're still on target with what we last told the Council in

Abu Dhabi and I believe what we told the Council even at the prior meeting. So I think we're on that schedule.

Are there any other questions on Work Tracks 1 through 4? And I don't know if I've missed – okay, Jim, please.

Jim Prendergast: Yes thanks, Jeff. Jim Prendergast for the record. Could you go back and explain – you lost me there at one point when you were talking about consensus for the final but not consensus for the preliminary. Could you just walk me through that again, because it's unclear to me what you were saying.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Jim. I probably went through that a little bit quick. So ultimately any recommendations coming out of the working group are going to need to – we as the leaders of the full working group, meaning Cheryl and I as well as, you know, the full leadership team, need to assess the level of consensus on each of the recommendations that come out of the working group.

And so when we forward a final report onto the Council the recommendations will indicate whether they are full consensus, meaning unanimous, recommendations, whether they have rough consensus or some of the other elements, there's another status in there about strong support but strong objection, etcetera. They're in the Working Group Guidelines. And so we're required to do that for the final report.

For the preliminary report, we envision – and again this should be talked about too with some of the work track chairs – that in a number of situations we are going to probably describe the issues that were discussed by the working group or the work tracks whether the work tracks have either one or a few different recommended options and then discuss the pros and cons of those options and then solicit input on those different options.

Because in a lot of places they will be listing of options and just discussions kind of a deep discussion of what the groups have been talking about and

where they may be leaning and soliciting input on where they may be leaning, we're not going to do formal consensus calls for that preliminary report. If that makes – hopefully that makes some sense.

Now anywhere that we do have full consensus and absolutely no objections, then that's great, then we'll certainly indicate that. But I foresee on several topics presenting options as opposed to presenting one concrete recommendation of how to proceed.

Okay, I think I've been following along with the chat. I'm not sure if there's any other questions. Sorry, so let's see, Mike Rodenbaugh says, "One we have already done that before the preliminary report," I think that was on the consensus call. Okay, if I missed anything, someone raise their hand and bring up the question, but I think I got them all.

And Steve, I don't know if we did a timeline on Work Track 5 but we did have a discussion on that. Christopher Wilkinson, you have your hand raised. If it's on Work Track 5 I was just getting to that; if it's something else, please, go head.

Christopher Wilkinson: Yes, I wasn't - Christopher Wilkinson for the record. I wasn't sure whether you were coming onto Work Track 5 or whether that was included in what we've just discussed. My main point is that personally as a coleader I would just put a general reserve on the schedule until we've had more information from the first two or three meetings. When you say March it's clear to my mind already that the Work Track 5 will need another face to face meeting in Puerto Rico in March. So whatever we're talking about can be (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks. I think...

((Crosstalk))

Christopher Wilkinson: ...the very best...

Jeff Neuman: Christopher, I think – I don't know if it's just me but I seem to have lost the last part of it, but I think I got your comment which was that was really for Work Track 5. And for Work Track 5 obviously we haven't had the first official meeting yet.

However, that said, the work track leaders did have a discussion to see what we can do as part of an initial plan, if you will, or a goal timeline. And I believe a goal timeline would be to get out a preliminary report at some point in June so that gives us about six months of working towards a preliminary report, and then to aim for a final report either in conjunction with the final report of the full working group or a couple months after the full working group. So that would be the ideal timeline for Work Track 5, so that's what we're going to aim for because it is a much more narrow set of issues, understandably a complex set of issues, but still much more narrow.

So the task we're going to put on Work Track 5 to see if we can accomplish is by June getting out a – excuse me – a preliminary report. Sorry, Christopher, do you have your hand up again or is this something new?

Okay, not seeing a hand – okay, hand's dropped. So does anybody have any questions on Work Track 5 or what we're shooting for? We're going to talk about that in the first Work Track 5 call. So, you know, we're – this is what we're aiming for and hopefully we'll be able to achieve that. And for Work Track 5 their call, again, is coming up on Wednesday so we'll go through this and refine as necessary.

Okay, anyone with any questions on that? I see, "Will someone be circulating the goals for Work Track 5?" We will but that, again, there's the first work track call in a couple days and we will discuss it further. Annebeth said, "Do I mean a preliminary recommendations or initial report?" I guess, Annebeth, I



was probably saying it's both, a preliminary recommendations in an initial report or certainly options presented in an initial report by June.

Okay, any other questions? We've gone completely silent here. Okay, see I thought there would be a whole bunch of comments on the timeline. Okay, all is clear. Great.

Okay, so then why don't we – if there's no other discussion on that why don't we pull up the drafting team discussion on rounds. And I'm going to take a quick drink. Okay, thanks for pulling that up. So what we're talking about – sorry, Kristina says, "Is it a nonalcoholic beverage?" Yes, something – water but thank you or at least I think it's water.

So we used to call this section discussion or assessment of rounds, it's now called application submission periods because they may or may not be rounds. To just go over some of our previous discussions on this, and it's been a number of months since we've – since we've had these discussions.

We had come to what seemed to be – I'm not going to say consensus but it seemed to be the group's thinking that no matter what we ended up with as a long term steady state process for the introduction of new gTLDs, that we would need a round initially, meaning that to deal with any demands that has pent up between the 2012 round and the time in which we start the next one, that going straight into a first come first serve process to apply for new gTLDs did not seem to make too much sense and would cause a lot more problems from a number of different perspectives.

So that seemed to be where we came to agreement; I'm not going to say consensus because we didn't take any kind of consensus call on that. On the other things that we discussed were it seemed to be that we wanted to avoid indefinite or undetermined time periods in between – so if we went with rounds or even one round followed by a first come first serve process, we

wanted to define a definitive period in which we would start that next either round or first come first serve.

That we did not, as a group, want it to be some indeterminate period like we've been doing right now. So in other words, and I'm just saying this as an example to illustrate but not because we've honed down on any specific timeframe, but, you know, we would want to say something.

Like, so let's say we all agreed that there would be at least two rounds before anything else, before any other kind of steady state, we would say something or recommend something, like, again, for illustrative purposes, that we would hold a round and then the next round or start of first come first serve would be in a certain set of months or a year from the date in which the last round had closed.

So – and I'm trying to use kind of vague terms because there are lots of definitions in there. And I see that already Heather says, "Do we have more current information on delegation rates, scenarios, from October 2010?" And I'll get into that in a second. But I'm just trying to summarize where I see us – where we are at this point.

And so I think of those things, it's – those are the basic items that I think most of the people have – in the discussion so far have agreed upon. We do not yet have agreement or even a firm recommendation on whether we should do something like one round followed by first come first serve or multiple rounds followed by at some point going into a first come first serve process or whether we should never have a first come first serve and just keep doing rounds in – with determined time periods.

So those are some issues that we need to pick up on in these discussions, and also to discuss what some of the variables may be that may prevent us from going along with some sort of fixed schedule and one of those as Heather brought up was a – that we have a – currently have a limitation on no

more than 1000 top level domains being delegated within any given calendar year.

That recommendation actually came from the ICANN board as a result of work done by the SSAC, work done by the root servers, also looking at feasibility of evaluating applications from an ICANN staff perspective at that point in time.

So the – it's – for those of you that may or may not recall, a few months ago the work chart four has sent a letter to the RSAC so the root servers, the SSAC, the office of the chief technology officer of ICANN as well as to the GED to see if given the – that there was a study done on the root and what the impact of this last round of GTOBs would – what the impact was on or what the impact of delegating all of these GTOBs have on the root and concluding that it had very minimal impact on the root itself.

Whether that study along with any of the data that may be out there have resulted in any of those organizations rethinking their recommendations on how many – on whether it's really a policy issue of how many names we can delegate per year or whether it is a purely technical issue or whether it is a feasibility of how many can be processed by ICANN staff or the evaluators to really lock down on what the issues are.

So I think that's kind of where we are at this point. We are waiting for their responses. We've given the – each of those groups until January to give us back their responses, so at this point my advice would be for us to proceed as if they are – there are no limits, in other words how we could deal with this in an ideal world in which there were no limitations.

And then if we find out that there are in fact limitations and what those limitations are, we can then retrofit that limitation in with our current thinking at that point in time, if that makes sense. Does anyone have any questions on that so far? Christopher, please.

Christopher Wilkinson: I had a question (unintelligible) for the record. Jeff, I am not speaking as the co-leader of WT5. I'm speaking as someone who has both followed and participated in the process of creating (unintelligible) of GTOBs and CCLBs during the past more than 20 years. I – this document is quite a surprise to me. I'm not going to occupy space in this conference call in detail.

I think the problem statement does not express the problem of – I think there's – there should be more reference to the CCT evaluation of the first round and I think that in the next round it's absolutely essential, politically, economically, and geographically, absolutely essential that the next opening to GTOBs should be restricted to those groups and categories that were grossly underrepresented and undersubscribed in the first round.

And then follow this up with a more considered and detailed comment to the list on the basis of this document application submission period, but I think you – I think some people here have not understood, A, the economics of the situation, and B, what their duty is to the global interest in these GTOBs.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks, Christopher. So do you have any – while I'm – let's see if anyone else wants to respond to that. Do you have any kind of specifics, you know, in your opinion what are some of the groups that were lacking in terms of receiving applications from, can you just maybe perhaps provide some more specifics on that, and then we'll see if people queue up if they want to address that.

Christopher Wilkinson: Jeff, Christopher Wilkinson, for the record. Jeff, I'm on the record over the last ten years on this, Jeff. I don't need to go into detail at this point in time. I said review the application submissions periods document and respond to the list. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks, Christopher. So okay, so regardless of how or when we open, or who we open that next round to, are there any – so Kurt says, I'm just

looking at the chat here, Christopher raises a good point. Isn't one of the working groups considered participation in one of their work tracks? So I think work track one is considering how to bring in applications or how to have – well number one is outreach.

And also they're considering whether – how to provide an applicant support program to encourage applications from underdeveloped regions, so I think that's – that is being worked on. We have discussed the issue of whether there should be rounds for – or priority I should say for any specific categories of top level domains, and I think that we've discussed that as an overall group.

We will come back to that in terms of whether there should be prioritization, and when I say we'll come back to that, that'll probably be on either the next full working group call or the one after that, so there is work going on, on categories. But to go through this particular document – oh, Greg, okay. Please.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, it's Greg Shatan for the record. Just looking at the problem statement, I'm concerned that it's one-sided in that it mentions concerns that arise from having discreet application submission periods or rounds as they used to be called, but does not in any way acknowledge the concerns or problems that would come from having any of the alternatives to that, which presumably would be some form of continuous flow.

Which in various contexts in the course of this group, such concerns have been raised. You know, in order to acknowledge in any way in which the periods are beneficial, so I understand this is in essence a – maybe it's an argument statement more than a problem statement, but I think treating it as kind of – you know, looking at one side of the coin is perhaps short-sighted or perhaps maybe even a bit loaded.

So I think you know, we need to consider the fact that there are – there's another side to the coin and perhaps an advantage statement as well that could be made for the same concept. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Greg, and one of the things just looking at the problem statement, it may be – I think the problem was from having indeterminate periods of reviews without kind of any ending or any kind of you know, there was no predictability in when the next round or application window would open up, I think is part of the problem statement.

If I'm understanding your – so I'm going to try to restate what you said, and if I'm off, let me know, but I think what you're saying is that there could be a disadvantage in just doing round after round after round without having a period of reviews, so you know, that's part – that should be part of the discussion as well.

It's not just the one side of you know, making sure there's a continuous flow, but the other side of considering what issues could be inherent in having a continuous flow. Am I – sorry, Greg, to put you on the spot, but am I getting that sort of correct?

Greg Shatan: Yes, Jeff, I think that is correct. There's both the issue of continuous flow and there's the also kind of hint at the idea that there could be rounds, but not separated by a review period, which is in essence kind of a third model, a continued – maybe you'd call it a continuous round model as well as continuous flow model and a separated round model.

So I think we have to kind of look at all of those, and in terms of predictability, you know, life isn't completely predictable. Obviously we need to try to look at criteria that could make it more predictable.

One thing I would encourage us to encourage ICANN the organization to do is to consistently review that thousand a year number and assume that that

can be brought – that number can be enlarged over time through various advances and efficiencies. That that's not a kind of absolute limit, but it's just a limit based on current issues, that could be resolved over time.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks, Greg, and Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I didn't put my hand up for this, but I do support what Jeff – what Greg said, and it's not only the issue you raised, Jeff. You know, things like community prioritization don't work if we don't have rounds, so you know, there's all sorts of second order effects that go along with it. I did raise my hand on the issue of the word prioritization.

And you I think used the expression give certain categories prioritization. I think there's a very distinct difference between prioritization as used for community applications, that is if there's a competition for a string, then one gets priority over the other, as opposed to what has been suggested, and not generally accepted, but has been suggested that we have rounds for particular categories.

And that is have rounds only for community or only for you know, non-profit or only for brands. And I wouldn't want to use the term priority for that, because that starts confusing the two issues. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thank you, Alan. This is Jeff. You're absolutely right, those are two different issues and I think we need to separate those two out. I will say that neither in any of the overall group discussions or even in the comments that we got back to CC1, because this was the community comments one, were there any suggestions that there should be rounds only open to a certain class of applications or category of applications.

So at this point absent a strong proposal, there's not been any support at this point for having let's say a community only round or a brand only round or a geographic only round. I'm just trying to think of different examples, so if they

are out there, this is a – and if you know of them, this is a good time to remind those that may be advocating that to submit those as comments.

But at this point I will say that we have not received those types of comments, so at that point you know, at some point given that this group has been around for a year, absent anyone strongly pushing for that type of model, I'm not sure where we would go with discussing that issue at this point. And if anyone differs from my opinion, let me know.

But these are topics we've been discussing for about a year now, and – well, over a year, and so we've given plenty of opportunity for groups to come in and make that type of argument. I just – we haven't heard that yet, and I'll double check with (Steve) and (Emily) and others from ICANN staff or any of the other work track leads, but absent anyone pushing for that type, I'm not sure we can mention it as a topic that was discussed. But it's not something that anyone has really been advocating. Alan, your hand's raised. I'm not sure if it's a new one or an old one.

Alan Greenberg: It is a new one. I guess I have to disagree with you. The issue has been raised quite a number of times in different calls. You know, one example was at one point it was raised saying if we can't come to closure on everything, maybe we should have a doc brand application round first or it's also been talked about for community applications.

I think every time it's come up, there are enough other people on any given call to say no, you know, we wouldn't support that because you know, we're looking for accessibility to some other group, so I think it's incorrect to say it hasn't come up. I think it's correct to say it hasn't had – you know, it hasn't held the day on any given call where the issue has come up.

But I don't think it's fair to say it hasn't arisen. It has arisen a number of times certainly that I'm aware of. And you know, maybe it's just the nature of these kind of discussions that unless you have a really strong statement and do it in



writing in some way, it doesn't have permanence, but the issue has certainly come up at times. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Alan, I guess I think I misspoke. I – it's come up, but nobody's – from the way I've seen it, nobody's really advocated that that is something that we should be pursuing. So it's come up in the sense of we've heard discussions and some have suggested, but it is not something that's been advocated either on the calls or in the comments that we've solicited.

So I guess what I'm saying is if there is a group or people that strongly believe that this should be a topic that's given more discussion, I guess I'm putting out a call to ask for those that are in favor of doing something like that to raise their hand, to bring it up, and to bring it up as an issue.

Otherwise it's tough for me to dwell on issues that are just kind of raised but then not really advocated by anyone. So the – but again let me go to Martin. I don't know if Martin's got any comments on that.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Jeff, Martin Sutton for the record. This is a tricky one, Jeff, and listening to the conversations, yes, there has been opportunities to raise the idea of different groups or types applying in a distinct round. I think the issue with all of this is both similar to the 2012 round, you're not going to get many people revealing what they intend to do in a future application process.

So hence we're lacking any visible demand, and we're not going to see that until there is an application window opening up. So it's kind of chicken and egg, you're not going to see strong demand coming through from different parts of the community and we'll just evolve as the application process emerges again.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, yes, thanks, Martin. Yes, you're right, it is hard because as we've all acknowledged in the past, there are many that even if they're thinking about applying won't publicly come out and reveal that because that's – you know,

obviously giving away either a trade secret of theirs or you know, giving away the notion that they're applying for something.

It is just inviting others to apply for the same thing. So I think that's right, (Donna) brings up a good point that we could park the issue of category only type rounds until the – a couple calls from now when we get into the discussion of categories again, and so we could park that.

Martin Sutton: Okay, what...

Jeff Neuman: I'm sorry, Martin, did you have something else?

Martin Sutton: Yes, connectively, Jeff, thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I'm sorry, is there someone that wanted to speak? I kind of – okay.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Oh, yes, yes, please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, sorry, I thought someone was raising their hand or wanted to speak. I'm not sure, but okay. Let's see, we did not catch who was trying to speak. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Would you connect me, or not?

((Crosstalk))

Operator: Your line is connected.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, okay. I'm really sorry, you're not in Adobe but we can hear you, so yes, please speak. Or are you just trying to get connected? Okay, Kavouss is only in audio. Kavouss, are – it says his line's dropped. Kavouss, can you hear me? Okay, we're – we'll work on that. We'll work on getting him back, okay? So let me scroll down a little bit on some topics that I want to get into.

And that's really kind of the notion of you know, we need to get to some sort of position on in general putting aside the notion of whether there should be rounds or certain priorities given for certain categories which we'll get into in a couple weeks. We really should talk about the notion of or have further discussion on the notion of getting to a steady state of doing something like a first come first serve model versus doing rounds in the future.

Now we've heard a number of pros and cons on the first come, first serve model, so in other words we've heard some positive things and some negative things, but I want us to try to get to a position as to whether this is something we think we want to pursue the notion of having eventually first come first serve, or whether at this point in time our thinking is really to just do rounds.

So a number of people just to go through some of the pros and cons of the first come, first serve, which are on page 4 I believe it is, so those that are speaking out of eventually having a first come first serve model talks about this providing the greatest – this first come, first serve model – actually you know what, before I do that, does everyone understand what we mean by first come, first serve? Does anyone need any clarification on that?

So by first come, first serve, we mean that eventually even if we don't do it at the beginning in the first round, but let's say in five years we get to a first come, first serve, that means that the application that applies for a name or a top level domain that in all respects qualifies for that application, assuming no

objections and all that kind of stuff and a successful evaluation, that that first qualifying application will be the one to get top level domain.

This is a – in contrast to what we have in rounds where we solicit applications and then close the round, and if there are multiple qualifying applications for a particular string, that we do an auction or have a community prioritization process or something like that. If we did a first come, first serve, it literally would be whoever applies first meets the requirements will get to – will get the string.

It's very much like how registrars are accredited in this day and age, and very much like how second level domains are issued in most top level domains at this point, which is on a first come, first serve basis. The first one to apply, that's otherwise qualified would get the string. So the positives we've heard so far have been that it provides a great amount of flexibility, that it is responsive to applicants as business needs change.

It does not have artificial pent up demand in between where we have rounds. You're not going to have auctions, you're not going to have a string convention because there by definition is no contention, it's just whoever was in first, and some have said that it creates incentive to develop new ideas for applicants that they may not want to have an auction over.

The negatives are that some fear that this would give advantages to ICANN insiders because they would know when the first come, first serve process starts and would know that you can apply at any point in time and so once you have an idea you can apply and therefore that may give an unfair advantage to those that know the processes.

It may disadvantage certain types of applicants that need time to prepare applications, so we've heard from people like Alexander Schubert, I'm sorry, not Alexander, sorry, (Jamie Baxter), who's on the call, that having a first come first serve process would make it difficult for communities that need to

socialize the ideas and strings within their individual communities in order to get support.

And the last thing they'd want to do is while they're socializing to get support is have someone else apply for it because they don't yet have the support needed to apply for that string. The third thing that's been pointed out by a number of governments and others has been that look, if it's first come first serve, how do we monitor the applications? How do we raise objections?

You know, we'll always have to be looking to see who applies and you know, there's no way for us to know that applications have come in and – unless we hire people to watch who applies every day. We'll never be able to do our objections or file comments as such, and the first come first serve could cause a strain on the ICANN system.

They're afraid that rushing applications in may result in hastily prepared applications and ultimately at the end of the day may encourage speculation and what's called POD warehousing. So as Paul just – Paul McGrady just put a comment in that talks about encouraging squatting, which is another word for warehousing.

So those are some of the pros and cons. I would really like some additional feedback, and I'll put Alan and Christopher in the queue, and we'll go from there. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Sadly I think this is one of the things that is tightly coupled to pricing. And I'm not sure we can settle on one without the other. If the pricing is low enough then there's no question it will you know, strengthen the ability of some for speculation in warehousing, if the price is set really high you know, and probably that means above the actual cost of evaluating the application, then the scenario changes completely.

So I think those two issues are so coupled that I just don't think we can avoid having to understand you know, the seesaw effect of changing one and the impact on the other. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Alan. So I agree that there's a lot of issues that are coupled, but we have to start breaking through the coupling in order to come up with models. So if I can just break down what you said, your thoughts, and again just totally correct me if I'm misstating, so what you just said, Alan, was that if the costs are low or too low, whatever that too low mark is, then you believe having a first come, first serve model would be a lot more difficult or would be more problematic because it would certainly encourage a good deal of speculation.

But can I say alternatively if the cost was high enough and again we don't know what that point is, that you do not see that speculation issue being as problematic if we work, decide to go with a first come, first serve model. And if we take that approach, would we say, Alan, that at least in your opinion, going to a first come first serve approach would not be out of the question, I guess, if the price were high enough?

Alan Greenberg: I'll try to answer and it's a – it is a complex issue, and I realize we need to somehow uncouple, but I'm not quite sure how we go about doing that. If the pricing is low enough, we are going to have speculation and warehousing whether there are rounds or not rounds. The only question is we'll have multiple people fighting for the same name if we do it in rounds, whereas otherwise it's going to be a rush of how many people can get the application in the first second.

You know, we're – I hate to mention digital archery, but it's going to come down to that at that point, that if we open a non-round, time matters, and we are going to have people competing to get the applications submitted, you know, a micro-second after it opens. So the dynamics will change. Certainly if

the price is very low we are going to have speculation and warehousing.  
There's no question about that.

It depends on what rules we end up putting in for how long you can hold onto it without using it – you know, using it for any real purpose that counts, and currently we don't have that. You know, we have lots of TLDs right now that are there with just the (Nick) registered, and you know, someday they may be used or someday they may not, but they're technically live.

So I – the dynamic's going to change, pricing will affect a lot of these things regardless of whether they're rounds or not, but a lot of the other dynamics will change, and I'm not advocating for or against rounds at this point. I'm just saying we have to acknowledge that these things are linked and somehow figure out how to approach them. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks, Alan, and I think I'll add one more variable, not expect a response, but I'll go to Christopher and Kavouss. One other variable we could say is well, does your issue lessen if you did a round followed by almost immediately first come first serve, so you've handled the digital archery rush through doing a round and then doing a first come, first serve, it's sort of the way that some of the TOBs have launched, which is do like a land rush period followed by the first come, first serve.

Don't expect an answer, I'm going to go to Christopher Wilkinson. You can go back in the queue. Let me go to Christopher Wilkinson, Kavouss, and then Paul.

Christopher Wilkinson: Hi, Christopher Wilkinson for the record. Jeff, I do largely support Alan's concerns and the issue that he has pointed to. I think we need a few boundary conditions for this debate. The first is that whatever policy we come up with, it has to be regardless of (unintelligible) applicable to all other languages and scripts.

If we look forward to the next 20 years, what we do now with (unintelligible) English are possibly applicable and relevant to what we do in all other languages and scripts. Secondly, I speak personally, I'm not speaking for my position as a co-leader and at large, but as somebody who has dealt with this issue for the last 20 years. Secondly, the whole idea, the concept, of speculation and warehousing of TLDs is outrageous.

This in my moral is an exploitation and occupation of the public domain. Upper limit, theft. You must stop it. And thirdly, I'm afraid to say that the first round, which obviously facilitated such speculation and occupation, the first round has in effect made it impossible to have a first come, first serve, because the first served have already been served. What you're proposing is off the map.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks, Christopher. Just for the record I'm not proposing as like a personal opinion or the way I think we should be going.

Christopher Wilkinson: I apologize, the second person plural in English was not sufficiently precise, if I was speaking Spanish I would have used the reflexive third person.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks, Christopher. So Kavouss and then Paul, and then I'm notice – noting the time, so – and then Martin. I'm closing the queue after Martin, so Kavouss, please. Kavouss, are you – can you hear me?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I can hear you, do you hear me?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I hear you. Please, yes, go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: I said that (Unintelligible) first come first serve in other areas that (unintelligible). It has some advantage, some advantage that the people, they need something, they could ask that. However, it would have disadvantage that (unintelligible) really that may be none of them or some of them would



have a conclusion (unintelligible), every day, every month, every minute, until August.

So we need to look at that part carefully and to see whether we could do it, the approach of first come first serve, not to lead to a sort of speculation. If we could (unintelligible) I have some doubt (unintelligible) there are speculations. It would be beneficial for those people who are more clever and more rapid than others (unintelligible) disadvantage for the people who are late (unintelligible).

They will get nothing, and they (unintelligible) at the end of this interview go to the auction and in order to ask that they have sufficient context of (unintelligible) so I don't think that this would be a good method of applications for the DNS. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Kavouss. And I think that you've been pretty clear on this, and hopefully I've captured or we've captured a lot of your points in the cons or against first come, first serve column, and if not we'll go back and make sure we've covered them all. I will go to Martin for the last word on this subject for now, and then place a whole bunch of questions on the list, so Martin, please.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Jeff, Martin Sutton for the record, and I know we're trying to balance a number of different sort of components and possible applicants when we're considering whether it's first come first serve or rounds. I'm just wondering whether even if it's first come, first serve, or rounds, the underserved regions or lack of items that came through in the last round that we probably want to cater for in future applications processes.

I just – there's still going to be issues in a lot of those areas working through the process to arrive at an application in time for any new application process.

I just wonder if there's been any consideration towards a kind of process for specific types of applicants having an opportunity to reserve if you like, place

a hold on a potential application that they want to proceed with whilst they then formulate their you know, community, if they're a specific community, protect it so that they don't have to worry too much about the timeline that's in place once an application round is launched.

So just an idea, I mean, when you look at property, you know property is going up, you can go and put a booking fee and have first choice on the properties as they go up without having to pay the full application fee. And so there's an opportunity to back out of that. I know adds in more complications, but it could actually be a way to encourage underserved regions to come forward. Thanks, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Martin. So before we get to close this call, which we'll do in a minute, I'm going to turn around an email to the full group, and it's basically going to be a question, one question to say under what circumstances if any would anyone support a first come, first serve model and if so how would those address the concerns that have been raised, and we'll list the concerns.

I'm not pushing us for a first come, first serve model, but I'm pushing us to think about that option and if there are no good options to deal with a first come, first serve, to indicate that or if there are then we can set those forward, but I just want to get kind of moving forward a little bit on this issue, and perhaps that question can elicit some good responses.

Christopher, I closed the queue. I want to ask because we're already two minutes over, is there any other business that anyone wants to cover on this call? Let me just ask that question first. Okay, not seeing any...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Okay, Christopher, please, yes.

Christopher Wilkinson: Just to say that I agree very much with Martin's latest statements, and I would say that this is particularly relevant to geographical names as well as the rounds. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks, Christopher, and again I'm just trying to push and be what we call the devil's advocate here, because people have raised that there should be a first come, first serve, and we should explore that to see if it's a possibility. We may conclude at the end of the day there's just too many obstacles to overcome in order to recommend a first come, first serve.

Or we may surprise ourselves and find a way that we can do it and account for all these concerns, but I want to thank everyone and remind everyone that we have a work track, three calls tomorrow and a work track, five call on Wednesday, and next week we have a work track one and a work track two call, so please check your email and your invitations. I look forward to talking to the full group in two weeks' time. Thanks, everyone. We can end the meeting.

Julie Bisland: Okay, great, thank you so much, Jeff. You can stop the recording, (Johnny), and everyone have a good rest of your day.

END