ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call
Monday, 05 March 2018 at 15:00 UTC for 90 minutes
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-05mar18-en.mp3

Adobe Connect recording: https://participate.icann.org/p8oaemqwkt0/

Attendance is on wiki agenda page: https://community.icann.org/x/_hK8B

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

Coordinator: Recordings are connected. You may proceed.

Michelle DeSmyter: Great. Thank you so much (Carri). Well I'd like to welcome everyone, good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on the 5th of March, 2018. In the interest of time today, there will be no roll call. As a reminder to all participants, if you would 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'll turn the meeting back over to Jeff Neuman.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you, Michelle. Welcome, everyone, to ICANN - or the week before ICANN. I know a lot of you are leaving this - in a couple days, two, three days so I wish everyone a good trip. Today's agenda is on the right hand side; not sure we're going to use all the time today but we'll see. We're going to do some work track updates and then really spend the bulk of the time talking about the overview for ICANN 61 and also the structure of the initial report and progress on getting that done. So we'll show you a slide deck that we've

put together that we're planning on also sharing with the Council - GNSO Council on Sunday, I believe it is.

So with that said, let me just start off by saying - or seeing if there's any updates to any statement of interest? Okay, not hearing or seeing any, why don't we just then move on? I know that we have some people that are absent today so let me just check to see who we have. We have Sara from Work Track 1, do you want to just give a quick update as to where we are and we'll take it from there.

Sara Bockey: Hi, Jeff. This is Sara. Work Track 1 we've been going through all of our topics and trying to make sure we've collected feedback received during the calls as well as CC2 responses we got. And so just working towards getting that product over into the initial report to work on it from there. Looking to see where we have gaps and what we might need to discuss further with the working group.

And other than that we have a working group call scheduled for tomorrow that is tentative. I need to speak with Christa and see if we have something we're ready to discuss regarding gaps for tomorrow or we may just put that off for next Saturday when the working group meetings in person. So that's where we are with that, just working towards the initial draft.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Sara. We'll talk a little bit about the initial draft in a couple minutes. Let's go to - I know Michael sent his apologies and I don't think Sofia is here from Work Track 2. So is there anyone here from Work Track 3, Karen and - Karen, there you go. Thanks.

Karen Day: Hi, everyone. This is Karen Day for the record. Work Track 3 has finished our meetings and going through our topics prior to our time together in San Juan next week. We are working on making sure we have captured all of the input we received our topics in our draft initial report, which as Jeff has said, we'll be going over later. That's what we'll be using as the basis of our discussion

in Puerto Rico again, making sure that we've captured all of the input that we have to date there. So we look forward to seeing you all next week. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Karen. Work Track 4, I do not see Rubens on. Cheryl, are you in a position to give a quick update?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure, happy to do so. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And we had our last Work Track 4 meetings about four days ago actually, and we looked at our pathway to our initial report writing and also the registry testing systems that I think was quite a productive meeting. Rubens and I are planning that we will be furthering our outstanding items in Puerto Rico and certainly be looking to have as much input from the wider plenary as well as other attending members on those - the topics that we're going to be looking at in Puerto Rico at - I think is it Sunday? I'm sure you'll cover that in a minute anyway. Forgive me, it is a little after 2:00 am here as I'm sure Heather knows.

So that's where we are at this stage and one of the main things of course I want to mention about the Puerto Rico meeting is part of the work that we're interested is has got to do with the name collisions and I'm sure all of you know that there's a number of things that will be discussed including an SSAC presentation on their pathway forward for their analysis and that's something that Work Track 4 will be keenly watching and probably making some comments in. Thank you, Jeff, back to you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Cheryl. Right now the document Cheryl is referring to - and someone might be able to post the link to it - is a - I guess it was November that the ICANN Board had approved a long - or a longer term study on name collision. It was brought up in the context of Corp, Home and Mail. And the SSAC had proposed doing a more in depth study on name collision and so they're on Friday - late Friday there was a project plan that was put out there for public comment that I'm sure the SSAC will be going over to - for comment and that's what Cheryl was referring to.

And that SSAC or the study is a multiyear study that could definitely have an impact on the timing of the next round and so it's something I think everyone should pay attention to and comment on if you have a - if you have any comments. Thanks, Cheryl.

And then last but certainly not least, Martin, I think you're the only one here from - one of the coleaders from Work Track 5, do you want to provide us a quick update as to where you are and your preparations for ICANN 61?

Martin Sutton: I certainly shall. Thanks, Jeff. The last couple of work track meetings have been a sort of a structured process going through the different categories of geographic terms that were contained within the Applicant Guidebook and comparing those also with the initial GNSO policies that were developed in 2007.

So piece by piece we're going through and identifying the pros and the cons essentially so the positive and negative impact of the way those categories were treated in the Applicant Guidebook. And we'll be looking then at how we may want to consider either doing the same thing in future or changing what was in the Applicant Guidebook but addressing any sort of variations between the initial policy work and the final Applicant Guidebook content.

As we complete that we will then move onto what was not contained within the Applicant Guidebook to consider any other categories of geographic terms that this group should consider. And we do have a session dedicated to Work Track 5 in San Juan on - I think it was - oh Wednesday if memory serves me right, 8:30 in the morning on the Wednesday. So please you're all welcome to join us. It will be a working session so there will be plenty of opportunities to progress the work we've already kicked off. Thanks, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks, Martin. Is there any questions for any of the work track coleaders before I get into kind of what I was thinking about presenting to the

Council which I want to show everyone here to make sure we're all on the same page? Just reading the comments while everyone thinks about that. Okay, well I'm not seeing any comments, why don't we just jump into this?

So here's a deck that ICANN staff, and thanks to Steve and Emily and ICANN staff, Julie, for putting this together. This is kind of our thoughts on the timeline but also on the structure - we'll get into the structure of the initial report and talk about how we're progressing.

So if we go to the next slide and I don't mind if the slides are unlocked actually if you want to do that? Cool. So the second slide just goes to the timeline just for getting to the initial report. And so we're in early March now and we are completing our preliminary work. And we'll discuss some of the preliminary outcomes at ICANN 61, we'll go into that in a little bit more detail after this slide, and then by the end of March, hopefully completing a draft initial report to send to the full working group.

And then hopefully use the month of April and by the end of April, publishing an initial report for public comment which would close the comment period, it's usually a 42-day - or a 40-day, 42-day public comment period so we envision that closing in June and then working on - starting to work on the final report in July.

If we have - this is, I'm sorry, I should have said earlier, this is for work tracks 1-4 and for overarching issues. You'll see an asterisk down there for saying that Work Track 5 we're aiming to get an initial report to be published by August 2018 but we should know some more after this meeting in San Juan next week.

And go to - oh, I - the slides are unsynced. So if you go the next slide here is just kind of a - I think we showed this on the last call or something very similar to this on the last call which is for a, you know, what happens after the work tracks - after this to get to a final report, and then ultimately what happens

after we get to a final report. So what here we have is our aim is to complete these reports by - the final report by the end of 2018.

And as you can see there what we're doing for this initial report, which I want to kind of emphasize and we'll emphasize it again, for the initial report we are not doing consensus calls, we are merely putting out the sense - in most cases the kind of the sense of the group on certain issues or options that we have out for public comment. We felt like this was not the right time to take a consensus call on any one or more of the particular recommendations because we really want to use the initial report to discuss what we've been doing, where we're at, potential options were considering in order to get feedback on that without kind of biasing the comments that we get back.

So when you are presented by each of the work tracks or when we see some of the sections of the initial report and the outcomes it's very important that your review that to make sure that anything that was discussed, any options are all on the table to solicit feedback.

So Jim says in the chat, "What sort of time will be given to the working group for review of the draft prior to being published?" So, Jim, our goal is to get out the draft initial report by the end of March so pretty much the month of April to have the working group kind of review the draft just to make sure that again, this is a draft not to take consensus on any one of the - any of the outcomes or on the options being put out to public comment, really to make sure that we've included everything, we've included all of the options, we've given an accurate description of the options and we've given - we have the questions that we want to ask for feedback - we want to ask that we have those questions right and that they're complete.

So that's really kind of the role of this initial report. Are there any questions before we move onto the next slide? And I see Jim is typing. Okay. Yes, Jim, so about a month to review, yes. But hopefully what you see in the initial report, the section, the outcomes, especially if you're in those particular work

tracks and participating, there should not be any kind of surprises in there; they should be very similar to the things that have been discussed in various calls. Steve has his hand raised, so Steve, please.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Jeff. This is Steve Chan from staff. And I just wanted to note in terms of the review of - or the working group review of the initial report, one thing that we're thinking of doing is actually changing the meeting schedule as we return from ICANN 61. So for the full working group what we're contemplating is actually meeting every week to help us get through that review and agreement from the working group to publish the initial report. So like I said, we're giving that some thought so it'd be good to get some input from the working group if they think that's a good idea as well. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Steve. So that would not start the Monday we get back but the following Monday so it would be ICANN meeting, week off, then meeting every week. So that is the proposal so we can get to an initial report by the end of April. Jon says, "Will the working group still be meeting during that time as well?" Jon, I think they will. There are certain subjects that - I will get into this a little bit later but as we're putting together this initial report there are certain topics that we've found that we may not have adequately covered yet or that we still need some additional feedback on so I envision that there will be some of the work tracks will certainly be meeting during that time period as well or at the very least will certainly have discussions on the email list.

And Donna says, "Does this mean we could use Panama to discuss the comments?" That - Donna, that's exactly the hope so that the comments could come in prior to the Panama meeting so that we can assemble them and to discuss the feedback at Panama so at ICANN 62, that is our goal. Donna, please.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Jeff. Can you hear me okay?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, great.

Donna Austin: Okay great. Just on the, you know, this timeline and heading towards Panama as the time to have the substantive discussion around the comments, I know we're all thinking about San Juan at the moment but I think it's really important that if that's the intention then that message gets through to Council and in the planning for Panama we really need to understand whether Subsequent Procedures needs, you know, a good chunk of the time that's available for the PDP work in Panama.

If we think there's going to be the opportunity to make significant progress on the, you know, analyzing the comments and perhaps coming to consensus on some of the items then I think we should flag that now. So to the extent that your planning goes to that point, I think it would be really helpful for Council to understand what the planning requirement is for Panama. Thanks, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Donna. Those are great, great comments. And I've - we'll put it as an action item for us, the leadership, and for staff to make sure that we put that into the slides we present to Council and to make sure that we're discussing that as it helps in the planning for Panama. I think that's a great comment.

Okay, Donna, you still have your hand up, is that left - okay great. So if you go to slide Number 4 just kind of a slide presentation of where we are and some of the color coding that you'll see in the following slides, so as you know, we have - and right now we're going to be focusing on the overarching issues in work tracks 1-4, we're putting Work Track 5 to the side right now so all of the rest of this conversation will really focus on 1-4 and the overarching issues.

If you see the slide there you'll have kind of a - and I'm always bad at describing the way colors look. But you'll see that there are certain areas where we have preliminary recommendations and implementation - or implementation guidance and that's indicated in the - I don't know, Steve,

what color that actually is, but the darker greenish bluish color. And that's the technical name.

And then you'll see where we have on some subsequent slides that more whiter blue color for where we're presenting options and open questions. So just a reminder, again, that the outcomes that we are going to show in this initial report have not undergone any kind of formal consensus call and it's also true of the preliminary outcomes contained in - we're going to show a couple slides with some examples and so that you'll see either these examples that we're showing have not gone through any kind of consensus call.

As we talked about the initial report will have a mixture of some policy recommendations but also a list of different options or open questions where we're seeking feedback from the community. And we - when we present certain things on the slides because we've often had people make comments about wording that we've used on slides where, you know, we're trying to do things in shorthand because we're trying to fit it on the slide, the wording of the report is really going to be what's authoritative, not what we put on these slides.

Jumping to slide Number 5, so this is kind of an indication, and it's a little bit cut off so apologize for that, of the breakdown of the overarching issues and the different issues in each of the work tracks that they're covering that we will have either preliminary recommendations on or options or outcomes. And so this is really just a repeat of what's in the issue - the final issue report as well as the things that have been added by the RPM Working Group, for example, in Work Track 2 or things that have been added that were not included in the final issue report. So I'm not going to go through these all but this should be a summary list of all the things that we will have content on in the initial report.

All right, moving to Slide 6, this is how we see the content being in the initial report, meaning that for the six overarching issues we envision having recommendations on preliminary recommendations on at least four of the topics, and I've kind of - I'll say 4.5, and I'll get into that in a second, and then which ones will have options or questions. You'll notice that in some of them we have recommendations as well as options for certain parts of that topic.

The reason why Number 3, community engagement, is sort of this cream color is because the, you know, we - in going over that subject we really found a lot of overlap with either the predictability section or the - or the things that we've actually done to get feedback within this PDP. So if you went back to the initial report you'll see a section in there on community engagement that says, well how can we encourage additional participation in this particular PDP?

Which I think we've already addressed by doing things like creating Work Track 5 and having a unique model of participation there but also the word of mouth and the newsletters and all sorts of other things we've done in this PDP to encourage participation. And so that's why Number 3 is kind of this off white creamish color in that it's really covered by other areas.

So moving into Slide 7, so for example, for the overarching issues and this is kind of what we're going to try to do for each of the work tracks in ICANN 61 is to provide sort of an update as to where we are on each of the issues. And so on overarching issue the first one was called canceling Subsequent Procedures which I am going to try to get the name changed. It shouldn't really be canceling Subsequent Procedures but really it's whether to continue Subsequent Procedures since the GNSO policy is on - that there will be additional subsequent procedures.

And so we think that based on the discussions we have a preliminary recommendation that the working group dos believe for a number of reasons,

and we'll obviously elaborate on those reasons, that there should be additional new gTLDs and to affirm the existing GNSO policy.

On predictability, the - we've come up with a draft predictability framework which has some recommendations in there but also some options for proceeding including a potential option of creating a standing panel to be in place even after the policy and implementation process is done so that certain types of issues can be brought to that standing panel even if they were not contemplated during the PDP or implementation phases.

The third one, community engagement, we don't have any additional guidance because, again, I think it overlaps with our participation for this PDP as well as in the - it's covered in the predictability framework. For the application assessment in rounds, the working group has seemingly agreed that there will be at least one additional round and moving forward from there we have different options and we'll present those options including the pros and cons of each of those options in order to get additional community feedback.

On the different TLD types, this one is probably one of the more difficult ones. We have here that discussions are still, as Heather puts in the chat, ongoing. And that we do not have consensus on creating any additional types of categories or different types of TLDs but there seems to be agreement within the group, at least at this point, that the ones that were in the Applicant Guidebook already, including the standard, the community, geographic, as well as the one that was added afterwards, the brand TLD, by contract, should be formally recognized in policy.

So other than that again, this section will - so it'll recommend that we formally recognize the types that were in the Guidebook plus the one additional one and we'll also present different options and solicit feedback on those options.

And then finally with the overarching issue of applicant submission limits, the working group at this point doesn't believe that there's a practical way to limit the number of overall applications per round or - or nor applications from any particular party. It's not that there were some comments from some participants that wanted to see some way of limiting but at the end of the day the discussions have produced no practical was that we could actually do that. So that's, you know, where we are on these overarching issues. And I want to just take a second to read the chat to see if there's anything I missed.

Heather says, "I hope we can pick up the threads on this discussion about engagement in PDP in the Sunday GNSO session in San Juan." Yes, so Heather is referring to the GNSO has a morning session while not devoted to specifically to this PDP it is devoted to how we can improve the efficiency of PDPs, how to make PDPs more accountable and how to encourage participation. So I think with different things that we've tried in this group certainly we have not by any means perfected how to get more community engagement but we hope that we have been successful in making some improvements. So we'll certainly discuss that on Sunday.

Any other comments or questions with the overarching issues and where we are? Does anyone disagree with where we are on these issues? I see some people typing. So Christopher Wilkinson says, "I'm not in favor of limiting the number of new applicants but would definitely favor distinct rounds, phased in time according to categories of names."

So that's - Christopher, I think that's in kind of both overarching issues 5 and 6 and I think that we will present different options that have been discussed in terms of whether to do - whether to give certain types of TLDs preferential treatment but certainly we have not reached any conclusions one way or the other on having distinct rounds phased in time according to categories but it is certainly an option that's been presented and one that we should certainly put out for public comment. Any other thoughts on the overarching issues and where we are? Okay.

If we move on to the next slide, Slide 8, this talks about the - what we're doing here is just as an example of Work Track 1, we do not have all the work tracks in this slide deck but it's really to just show an example of where we are with a particular work track. So Sara, if you can help me make sure that I've got this right or correct me where I'm wrong, we believe that for each of these topics we have, with the exception of the first one, we either have recommendations or options or in a lot of cases we have both recommendations and options to present.

And so with the exception of Number 1, which is really dependent on the final outcome of the competition, consumer trust and consumer choice, that review team produced its final report. So we don't have anything concrete to respond to that particular work area for Work Track 1, but that said, I do believe we certainly from the - I forgot stakeholder preliminary report or initial report but their first report that they put out there and their addendum that they put out there, I think we have gotten an indication of what they will likely recommend to us and therefore have tried to incorporate those topics as we have become aware of them.

So and Maxim says - or Donna says, "Do we know the timing of the CCT report?" Maxim says, "July 2018." Trang says, I believe CCT Review Team is targeting the end of this month for their final report. So I think that's a better update than I have. So if that's their recommendation or if that's what their timing is that would be great. But we can try to confirm that for the group, so we should have a good indication certainly by the end of the month. They're not - there is no formal CCT Review Team session at this ICANN meeting. So I do know that they're in their final stages of trying to put that report together.

So you'll see for topics 2-11 for the Applicant Guidebook the structure and how that is laid out. I think we have some recommendations, sorry, excuse me. Thanks. And for clarity, the application process we have some options and questions. For the RSP program we have recommendations and - well

both recommendations as well as options because I think we're recommending the overall kind of having one, an RSP program, we have some recommendations but there's a bunch of options that we are going to solicit feedback on.

For systems, I think we're pretty much on the options; we have some options for different - or different ways that the systems could go. Application fees I think we're at the stage of having both recommendations and as well as options and questions. I think for communications we have mostly options that are being presented. And application queuing I think we're pretty much there on hopefully making some recommendations and I know that ICANN staff needs to do some - I'm sure some work on their own, some legal research and otherwise to make sure that we - the way we're proposing is in fact a way that they could get - a way that they can actually structure this.

So just reading the chat here, options implementation improvements, Steve says, "Apologies, I think this needs some updating." Okay, so in essence this is a type of chart that we're - that we'd like each - we're going to get each of the work track leaders to kind of fill out so that we can show the Council this on Saturday. I know I'm putting some the work track leaders on the spot here because we haven't yet discussed this particular type of slide but I think based on what they're doing already we can pretty easily fill out where we are on these. As Steve says, we're kind of midflight on these slides, this is our, you know, draft of what we want to show the Council on Sunday.

So to go into some more detail for Work Track 1, again, this is very much as Steve says, midflight. So this is the type of thing that we'll be presenting during the meetings at ICANN 61. So I'll give everyone a second to read this while I take a quick sip of water here. Don't focus on the language here, because this is not - we're really just showing this as kind of the format, and we've chosen a couple of the easier ones here. So essentially what we're going to do with each of the work tracks on Saturday - yes, Saturday - is kind of go through slides like this.

So it'll basically be, you know, these are the recommendations that we think we'll come out with in the initial report and then you'll see on the next slide ones with communications. So these are just two of the topics of Work Track 1. And again, it's really to kind of go over the recommendations we have on each of the subjects for the initial report and also what we don't see here is if we have time also to have slides in here that will have questions that we intend to put out for comment.

So that's really pretty much the format of how we'll conduct the work track 1-4 session on Saturday from 12:30 to 3:00, do I have that right or 1:30 - I can't remember the time now, but it's in the afternoon on Saturday. Any questions on this format or the structure for ICANN 61? Steve says, "12:15 to 3:00" okay, that's the time on Saturday. Trust Steve, not me. He is the one that knows this stuff better than I do as far as the timing.

Steve, you have your hand raised.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Jeff. This is Steve from staff. And to just to add to what you're talking about, Jeff, about this slide deck for ICANN 61, so the thought is, as Jeff was saying to include the summary recommendations implementation guidance options and questions all on the slide deck, so I think it's safe to assume that we won't be able to go through all the content in the face to face session but we're hoping to do is to be able to provide this as a resource probably on the agenda for the face to face session so that all the participants at ICANN 61 can download the deck, take a look, get a good summary level understanding of where the working group is heading for all the topics within its remit.

So, yes, as Jeff said, we won't be able to cover all the topics in the face to face but, sorry, you should be - everyone should be able to understand where we're heading as a working group. And I was just going to cover the thing that Jim brought up. The intention is to provide lunch since the meeting will be during lunch so hopefully that's an improvement over last meeting. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Steve, if we could check on the lunch? If we could get there at 12:00, I don't know if there's a meeting right before it, but it would be great if everyone could get their food and be in place by 12:15 because we do - we are going to (unintelligible) time and because there is a lot to cover, so even though there will be food there, Steve will let us know if we can get there a couple minutes early to make sure we can get some food. So Steve says we're doing box lunches to make it simple and timely. Good.

Okay, so any other questions on the structure for ICANN 61? Okay, we were expecting some more questions but great. So what I want to jump to now, as Steve prepares getting the next thing on Adobe, is just a little bit about the format of the initial report.

So the way that we thought we would structure the initial report is not by overarching issues slash work track but more in terms of chronological order or the way it would appear in kind of an Applicant Guidebook format. So we will start with the overarching issues, just to make sure that that's covered, but also then - or sorry, then, going to more of a chronological order. This has really helped us in thinking about, at least for the leadership, in helping us think of issues that we may have missed or not adequately covered as we go through this in that chronological order.

So for example, you know, in going through the structure and going through the issues we have not spent a great deal of time in Work Track 3 talking about the role of auctions in string contention or sorry in contention resolution, not string contention, sorry, contention resolution. We have not really spent much time on discussing the GAC advice presumption that if the GAC provides advice that the string won't be delegated. And we really haven't spent too much time talking about the exact role of public comments in the evaluation objection processes.

So, you know, in kind of thinking about it in the chronological order really helps us kind of - or makes these types of issues stand out because of where they're chronologically placed. So if you look at it, and the way we envision doing the initial report or structuring it, and we started populating content in it, would be these are overarching issues, then go into some foundational issues, so things like the global public interest, applicant freedom of expression, universal acceptance and we would also cover some competition, consumer trust and choice, I think it's (J) there in that foundational issues.

But then structure the topics more like here are the prelaunch activities, so things like communications, how the Applicant Guidebook will be structured, systems, and then go into all of the various elements involved in application submission, which includes the application fees, variable fees, submission period, the applicant support, terms and conditions. I might actually put in there an RSP preapproval, somewhere in there because I don't think that's in there yet so we'll consider putting that maybe even into the prelaunch activities.

Then we would put things like how to process the applications and evaluate them so that's how we queue the applications, dealing with, you know, which issues are reserved at least at the top level - or which strings are reserved at the top level, going through - we have a placeholder for the geographic names and IGO INGO protections because those are reliant on at least IGO INGO on the other PDP that's going on and the geographic names on Work Track 5.

We have things there like registrant protection, closed generic, string similarity, IDNs, security and stability, applicant reviews and name collision, so you'll see a hodgepodge of topics that are some that are actually I think there's probably a topic in there from every one of the work tracks in that section.

Then onto things like dispute resolution, string contention, pre delegation contracting, post delegation. So we think structuring the report like this would be easier to read for the, you know, for the community and also provides a logical way to organize the topics in a way that also helps us figure out areas where we will need some more information or potentially areas that we've missed altogether.

Thoughts on that? People agree that that's a good way to go forward or would people rather do the organize by work track? Very quiet group. So Jannik says, "Makes sense, this new structure," okay so it seems like we're getting some comments that this structure makes sense.

What we'll do is we'll take this list of topics, we'll put that out to the group and if we've forgotten any or you think some of these topics should be moved around let us know. So like I already saw the RSP preapproval was in overarching issues but I think we might want to put that into the prelaunch activities or keep it where it is in the overarching issues, so there may be some differences of opinion there.

Maxim says, "Do we as the PDP working group need to file a comment to the budget in the absence of funds for the next round?" Great question. I'm going to put that, Maxim, under any other business, so if we can just add that there because I think that's a great question but let's put that off for a minute.

Okay, everyone seems to agree with the structure, sorry Justine says, "Agreed, we should cater to the registrants or applicants." And Jannik says, "Please remember outreach before the application window opens." Yes, so communications does include outreach but we can - we can make sure that we highlight that more.

Okay, well I was actually thinking that this would take a lot more time, so Steve, is there - or Cheryl, is there anything to get to before we go to the any other business? Paul says it's okay to end the call early. Great.

All right, let's go to any other business because actually I do think that the issue that Maxim has brought up is really important. So if you have been looking at the budget that was put out for comment, I guess it was several weeks ago now, the - along with I guess there were five or six documents put out - there was only a short mention of the Subsequent Procedures PDP but there was a very explicit statement in several places that said that there are no funds allocated for - and I'm paraphrasing here - for implementing the GNSO - any GNSO policy on subsequent procedures.

So it was very explicit in that fact. And so obviously that statement has raised - or has caught the attention of a number of us. I know that there are some constituencies and even the Council is planning to comment on that. But if we look at fiscal year '19, which is what the budget year is for, that really goes from July 2018 through June - the end of June 2019. If we proceed on the timeline that we are hoping to, we are hoping to have a final report delivered to the Council by early next year - calendar year, sorry - so in fiscal year 2019. And hopefully even having the Board, I'll knock on wood, approve that within fiscal year '19.

If the Board and staff waits until fiscal year '20 to actually start allocating funds towards the implementation of the next round, a number of groups feel like this could or would substantially delay the next round. And to draw some parallels, if you were to look back at the last round, which launched in 2012, the ICANN - ICANN started budgeting for that round in fiscal year 2007. I' not saying that the Board would need to - or ICANN organization needs to budget five years in advance because at that time if you look at what was going on it was believed that the GNSO Council would approve the policies in 2008, which they did, and the Board would approve it in 2008, which happened but it was believed that the round would launch in 2009 or 2010.

So if you look at it, ICANN started allocating budget towards the new gTLD process at least two years before it expected to launch. Again it was at the

end of the day, five years, but what they thought in their minds back then was two years. So if you apply that same type of logic going forward, ICANN would have to start spending money now in order to plan for a launch that would occur in 2020.

If it does not start spending money in 2018, 2019, then logic would say that you could not start a round until 2021 or 2022, which for many would seem a little bit unreasonable since at that point in 2021, 2022, we are talking about a full decade going between the two rounds. And that certainly does not fit in line with the GNSO policy of having a reliable predictable process for the introduction of new gTLDs.

So I wanted to kind of put that out there as a personal view. And also kind of as someone who's been working as the - one of the cochairs on this process if the GNSO does approve policy in fiscal year 2019 would very much like to see it move forward. And I believe that the ICANN as part of, again this is personal view, you know, since the policy is and has been - or should be a process for the introduction of new gTLDs in a reliable predictable manner, that ICANN really should be putting some budget towards the preparation even if not - if all the policies aren't finalized.

And there are whole host of activities that the - that ICANN could do not just in spending money but if you look at the fiscal year '19 budget you will see that all of the employees that were dedicated under, quote, new gTLDs, are now in the operations group, which may be fine if the operations group actually is taking on the implementation of Subsequent Procedures. So at the very least some of us feel like - that ICANN should put some recognition into the budget of allocating staff and resources towards implementing GNSO policies including the next round or rounds of new gTLDs.

So Christopher, please.

Christopher Wilkinson: Thank you, Jeff. So Christopher Wilkinson for the record. Just to revert to my earlier chat entry, and what you've just said, I would - I think the (ways) that you have just outlined are really unsatisfactory especially for groups underserved in the previous round. And I would strongly recommend, again, that (unintelligible) and identify categories of names for which we can reach early conclusions on a consensus basis that allows us to move forward more quickly than they - than what you've outlined.

If we all wait until everything has been agreed, all categories, I feel that some potential applicants will suffer unnecessarily from delays caused by others so I come back to my earlier chat entry, I propose that we disaggregate this into categories of names which are phased. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Christopher. At this point there has not yet been agreement on whether we should do that. That is a subject that's included, or will be included in the initial report and certainly options presented. So depending on the community feedback and we get as comments that we could discuss that. Again, I don't want to prejudge any kind of outcome. But certainly regardless of how we launch it, whether it's in phases or just one round, there you know, we do know from ICANN's post mortem report, that's not the name of it but it was in essence a post mortem done on the implementation of the last round, we do know for example, that the application system is not one that can be reused.

We also know that ICANN is going to have to devote attention to the, you know, rewriting parts of the Applicant Guidebook. We know that ICANN may need to have consultants to help with establishing evaluation procedure. There are plenty of things that I think and examples we can provide for ICANN staff to start working now without waiting until GNSO Council approves the policy and/or the Board approves the policy.

And for some reason the Board is taking the position that until the community - until the GNSO provides its policy and says yes, proceed, it's pretty much

hands down not spending any money. So all of that leads to the ultimate question that Maxim had which is, "Does this group as a whole want to make comments?" Now comments are due on March 8 or 9, which is right around the corner, so I'm not sure it's viable for the group to submit comments. I know that - I know that the Registries have some comments that they're intending to file; the Council has comments that it is intending to file.

Certainly if the working group as a whole wants to endorse any of those comments Cheryl and I have talked about filing comments as the two coleaders but only as coleaders but no on behalf of the group, knowing that we do not have time to get full group sign off. So there are those options.

I think Cheryl and I will probably submit something as individuals. If the group later decides it wants to support those that'd be great but I think we'll make it clear that it's our own individual comments. But - and I certainly encourage others in other constituencies and groups to make comments as well.

So as Jim says, I don't think that there is time for formal comment. So what we could do is, again, Cheryl and I are going to - are - we kind of have a draft of some things floating around so we may file that as individuals. To the extent anyone wants to sign onto that, agree to that after it's submitted or to the extent we want to provide at ICANN 61 feedback to ICANN staff that it's something we as a group generally support we can certainly do that, though we don't have to, it's just up to the group.

And Jim is typing. So Jim says, we - actually I won't read that comment, I'll let people read that comment on their own. Okay, so any other questions because I think a number of people are dropping anyway to attend another call. But any other comments? Okay not seeing any other comments, reminder, our meeting - our first meeting is Saturday from 12:15 to 3:00. If you're there it'd be great to see you, if you're not there please join us remotely. And then on Sunday there is an overall discussion on PDPs with the GNSO in the morning. And finally on Wednesday there is a session in the

morning on Work Track 5. So everyone safe flights and I will see you all on Saturday. Thanks, everyone.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you. The meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop the recordings and disconnect all remaining lines. Have a great remainder of your day, everyone.

END