ICANN

Transcription ICANN Barcelona

GNSO – New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Session 2 of 3

Monday 20 October 2018 at 1515 CEST

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 recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:

https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Jeff Neuman: All right everyone. Welcome back. I just need to look in the back to make sure that we've started. Do I wait to get a thumbs up? I don't even see anyone back there. Thanks, Michael.

Jeff Neuman: Gave me a thumbs up? In the back, gave me a thumbs up? We can keep going, all right, cool, thank you. So this is our second session, subsequent procedures, formally known as work tracks one through four. This will be the last time I think we actually call it that. So this session is, we probably should not have these slides still up, so we'll go to the right ones.

But this session, taking a little bit of a break from the policy to talk about things that the community can do between now and launch, or I guess between the time period of now till whenever to start getting this program off the ground.

We've been talking policy for several years now. We are getting to a stage at least with subsequent procedures to a point where we think we'll have a final report towards Q2 of 2019, and we believe that with that report ultimately the council could approve it and send it to the board, and so we, unless we want to do everything like we did in the last round, which was very sequential, there may be opportunities for us to continue the new GTLD program, and notice I'm not calling it a completely new round or anything. But to continue what's already been started six years ago or more to moving forward.

And so there are a number of, you know, so we've sort of discussed some of these both as a working group and at different ICANN meetings over the past couple years.

But it's getting now towards the time of trying to put things into play and starting to take some action because there is a fear that if we wait until the policy is finalized, the final report submitted to the board, let's say the board then waits for other groups that may be dealing with issues that might have an impact on new GTLDs, and then we at that point after the board does a comment period and finally approves it and only then do they start a new, or start an implementation. It could be several or many years before we see this program.

And you know, again to remind people that this program, the last round launched in January of 2012. So even on the trajectory that we're thinking of heading, we could very easily be into 2020, 2021 and that's if we start taking affirmative steps now to launch the program before we actually see a new round open up.

If there are additional delays or things that, you know, we aren't expeditious on starting the things that we can start now, we can easily see a decade between the 2012 round and the next one.

So these are just important reasons why now is the right time to start these discussions. I'm not saying we're going to make a lot of conclusions here, but certainly to get people thinking about how we deal with that moving forward.

And so to that end, we had invited the council leadership, both past or present and potential future, but it turns out that both the current council, well I don't see (Heather) here. Do I? (Heather)'s not here, and the two nominees for chair are not here. And neither are the two, well one of those nominees is also one of the current vice-chairs and the other vice-chair is not here.

So we're just going to decide amongst ourselves what we think council should do, and yeah, we'll let them know tomorrow what we come up with. So that will be one of the questions, and then also we're lucky to have Trang Nguyen here from vice president of, I'm going to get the title completely wrong, but she's like the best vice president at ICANN, I'll call her that. So she's responsible for the, amongst a lot of other things, the new GTLD program and for other strategic initiatives, is that what it's called, maybe?

Okay, there, I got it semi-right. And so Trang Nguyen, we sent an invite to Trang Nguyen and others to just kind of think about these types of issues, not that, and I'm sure she's already done a lot of thinking of how once they get the policy from the community how they move forward to implementation.

So one of the other points on this slide here is that you know there are different ways that we can classify a lot of these discussions, which is why I kind of wanted to have this out in the open. So there are, within the GNSO community there are several mechanisms to deal with implementation. Several years ago, the GNSO passed a, or approved a program that deals essentially with the implementation of consensus policies. And one of the requirements now is to form what's called an implementation review team, or it's also called IRT, if you hear that abbreviation.

There is also in the procedures a mechanism that allows for action to be taken called pre-planning or planning options, which then would set a basis for an implementation review team. So there's lots of different ways in which the community can start preparation tasks for the program to begin, but I thought this would be a good place to make sure that the discussion is out in the open, and so that there's no thoughts or feelings that we're having or people are having closed-room discussions on, you know, how to kick this program off. It's really just try to, you know, none of these, I don't have answers, (Cheryl) doesn't have answers, Steve probably thinks he's got answers. But I'm kidding. (Steven), I like

(Crosstalk)

Jeff Neuman: But the point is that, you know, we'd rather have these discussions out in the open so that people aren't surprised by this or think that this is moving a lot quicker than it actually is, or that they had thought it would move. So with that, let's go on to the next slide.

I don't know why I'm looking at that screen when I'm actually signed in. So the first topic which, I know (Ruebens) is on the council, I don't know, are there any other councilors in the room here, while we look? Yeah, existing or future. No? Okay, so (Ruebens) is going to be kind of our messenger here.

But essentially the GNSO council, as I said before, in the policy that's been approved, after a final report is approved would commence or would appoint, I guess say an implementation or decide to approve a point and implementation review team to implement the findings or to implement the final policies.

But the question that I have, and something I've been doing some thinking about, if you think about what has to happen, so once the council approves the final report, final report then would go to the board. The board then would send it out for public comment for at least a period of 40 days, and if you think

about the timing in which the board generally could approve, and I'm not saying, this is kind of a best-case scenario, hey, Rafik, thank you for joining us, great.

So the normal process would be for the council to submit the final report to the board. The board could take anywhere, I would think the shortest the board could approve under the existing policy is somewhere around a three- to six-month timeframe. So you're now talking about once a policy's approved, just kind of being stagnant for three to six months.

So one idea that we had was at least with respect to subsequent procedures, is that perhaps an implementation review team could be appointed at the point in which the final report is submitted to the board. So it's basically appointing an implementation review team prior to the board actually approving the policy, with the hope or understanding that the board would likely approve ost if not all of what's in there.

You know, obviously there'd be a caveat with the group that's formed that some things may change, so be ready. But ultimately the program should look a lot like, or should adopt the board should adopt a lot of what, if not most or all of what the GNSO's going to recommend.

We're also hoping that between the public comment periods that we've had, several of them, and the, you know, the constituency comments initially early on, the community comments and then finally the preliminary, sorry the initial report and the supplemental initial report and ultimately a final report and there may be other opportunities as well, that between all of that we'll have a good understanding of whether we think these things could pass muster. We've also had comments from the ICANN staff and ICANN board.

So all that's a very long way of saying that one idea we had would be to go to the council and ask them to start an implementation review team at the point in which they submit the report to the board. We've checked the operating

procedures of the council and nothing would prohibit any of this. There's nothing in the operating guidelines that says that the policy has to be approved by the board before you start an implementation review team.

So this is just kind of as a question out to the community, what are your thoughts on something like this? Does this sound like a way in which we can get work started on implementation without kind of losing a three- to six-month period of the board approving this policy?

So throw it out, thoughts. I see hands coming up from the mic. So I'll take Anne and then …

Anne Aikman-Scalise: Yeah, you know, people'd be surprised to say that I like this idea. I like this idea, but I just wanted to mention that the IRT, once constituted, probably shouldn't work on things where there's existing conflicting advice such as advice or other, you know, dependencies where they might be facing time if the board still has to resolve an issue and might perhaps those could be carved out when the board has not yet acted.

But I'm sure there's plenty of other stuff that could be worked on. That was all, thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks Anne. I think there'll be other dependencies too, so you know we don't know for example there may be dependencies in some areas on rights protection mechanisms. That may or may not be finalized by that time. There may be dependencies on IGO INGO, sorry, using abbreviations, Intergovernmental Organizations and international non-governmental organizations.

So there's work going on in that, that may not be fully decided by that point in time, but as long as, and like Anne said, as long as those are made aware of the implementation team, that stuff could be coming, and let's not work on

these couple of areas yet, because that's not right, but we can work on these other areas. I think that that makes a lot of sense.

Any other thoughts, concerns on that question? Kathy, please. Everyone should introduce themselves, and their affiliation and thanks.

Kathy Kleiman: Kathy Kleiman, affiliated this year with Princeton Center for Technology Policy, but these are my own comments. And also I'm co-chair of the Rights Protection Mechanism Working Group, which will be a dependency and I'm not going to address that now but as you point out, dependency.

So question, I apologize for missing this morning. In the initial report, there's in the 300 pages there's a lot of issues that were presented as alternatives, as background which was great. But to what extent when it goes to the board do you think that there still will be open issues in the community as well as in the GAC, but in the community that might be resolved up at the board level and through the board comments, and to what extent do you think they'll be resolved or ready? And I heard something about a subsequent report. So again I apologize for kind of missing the timeline of what's happening next.

Jeff Neuman: So Michael just said can we show the timeline? Do you want to show that slide? So Kathy that's a good question. So that's a couple parts. So the default of this, let me go back all the way to the beginning. The default of this group is if there are areas of contention where there's no kind of pathway to resolution. And it will be as it was in 2012, as it was implemented. So that's always kind of the default. But there are other areas where hopefully we will find paths forward on a lot of the issues and so I'll be optimistic on that.

And there may, sure there may be, it's certainly conceivable that there may be a couple issues that are still being debated, for which we would or the council would need to instruct the IRT to either not go there yet or you know, assume, make certain assumptions that let's assume for now that it's going to be as it was in 2012 and then if it changes, you know we, the council, the

board, to the council, the council to the IRT, which would only at that point say, okay, things have changed, now let's introduce this other concept.

So it's a hard, other than giving you that kind of answer in terms of it's hard to speculate going that much going forward, but at the end of the day, you've also did say something that I'm not 100% sure of, and we've got to be careful in how we talk about this, which, we tend to just use the word dependencies, but I think we need to be a little bit more clear as to what exactly is dependent on what.

So, and I know that stake. For example, one may say or think that yeah, before you actually accept applications for new GTLDs, you have to solve these issues. But that doesn't mean that you have to solve these issues before you start working with an implementation review team on everything else. Right? So we just need to, and I think there have been some discussions where we haven't done a good job, and I'm including myself in that, of being clear as to what we mean.

So I would think, so probably use an example, with rights protection mechanisms, for example I think ultimately that could very well be a dependency before you actually accept applications in, but that may not be a dependency before you commence an implementation review team to implement other aspects of the program. And we'll go through some of those in more specifics, where rights protection may not, however we come out on that, it's not going to have an impact one way or the other on that other part of the new GTLD program.

So we just need to, when we have these discussions with the councils to make sure we're clear on what we're discussing. So, I know that's kind of vague for a lot of people.

I'll give you an example. So let's say we do go forward with, and if Trang Nguyen wants to jump in too or anyone else, if we do kind of go and say yes,

we think registry services provider pre-approval program is a good thing. Let's start working on that now. Do we need to actually wait for INGOs to be decided before we set up a program of approving technical providers? Probably not, I don't know, the end of the day anything that comes out of IGO, INGO, is going to only affect reserve names or curative rights. It's not, or dispute resolution, it's not going to affect how a technical operator is approved, right?

So there are lots of things that while it may be a dependency ultimately in accepting applications in, it's not necessarily a dependency to kicking off other areas of implementation. That make sense? Yes, no. Please jump in.

Woman: Thanks, (Charlene Dinou) for the record. I'm not seeing an illumination of Kathy's, so if I can metaphor my way through to some understanding here. I like to think of it as a little bit like the difference between a critical control point to a whole program In other words it's a go/ no go, right? Versus foundational work that can be either begun, not necessarily finished, or to some extent perhaps even substantially finished, which are so foundational to any program that it is safe and reasonable to get implementation review team to start focusing on those aspects of the inevitable work.

But it doesn't mean that there is a critical control point shift. It is simply foundational work, exercise, highly predictable agreed regardless of what is going on at this sort of surfacing layer, the foundations have to be done. Okay? So hopefully that helps. Thanks.

Sarah Langstone: Hi. A bit high. Sarah Langstone from Verisign for the record. I'm just wondering, and forgive me because this is my first PDP, what the budget implications are for setting up an IRT team to work on things that haven't been approved. And you gave a good example, or an example, the RSP pre-approval program. And if that aspect doesn't get approved or whatever, what do you do about the fact that you've had people that have been creating it, I don't really understand where the budget comes from, so understand that,

understanding this is my first PDP, it's not yours, perhaps you could explain that to me. Thank you.

Trang Nguyen	This is Trang Nguyen for the record. From ICANN, yes, thank you. So Sarah, the funding for any type of implementation related work obviously comes from org as part of the annual planning process and ultimately depends on the board's adoption of the policy recommendations.

You know, irrespective of when the IRT-related work starts, I do believe that the CPIF, the, not going to remember what the acronym stands for, consensus policy implementation framework, so the CPIF does allow for ICANN org to do some pre-planning work during the prepare phase, which is the phase that we're currently in right now, the policy development phase.

So concurrent with policy development, the CPIF does allow for ICANN org to follow PDP discussions, and engages in implementation-related matters where appropriate. So within that, there are certain things that we could do. We have to be careful about what activities we do under tech because you're right Sarah in that, you know, if things can change later on we don't, we want to minimize as much as possible any kind of pre-work that would need to be done.

So, you know, so we have to sort of balance what we can undertake while policy discussions are going on, recognizing that there's still an approval process that would need to happen later on, and also recognizing that we want to minimize as much as possible any rework, particularly activities where costs are involved.

Jeff Neuman:	Yeah, thanks, I mean it's kind of like we wouldn't expect capital expenditures for, you know, an RSP program to begin, but that doesn't mean you can't start as Trang Nguyen was saying, it doesn't mean you can't start thinking about okay, well if we were to do a program, this is you know the time frame in which we think we can do it.

This would be you know the plan for outsourcing X, Y and Z, or developing whatever technology, putting all of that stuff together. But yes, once you actually get to the point of spending money on either additional capital or additional human resources or whatever, that's probably at the point where you need a definite approval that that part's going forward. So I think yeah, thanks. So I see, yes, please.

Man: (Unintelligible) from (unintelligible), but I am speaking on my own behalf. I feel that there is an emergency or an urgency on opening the next round, because we are thinking about setting an implementation team for it, so that we will not lose time. I don't have any problem for this process except if it costs money. Because I don't know if we already tried to see what is the status or the situation and the health of the new GTLDs of the 2012 round. Are they all working? How many decisions per GTLD, et cetera.

So if the situation of those GTLDs are very good, yes, of course, we need more. But if most of them are not working now, I don't know what is the urgency of trying to open the new, the new round very soon. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, I don't want to be the only one speaking. I don't know if anyone wants to address the question of our new GTLDs working. While people are thinking, I think there are some resources to look at. Certainly there's a report from the CCTRT, consumer choice competition, I'm missing, and trust, of course trust.

Did I hit all the right Cs? Consumer, choice, trust, anyway, CCTRT just released its final report. Their conclusion was definitively that it has enhanced competition. Little less definitive on some of the, so it says it hasn't enhanced competition, it has in some cases enhanced trust, but there's still, they need more data sources on some of the other ones.

At the end of the day, this is a program, the GNSO approved this program in 2008 and it's had as a policy that there will be a systemic, not using the right words, basically an ongoing process of the introduction of new GTLDs, and the GNSO is not wavering from that. There's been no hint of any discussion within the GNSO, the GAC or any other groups that said "Stop."

So we're moving, you know, we move forward. I don't know if you were here at the beginning, we think about the program and while it may seem urgent to some, 2012 is when the last round launched. And even if we worked efficiently and as quick as I could even envision it, we're not launched until 2020 or 2021 at the earliest, and now you're almost a decade between rounds.

So I've heard for last in fact a year and a half ago I heard some people from the GAC saying "Why are you moving so urgently and urgently," knowing how long it's going to take us to eventually get where we're going to go. And I just kept saying "Look even if we move on the path, we haven't slowed down." You know, but now when people are starting to realize it's more real, even because five years ago or last year they were paying attention to GDPR, and now all of a sudden they're paying attention to this, it really hasn't been that urgent or that expeditious a movement.

So, but there will always be people that feel that way. Sorry, Kathy's at the mic, anyone else? Oh.

Kathy Kleiman: Kathy Kleiman again, and thanks to both you and (Cheryl) for talking about this. What I'm about to say is no position of the RPM working group, because we haven't discussed this yet. But as a member of the sub working group and I know we're going to be talking about this with council as well.

So two things, the IRT, at least two things if an IRT starts before the rules are accepted. One is we really have to leapfrog over the controversial issues, and this is what you focused on, (Chery)l, but let's make it a premium that to the

extent anything is likely, is or is likely to be controversial, we have to set it aside. It can't go to the IRT. So let's say there's nothing controversial about certification of back end registry service providers. That might be a good thing to go to the IRT.

The other thing is the membership of the IRT has to stay open, because members may come in or out based on the issues that the board decides on later, or based on issues that the RPM may come in with, or others providing input in. So we can't fix the membership of the IRT. It's got to stay open because we may find depending on the final rules that we pick that there are people who want to participate based on that. And we haven't talked about the membership of the IRT yet, but that's going to become an open issue as well.

So, two thoughts and I know there are others, thank you for kicking off this conversation, it's an important issue and one that will generate a lot of discussion here.

Jeff Neuman: On the latter issue, maybe someone that's ore familiar, I'm looking at Anne, than with the CPIF. I believe there are mechanisms or rules in there about how an IRT is constituted or that it needs to be open. Basically, we would just be asking for an IRT to be formed in the way that the GNSO normally forms IRTs. We wouldn't be asking for any kind of limitations, but Anne do you happen to know, I'm sorry to put you on the spot.

Anne Aikman-Scalise:Yeah, I think that the policy implementation framework says that the IRT has to be representative. Now it also adds this phrase that if, you know, technical expertise is required, that the technical resources should be found and be placed on the IRT as well. I think, you know, okay, so my name is Anne Aikman-Scalise, I'm a member of the IPC. We're always looking of course in the GNSO to be fairly representative and not just representative GSC, but to be representative of the intellectual property constituency. And so that's something that comes up quite frequently in our GNSO context.

And the other thing I wanted to add very quickly as a codicil, is when I said I support this idea, I assumed at that time that we will have figured out unified access models for access to RDAPs for legitimate interests under the GDPR, because if that's not figured out, you know, that's a disaster on many levels. And I would not support going forward with another round until we get that figured out, personally, thanks.

This is not an official opinion of the IPC but probably could get some support on it.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Anne, if again for now we're just going to assume that by then we'll know more hopefully. But if we don't, then there may be some more nuances with your opinion as well, because there may be issues with certain types of TLDs but maybe not others. Hopefully we don't even have to go down that road, hopefully everything will be figured out by then.

But certainly we understand, these are just preliminary discussions, but you have to have these in order to do some planning and you always plan on things going in a certain direction and hopefully even when the unexpected happens, it still doesn't deviate you too much from the course you've planned.

But yeah, Kathy, additional things, or, no? Great. So let's go to the next, oh I'm sorry, Jim. Everyone else is walking up to the mic, (Jim), I'm just pointing that out.

(Jim): (Emily) has told me she enjoyed getting up and moving around, is that correct? Okay. So couple things that I think would help the larger group think through this question is one, have you mapped out the various contingencies that are outside of our control? Mapped out the various contingencies outside of our control, so, end cap study that the ASIC is charged with, the RPM's working group. When all that comes together, I think seeing that either on one

of your timelines or some other visual would certainly help, you know, us understand what else is out there besides what we're controlling.

The other part of it that I think is a big question mark is, especially for those who are new to the policy development process, what is the role of GNSO when we are done with our work, what do they review, what can they reject, can they reject portions? You know, can they line item veto any recommendations and then kick it back to us? And the same goes for the board. Do they reject it whole clot or not? So I think that's something that may help people think through it since, you know, a lot of folks are new to the process.

Then finally, I hear what you're saying about being conservative and not assuming things like the board will approve whole cloth. I think the board when they come with advice or when they come with feedback, sometimes it's vague. I think, I don't think we have a board liaison to this working group and if we do I apologize.

But I think, you know having some discussions with the board in an informal manner about, hey where's your head around what you''ve seen so far? We did get some comments from them on the initial report but there's a lot of unanswered questions about that feedback that I think we do need to find out at some point, and I think that'll help us do a better job of doing a more complete effort to try and make sure that they are happy with it.

But the other thing you need to factor in is the role of the GAC. They not only had issues with specific applications, they had issues with entire processes last round. And I don't know how you anticipate for that other than what I have advocated before in the past is asking the GAC to submit their advice before you open the application window so that there are no surprises for applicants, ICANN community. But, so just some things to think about as we continue to mull over this question.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, (Jim). That's all really good points, I just before we go on to the next, Avri Doria, I don't know if she's appointed as a board liaison like some people are formally appointed, so like the EPE and some things like that but Avri has essentially been in that role. So we are, Avri is keeping tabs on what's going on here and has been communicating with the board on things as they're moving forward.

On the, so technically when the GNSO approves a final report, they can approve it all. They can send it all back, they can send pieces of it back. The rest of their options depend on what the working group says.

So if the working group says "We are approving all of this as a package and not like you pick and choose type thing," then the GNSO essentially has to look at it like a package. And if they don't like one item that is part of the essential package, then their only option is to send it back. They can't line item veto, meaning they can't just pick out the things they'd like and then push everything else up to the board and they can't modify those without going back to the group.

The other thing, so let me ask you, dependencies. So one question while we take the next comment, maybe, so everyone can think about. So you mentioned a couple items that you think are dependencies. It would be great to hear from people in this room what they all believe are dependencies. So you mentioned the NCAP study, and I would say at this point because the NCAP study hasn't officially been approved by the board, that is not yet a dependency.

It may very well become a dependency, but it's hard to put things as dependencies now until they're officially approved. So I'm not disagreeing with you whether it is or it isn't, but at this point, you asked me the question have we started to work on development of dependencies, and we have. But NCAP wouldn't be on there because it's not an official thing yet.

But there are other items on there, like our PMs and other things. But so let me ask the question as we go to the next one, "What do you all believe are dependencies, before we can start implementation or before we can accept applications?" So why doesn't (Emily) go to the next comment, and then we'll generate.

Annebeth Lange: It's Annebeth Lange, that's okay? So Annebeth Lange, here from Culture in work track five for CCN, so, I would just like to follow up on what (Jim) said. That the experience from the last round should be better now, especially for the geo names that caused a lot of problems in the last round.

Since we have established work track five, we have better opportunities and better chances to find the way forward before the final report will be there. But still, since it's more engagement from all the stakeholder groups at the earlier stage, quite a lot of people in the communities don't understand completely the process, that it is a GNSO process, that it will go to the council, and what we have decided in the recommendations we are giving in the work track five, might be changed and then back.

So what happens there, it's really vital that all stakeholder groups, not only the GNSO, understands what can happen and the process further on. To save time, to not have the system we had last time, that it took so long from 2008 to 2012. That is really essential that we don't have every petition of that. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks Annebeth. Things are a lot different, this is Jeff Neuman, things are a lot different this time around between (Cheryl) and I and before that Avri and I and the other co-leaders. We've been presenting to the GAC at least the last five or six ICANN meetings if not more. We consistently seek their feedback, we've incorporated their feedback from the sessions that we've had, they've responded to comment periods.

You know, all that's not to say that they won't come out with things that are drastically different and they could always do that. But hopefully through everything we've done over the past several years that hopefully it won't be the same as 2008, when the GNSO policy was approved and we had to go through a four-ear process to actually roll it out.

Can't guarantee that, but hopefully we've done some things. So what else do people feel are dependencies? So Anne and …

Anne Aikman-Scalise: So very quickly, it's Anne Aikman-Scalise again, and I would have to agree with Jim that end cap is a dependency, and one of the reasons I think, so is that one of our own recommendations out of sub-pro, that we've thought about the do not apply list. And so suppose you send the IRT down a path of hiring somebody a technical consultant or whatever, of you know the do not apply list and the from slightly different results or definition comes out of the whatever project end cap is ultimately approved by the board.

Well, then once again you have that potential conflict and you've spent money to try to develop your do not apply list or, and we also are staying within sup-pro, develop a lot, medium and high risk name collision analysis in Unisys.

You know, and if that doesn't come out of whatever is approved by the board under NCAP, again you have money being spent on things that could be reversed or modified and then you're going to have to go back and really that issue of do not apply, as we saw in 2012 round, it can be expensive for parties that apply and later don't get what they were looking for.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks Anne. I think, so again just to talk about why we have not yet included End Cap as a dependency. Well, there's a couple reasons. One is that it hasn't officially been named a project of ICANN. They have meetings here, they're closed. I'm not, I'll go to the open session, but it hasn't yet been approved, doesn't have a budget.

And then the other issue in talking to potential NCAP members or ESAC members, they have not committed and will not commit to doing things like producing a Do Not Apply list. And they won't commit to having a definitive test, and they won't commit to, so when we talk about, I'm not saying I disagree with making them a dependency.

It's just that we need to A, make sure that they get approved; B, fully understand what it is that they're committing to do and then incorporate that into the dependency list. Because we can't really say they're a dependency for something that they're not willing to take on doing.

So that's just kind of a, we absolutely, and I've been trying to stress this to them, to the FSAC and if you meet with the SSAC or talk to them, I've been pushing very hard to try get some coordination and get them to talk to us enough, talk to them, I will be honest and up front at this point in time, DSAC and the NCAP don't have a desire to or believe that they need to coordinate with us.

So it would be great if you all can go there and say "Hey, why don't we have that coordination?" But to date there just hasn't been that willingness, and I'm not, yeah, that's all I'll say about that. Sorry, who else? Kathy thank you.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. So Kathy Kleiman, I'm supposed to hold it closer. Okay. So (Cheryl) sent the link to the IRT principles and guidelines in the chat room, which I appreciate. And the IRT wanted to not address dependencies per se but back to the IRT. And number one is the IRT recruitment. And I think this raises an issue for us.

The implementation, and I'll just read some of it, the implementation recruitment team, volunteer recruitment process should take into account what areas off expertise are expected to be needed. B, the call for IRT volunteers should clearly identify the needed areas of expertise, the scope

and approximate timeframe, et cetera, and then the call for volunteers should be sent to all members of the PDP working group.

If you are putting out a call for the IRT before some of the working groups are done and before some of these dependencies are done, we may need to redo this recruitment because people aren't going to go on the IRT if, say, the RPM working group is still finishing up. You can't, that's an over-commitment of time.

So we may need to keep in mind that a double recruitment is needed because the initial IRT is going to be implementing certain parts, the non-controversial parts of the subsequent procedures working group, the new policies. But we'll need to put out the call again when the rest of the rules are finalized in that additional area of expertise, like you know what comes out of the RPMs, the rights protection mechanisms, come in.

So let me see just a slightly different approach, which is since the subsequent procedures working group may be slightly ahead and according to the timeframes only slightly ahead of some of the other working groups, do you want to put in to play a group that could, a sub-group, maybe a full working group or a sub-part of the working group that would go forward to create procedures for implementation that could expedite and be used as suggestions when the IRT is constituted based on all of the policies and all of the expertise that will be needed. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Very few councilors in this room. That's really a question like so, that's really a question for the councilors, I think, because that's not something I would, you know, all I would be doing is going to the council, saying "Hey, can we form an IRT?" and then it would be up to the council to basically set the scope and then set the member, you know, whatever the rules are there so that would be a question for the councilors. I don't think I have a view one way or the other. I'm not sure, it's not really necessarily fair, but it, yeah.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so Rafik speaking. So as you said Jeff it's a question to the council and my understanding from your question that's kind of not going to say it's a request for guidance, but that's your plan to ask the council if you can go with this or not. So.

I cannot speak for the council, it's, but I think it's fair maybe to have this question because we raise it many times about timeline issue and so on, so it makes sense to have this as a topic for discussion. So I'm not sure what's your plan exactly, but that's, I'm sorry, about when you want to bring this, so that's why I was going to ask.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks Rafik, this is Jeff. So I think we're just kind of talking now and I think we would, I think (Cheryl) and I would ask at the point at which we submitted the final report to the council, that's when we would make the ask.

But the end of the day it would be up to the council according to their procedures to at that point if they said "Okay, yeah, we'll do that," then it's the council, they're responsible for constituting the IRT and doing kind of everything that you were talking about Kathy, and certainly we can, I'm sure we can provide recommendations that, you know, as the co-chairs and as the working group we could say that we think an IRT should be comprised of at least these types of members and, you know that they should work on these types of issues up and until the point that these, when these other issues are resolved then you may issue another call out for additional expertise.

Whatever it is, we can make any recommendations but at the end of the day it's council that would approve that. Who's, oh, I'm sorry, Rafik and then Anne.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, I don't know, thanks for the clarification Jeff. So I think it will be really helpful to have these, I mean you already shared, you are giving a heads up and I think it's from the council's standpoint we are trying to be more effective

in term of managing. So having this earlier, it help us maybe to do the planning and so on.

So I'm going to say this is, council position but that's I think really will help us a lot to, it's not just maybe waiting to get the report but from now on we understand what you are going to suggest and that helps us more in term of planning and so on, and particular for the upcoming council

Jeff: Thanks, Rafik. I know Anne's, okay, Anne, please.

Anne Aikman-Scalise: Me again. So I'd really like to encourage the group to reconsider on the question of whether name collision policy is a dependency or not. And the primary reason that I think you need to consider it a dependency is due to (unintelligible) 90, which says do not move forward with another round or window or whatever until the name collision issues are resolved.

And since (unintelligible) 90 was adopted by the board, and we have a response to that which is basically our response is our response, blah blah bah blah blah, and we have our response, but the board has adopted (unintelligible) 90, so there's already an identifiable potential conflict. So we can't just say that we don't know what they're doing, and they're not coordinating with us, so we on't want to deal with that. We have to understand there's already a conflict. And so it's a dependency.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks Anne. So let's, sorry for getting into the weeds, right, for everyone else. But let's also distinguish between SSAC 90 and the NCAP study. SSAC 90, there are dependencies in there. But those relate to things like much higher level principles than what the NCAP is calling for. So I do believe the things in SSAC 90 are dependencies, but that doesn't include the NCAP study they're very different.

Anne Aikman-Scalise: I respectfully disagree, I think there's a, and you and I are going to disagree until the end of the world about that

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, so either way this is not a resolved issue. But yeah, it's, I'm not the one that's going to be constituting the IRTs. I'm not on the council anymore. Sarah.

Sarah Langstone: Thank you, Jeff. Sarah Langstone for the transcript. So I wrote a list, this is what I think for debate. I think NCAP, I think SSAC 90 the same as Anne, RPM working group, the CC auction proceeds, work track five, two timelines need to converge, IGO and INGO, which we've already talked about. And then there's all of the GAC advice around one that's kind of still not been fully resolved. That's my list, seeing as you asked.

Jeff Neuman: It'd be great if you could submit that in like an e-mail. Or in chat, yeah. Just because you rattled that off, thank you Sarah, that was pretty quick. If I could ask a quick question. Yes, please.

Trang Nguyen   This is Trang Nguyen from ICANN org. Along the same lines as Sarah, what you were saying, it would be great if we do have that definitive to the extent possible list of dependencies. I know that's something that's going to be really helpful to org from a planning and implementation perspective. And I would assume that it may be helpful information for the board and for the GNSO council as well

                 I would like to submit to you another consideration, another item for your list, which would be the CCT report, and it contains some recommendations that they have identified as prerequisites for the next round, and those, some of those are directed towards the PDP working group but also some are directed towards ICANN org, so I think that's probably another item to add to the list.

                 There may be other SSAC and/or RSSAC advice and/or GAC advice we may need to comb through and kind of look and see. Thanks.

Jeff: Thanks, Trang Nguyen. Just to also, quick question, because Trang Nguyen
                 used the word dependency and so did Sarah. Let me ask kind of a pointed
                 question, is that a dependency before you actually launch the next round and
                 take an applications, or are you saying that's a dependency to even kick off
                 the start off an implementation review team?

Trang Nguyen   I would probably say before you start, but it depends upon the list of things
                 that you think that you could do that don't touch any of these items, because
                 there may be some things that don't touch any of these items that you could
                 work on. But I would urge cautiously of starting work on any of these things
                 are outstanding.

Man: Yeah, you could start on task 2.0.

Jeff Neuman: They couldn't even I don't even know where that is right now. Oh, hey Justine
                 please.

Justine Chew: Justine Chew from Larch but this is my personal opinion. Prerequisites for
                 launch is obviously systems one, your applications systems and whatever.
                 But certainly effective outreach for applicant support program.

Jeff Neuman: I think you're getting nodding of heads here, so certainly before we launch a
                 new or accept applications in, or even launch around the call for applications,
                 we should have plans and effective outreach. Anyone else, any other
                 dependencies? Let's go to some other questions we have, I think we've
                 touched on some of these, but let's just go to the list of questions.

                 This is one for Trang Nguyen, so this is a question basically of, if there's other
                 than what has been previously sent to us, you know, if there was a priority of
                 things that you needed to begin implementation efforts, you did submit or
                 there has been some comments that have been submitted, which I've now
                 read through from the initial report, which looks really good. What are the
                 areas of priority that you just have to have full answers to before you can

really move on? Like, you know, are there those go/no go items that just absolutely need complete resolution before you would think of an implementation team?

Trang Nguyen   This is Trang Nguyen from ICANN org, just so I understand your question Jeff, you mean any items that we need absolute clarity on before an IRT work could begin? Or before what could begin?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, you said it better than I did, your restatement yes. What items do you absolutely, well one before an IRT, and then I'll ask I guess, I think there's some follow-up, other questions, so yeah, so just that question, before an IRT.

Trang Nguyen   Thank you, so some of those are in our input two, the initial report. In it obviously we have included several areas where we require clarification and where we have follow-up questions on, so certainly clarity around those would be helpful. I think we also identify some key areas where additional information would be needed to begin implementation work. For example, the initial report contemplated establishment of a new appeals mechanism for the new GTOD program, but at this point it's lacking some of the details that we would need to begin implementation.

So I think we, those are detailed in our input to the initial report.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks and I certainly would encourage people to read that. It's very comprehensive and as we break out into the sub-groups, the relevant portions have been broken into the sub-groups and you'll see those comments in there.

One of the, certainly one of the questions that I hadn't thought as much about or had maybe taken for granted, in a number of areas in the ICANN or comments it just says please clarify that this is only intended for the new TLDs going forward and not all the ones let's say that have been delegated or

that are in process now. We need to just be more specific in that, I mean I think most of the people would have assumed, and we did talk about in some circumstances that this really is just forward looking as opposed to backwards looking, but we didn't spell that out, necessarily.

Okay, let's move on to next question. If we had an RSP pre-approval program, then the question would be, you know there were some comments in there about, in your and ICANN org's comments about maybe three months is not a long enough period, or some other in there.

But from a, what kinds of things can you think of that would be, what information that you think you would need to start even contemplating that RSP program, or have you? Have there been discussions of hey, you know, this recommendation may come down, you know, what do we think, how do we think we can implement this, like that.

Trang Nguyen   This is Trang Nguyen from ICANN org. So we already started thinking about it. The, you know, based on what's in the initial report. I think we did ask the confirmation that our understanding is accurate, or is in line with what the PDP working group intends. You know, I think for impact to the conversation that we had before about implementation work that would incur costs, I think this is an area where significant implementation work would incur costs.

Now we can think about what that RSP program might look like conceptually, what would need to be done. Ultimately the actual implementation would require sort of engaging a vendor to perform the evaluation. You know, you talk about things like that, that incur costs.

So I think to the, there's certain things that we could do based on what is in the initial report in terms of conceptually thinking about designing the program, how would it be designed, how it would be operated, but actual implementation itself, I think that would incur costs and publicly we would

want to get to a point where there's certainty that that is a program that would be put in place.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Trang Nguyen, this is Jeff. So one example where your comments had said, please clarify that this, the pre-approval program is really just a timing aspect as opposed to anything else. In other words, you had asked in the comments to confirm that the only difference between evaluating an RFP before a round opens up in this pre-approval program, as opposed to after, is a matter of time and not a matter of any kind of criteria. And, so we'll have to clarify that.

I think the intention was, yes, it's the same, but obviously I can't, we'll have to take those comments back and confirm that. But that's just an example of one of the questions that they came back with, or one of the feedback items. If there are other items, so if the group is let's say, I know you're participating so if the policy group now is saying, does clarify the things that you need clarified, if any other questions come up, this is really just the start of a dialogue.

If there are other information that you think of, okay now that you've clarified, we actually need this other information, that'd be great to just feed that back and could hopefully provide that.

Trang Nguyen   This is Trang Nguyen from ICANN org, yes absolutely, and the work didn't stop by our submission of input to the initial report. We're continuing to look at it, and for the detail and for the depth in defining sort of what key activities would need to be performed based on recommendations. And as we're undertaking that work, we have additional questions that are coming up. So certainly thank you for the invitation, and we'll definitely take you up on that.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, anybody else? Okay, next question. Anne is next, so Anne please.

Anne Aikman-Scalise:Actually that's one of the questions I think would be who would determine the scope of the IRT's work at the time that it was constituted. Because a lot of this discussion has been around, well, there are these dependencies and then some people say no, those are not dependencies. And so the question is, you know, when GNSO makes a recommendation to the board, who then determines well this is within scope for IRT start in its work and this is outside scope of IRT to start its work?

Jeff Neuman: So I think there's two answers to that. Ultimately it's the GNSO council that determines the scope of IRT or any group, ultimately. But when you're asking, but to clarify, when you're saying it's outside the scope of an IRT, meaning it's something ICANN org can just work on itself, what is the meaning of outside the scope of the IRT?

Anne Aikman-Scalise:The discussion we've been having as to what constitutes a dependency that they shouldn't work on or waste money on, versus what constitutes something non-controversial that the time and money will be well spent to get ahead of the game.

So this is obviously an issue of some contention even within this group right now, so it's the procedural question of how will those things be determined, or are you suggesting that this is some sort of recommendation that's going to come out of sub-pro, and if so is that within our charter, and you know, the procedural questions associated with that.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I'm just, sorry this is Jeff. I'm just trying to think of how to answer that. So the, ultimately at the end of the day it's the council that decides when to kick off an IRT, what the scope is, who's on the IRT according to its own rules. I don't believe that it's going to be a recommendation of this working group to commence an IRT, it's just an idea that I'm kicking around with people here and would like to kick around with the council to just brainstorm ideas of how we can move things along.

But at the end of the day, dependencies and all that other stuff as to when to kick off an IRT, when to, that's all done by the council and other groups that are formed that's outside this group. It's just trying to engage community discussion now, at this point.

Michael Flemming: So this is Michael Flemming for the record. My limited experience on an IRT, I think that there's a lot of elements to your question Anne, and to what you're pointing out. But cold-hearted, let me make sure I'm using correct language. It's, definitely the GNSO that basically puts forward and decides when it goes forward. At the same time there are certain elements within the IRT when they look at certain topics, and if there are dependencies they need to come back to later, they will hold off on that discussion. And when there's new material for them to consider, they'll reconvene on that.

I think that there's elements of the GNSO council need to decide, as well as that they have to decide in their own right. If you look at the length that was provided, some of the questions and some of the elements can be addressed within that.

Anne Aikman-Scalise:Sounds like Michael's saying that the dependencies are up to the IRT itself, and I don't think that's what we're saying in this community discussion. And I know that the IRT, when they go into you know their determination, they of course will make decisions about gosh, can we just do this as implementation, or do we need to go back to council, or you know how should we go on this.

But I didn't think that the point of this discussion was to say let's constitute an IRT and let them decide whether or not to go forward on an issue. I thought this discussion was, we could support the idea of IRT as long as they're not spending their time on issues that can be, you know, reversed later by the board or very controversial or whatever. If you guys are saying let's just constitute an IRT and let them decide it, I'm against it.

Michael Flemming: So what we're able to do is we're able to provide certain base requirements, I think. We're not able to define exactly how it goes forward. But we are able to provide advice on what, recommendations on what kind of experience the IRT should hold up, sorry, should be make up of.

But my understanding from your question was if there are certain dependencies that are still being discussed within the community, whether or not the IRT had free reign to go over that. I wasn't, perhaps I misunderstood your original comment, so I apologize if I did.

Anne Aikman-Scalise: Well, the comment was, I mean it's certainly not been, I've never seen on an IRT somebody say "Hey, okay IRT, you can look at these issues but you can't look at those issues, because those, you know, it's too early to look at those issues." But that's what we're suggesting here, is a different approach.

We're suggesting an approach that says you know, there's certain things we could get a jump start on this if we limit the scope of what the IRT's doing until after this board approval of the policy, and that is going to require an additional procedural step that defines what the IRT should be spending time and money on. And the question is, who makes that call?

Jeff Neuman: So there are actually IRT, I can't put my finger on the name of it, but there, hope I'm responding with the correct foresight. But there is actually IRTs that are, talk about a certain subject for example but are limited in certain regards. So I think it was, I can't put a name on it but for, I think it was for the Red Cross names, they were able to consider the full text of the Red Cross names that were reserved by they were not able to look at the acronyms until that resolution was decided and how to implement that.

I could be misquoting it but what I'm trying to say is IRTs can be limited in some regards, and okay, Steve.

Anne Aikman-Scalise: Council itself can do that, right guys? I mean, council can.

Steve Chan: I'll do what I can. This is Steve from staff and so I think the questions that Anne is raising are, you know, valid because generally the IRT is constituted after adoption of the final report by the board. That only happens at that point, and so to the extent that the scope of the recommendations and the report, if there's any limitations in that scope and dependencies, presumably it would probably be the board that make those determinations and probably put in resolve clauses.

So I think if we're doing something a little different here, constituting an IRT prior to board adoption. That question that Anne raised probably needs to be addressed. Presumably it's the board but in this case it might be need to be someone else.

Anne Aikman-Scalise: I agree with Steve.

Brian King: Hi, this is Brian King from (unintelligible). Can I ask a couple of dumb questions? So IRT is the implementation review team, right? And what are they implementing?

Jeff Neuman: No, no, no, no, it's a basic question, and the reason I kind of laughed is I'm trying to think back of whether I started the conversation out with that. So at the end of the day an IRT is to implement approved policy. So making the assumption that subsequent procedures is all the work that we're doing now, subsequent procedures, work tracks one through four and five, frankly, if there's a final report at the end of 22 and the final report goes to the council and the council approves it, sends it to the board, that's what would be, we're talking about the implementation review team implementing.

Brian King: Thanks, so it's after the board approves the …

Jeff Neuman: No, so that's the key question. So normally with most PDPs, the IRT is not generally formed until after the board actually approves the policy. But I'm

throwing out for discussion because that could be another delay of potentially three, six or even longer months. Whether, and this is allowed by the guidelines, whether the council would kick off the IRT even before the board approves the policy.

Obviously by that point, the council would have some diligence to know, you know, or to understand whether the board would approve all, most or some of it. The board knows what's going on, so they're being kept in the loop. So with those caveats, the question is can we kick it off?

Brian King: That case, before I give up the mic I would encourage the IRT or as much work as can be done in advance as possible to get the next steps going. To the extent that we're not concerned that the board's going to reject something that's passed by the council.

Kathy Kleiman: This is Kathy Kleiman, let me follow up on Brian's comment. Since we are brainstorming Jeff, and since we are throwing this up for discussion, are there other ways to think, you know, the problem is expediting implementation, right, that we want to kick this off, as a community we want to kick this off as soon as possible, but that the final rules haven't been adopted, that there's still dependencies coming in.

So I'm not sure if this is what you were saying, Brian, but it's what I was thinking and wrote down earlier. Are there other ways to think about expediting implementation? For example, is there more, you know, as if you guys need more work, is there more subsequent procedures might do to start planning on those non-controversial issues once it goes up to the board. Could you kind of internally kick off procedures to help the IRT when it is constituted, move forward more quickly?

But let me throw it out to everyone, are there other ways to think about expediting implementation of non-controversial policy recommendations? And just checking if that's the key underlying question.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks Kathy, this is Jeff. I think that's definitely part of it. I think some people have, as we've been going through discussions within this working group, some people have been very insistent that wait a minute, what you're talking about now is much more implementation that needs to, we shouldn't be discussing that because it's not policy.

That needs to wait for an IRT, and so that's where you get into areas, you know, if it were up to me personally, yeah, if this is something the working group had ideas on implementation as well as ideas on the policy, then I think you should go for it, right? Just, you know, it doesn't hurt to provide those recommendations. But there are others in the group that don't agree with that, and so when you start talking about things in their mind that amount to implementation, they say "Stop, that's not part of our work."

But from a personal, completely personal perspective, you know if you're doing the work anyway on the policy side and you all agree or come to a common understanding of how the implementation would look, why should you stop? Why shouldn't you just go the next step and write it down and see what happens. But there's been others that don't take that approach.

Man: Thank you, and thanks. I think the conversation here is a really interesting one, and it is, you know, enlightening to be more proactive in thinking about this next stage and avoid any dead time that could come about with processing any decisions from the council to the board.

So all I was going to comment on was that we've already gone into the natural habit, putting hurdles in the way, and seeing what may prevent us from going own this route. Perhaps we probably just need to think about it slightly differently and to the last comments there, you know, what can we do? Is there a list that we can start putting together which says these areas are comfortable to look at, explore, and start looking at a positive list, because there must be plenty of those.

There's probably plenty of aspects here that will be very similar if not the same as 2012 round in any case, in which case that can just be slotted in and start your base implementation document.

And then when some of these other areas that are contentious do come to a resolution, we can start to push them into play as well. And one final thing, I heard comments earlier about, you know, do we think that it's been successful in the last round and we need more information for that?

I think you know you've got to go out and search for that information, it's not going to come and sell itself internally to ICANN, or they're not out there selling this type of business. If anybody's interested, I do a plug for Wednesday morning, half past nine, so a gentle line and start if you want. We're doing a three-quarter of an hour session for the brand registry group.

And we'll talk about some of the use cases that are emerging, how brands are using them, and it's not something you would typically see unless you actually have business with that brand and you know, delve into there dot brand usage yourself. So more than welcome for anybody to come along to that and we'll be doing that on Wednesday morning, nine thirty, thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, sorry. Good, okay, thanks. Sarah, please.

Sarah Langstone: Thank you so much, Sarah Langstone from Verisign for the transcript. So I don't want to miss the, but I think I heard Trang Nguyen say that the current process can do some pre-planning work without triggering all of the budget issues before the PDP is approved by the board.

Isn't setting up an IRT a little bit more than pre-planning? I mean, that was just one question. Because there are a lot of dependencies that have been brought up, whether or not everyone agrees, that's another issue. But, and I was going to ask, you know, if this had been done before, because you know

this is my first PDP, and I think that Steve said that no, it happens, so it was just a clarification for me. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Great. I see Paul McGrady is now stepped in the room. So Paul, how do you feel? On everything that we've just been discussing, how do you feel? I didn't see (Donna), I would have. Hi, (Donna). All right, if I had seen it I would have put (Donna) on the spot.

Okay, let's go to the next question. Or maybe we can just kind of summarize where we are. That might help Paul and (Donna). Why don't I do that, why don't I just start with that?

So we started this discussion for this session, making some assumptions that if we were to deliver a final report within the timeframe that we have set forth, which is the Q2, end of Q2 time frame, and the council were to say this is the best piece of work we've ever seen. Let's say it approves it.

The question then would be, normally what's happened in the past is then it would be sent to the board, the board would then do its comment period for 40 whatever days. Would consult with the GAC and everyone else, and then at some point, three to six months later at the earliest they would approve the policy and then the IRT, implementation review team would be kicked off by the council.

So that's the normal what we've seen to date essentially with any policy. And so the question though was the thought of asking the council to kick off an IRT on the subsequent procedures final report, and so we've gotten a bunch of feedback, clearly that accepts there are outstanding items, whether it's from other PDPs or just anything that is outstanding or things that we know may have fundamental disagreements. You probably want to stay away from implementing those, or working on the implementation of those right away, and waiting for the completion of whatever those dependencies are.

There were, then we had a discussion, just the word dependencies and whether we mean a dependency to kick off an implementation review team or a dependency to launch the entire program, meaning to start accepting applications.

So we had a pretty good discussion. Sarah, (Jim) and others listed some items that they thought might be dependencies and Anne, so there's some debate back and forth. Ultimately then there are questions about IRTs in general, and how IRTs, the scope and the composition, all that is set by the GNSO council. Some of that through the operating guidelines, but others are I guess there's some areas in setting up an IRT that are subject to the discretion of council.

Trying to think of what else to just try to, oh high level, ICANN Trang Nguyen answered some questions about things that she may believe are, or ICANN org believes are dependencies in terms of even kicking off the implementation review team, certainly on implementation of certain items.

A lot of that's documented in their comments back in their comments to the initial report, so we're in the process of reviewing that anyway. Anything else I missed just at a very high level? I know I didn't cover everyone's comments, but.

So that's generally where we are, we know that it would be a different thing for the council to do, to kick off an IRT while recommendations are still pending with the board. But again, as we've discussed is that that could mean anywhere between three and six months or more at the board level, and rather than necessarily waiting for the board to come down from on high and say "Yes," you know, what kind of work can we do so that we just have installed for three to six months and then changed a potential opening of the next round from 2020 to 2021 to 2023 or 22, which would be a decade after accepting applications to this last round

So that, I think, brings us up to speed. Sarah?

Sarah Langstone: Yeah, thanks, I think any additional high-level point I'd want to make sure, while we're recapping, recognizing that we've still got two more questions to discuss. And that is that there was discussion in the room as well of if not IRT, what type of supplemental supporting of pre-planning can we perhaps contribute to? So there was that as well, as the IRT per se is problematic, is there other ways of facilitating the pre-planning activities with the necessary expertise and input that you would ideally have in the starting up of an IRT. I think that's about it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Jeff, Donna Austin from YouStart and also the GNSO council liaison to this working group or the one of two liaisons to this working group. So from a personal perspective, if you want to know my views on these so I can direct you to my circle ID article on how we could have a phased approach to implementation, but from a council perspective, I think many of you would be aware that the council has spent the last 12 months developing PDP 3.0, and a lot of that has been around how do we make the process more efficient and effective?

And we're very conscious of the fact that these efforts go on for long periods of time, and we lose people along the way, people who have knowledge that could be helpful.

So I understand the concerns that you know this might be stepping out of process in terms of timing, but I would encourage folks to think about this from the perspective of how do we make, thinking about efficiency and effectiveness in how we use our time. Is this something we should consider, understanding that there will be lumps along the way that are out of the control of the council.

I mean once the council approves the final report I would think you're in pretty reasonable ground to move forward. I guess one of the stumbling blocks could be GAC advice for example, if the board has to take that into consideration. But I'd also point out that this isn't the first time that new GTLDs have been introduced. So some of the recommendations may be the same as what we had in the previous round. So it may not be too far removed from what we've done before.

And I think that's an important factor, too. So I think there's a lot of ways you can potentially slice and dice this, and I, you know, I think it's great that (Cheryl) and Jeff are having an open conversation with folks here to try and understand what that is.

But I'd really encourage people to think about this from the perspective of you know, making this an efficient and effective process, and not making this go on for, or having our thinking clouded by the way that we've done things before. Is it possible to do things in parallel with other processes without, excuse my language, without bastardizing the process in any way? Is it going to, you know, get in the way of meeting the objectives that we have before us?

So I'm sorry that I missed a lot of this conversation, I had another meeting to go to. But I think it's really encouraging that this conversation is happening now rather than waiting until, you know, six months down the track when we're getting close to a final report. I think this is a good juncture to have this conversation, so thanks to (Cheryl) and Jeff for the initiative.

Jeff Neuman: No, I'm laughing because, I can't remember the other name now, I used to read it to my daughter all the time. Gerald in, Piggy and Gerald, is that the, you know what I'm talking about? I'll find it. Okay. No, I'll find it, you know, it's been ten years since I've read that, but okay. No, no, no, no, all right. So let's get back to the real work here. So in anticipation of the next round of new

GTLDs, what steps can ICANN org take even in the absence of having final details?

So Trang Nguyen, you were talking about the team has already been doing some thinking about some of these issues. Are you able to just, obviously very high level, talk about the things the organization is doing to prepare? Again, very high level stuff.

Trang Nguyen   Sure, this is Trang Nguyen from ICANN org. Yes, as I had mentioned before, we are doing, we're taking another look at the initial report and its recommendation in a little bit more detail to think through what the key implementation activities may be. And what additional information if any we would need.

You know, to proceed with implementation. Obviously for some of the areas there's just not enough information yet for us to really do anything, for example the new appeals mechanism. But others, I think there's certainly quite a bit of information that's provided where we can do something with.

So identifying those key activities you know what we think the implementation timeline may look like, that sort of thing. And we've also started to think about the application submission system, conceptually what that might look like and sort of starting the design of that.

So, you know, there's a couple of activities that we're undertaking now and as PDP discussions progress, and additional information becomes more clear, I think that we can advance more, a bit more in our thinking as well.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. That's what we were looking for, so thank you. That's a high level, obviously we're not going to ask, what are you pointing to here? Christopher's pointing, what are you pointing out? Sorry. You have a question, ah, okay. Sorry. It's late. Christopher, please.

Christopher Wilkinson: Christopher Wilkinson for the record, very quickly. There have been several requests for more detailed statistical information about the results of the 2012 round, and I think that as soon as we could get that from several points of view, it would be extremely useful because we've asked over and over again with the form, ICANN form of results which TLDs are successful, which have been put on hold. And how they expect the market for the existing portfolios of TLDs to evolve.

I'd save the details, but this information is not only important for those of us who are trying to help to design a viable system for the next round, it's extremely important for the applicants so they can see what the market for particularly the generic TLDs looks like and how they should design and time their applications. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Christopher. Guess just as a question back, how, let's see how I should word this, how do we expect ICANN to define what success of the program would be, how do we ask ICANN to define the elements that you're thinking about? I think, and just the reason why I'm saying this is because I think if we went to ten different people in this room, and only in this room, we'd probably get nine to ten different answers of what they would think would be success based on their own perceptions.

So ultimately my question to you is what data, specific objective data that hasn't been collected do you, would you recommend be collected in order to help with that?

Christopher Wilkinson: Well, as a longstanding professional economist I don't want to take the time of the whole of this meeting to do that, and I could do it in writing. But bear in mind that the (unintelligible) team for the CCTRT went into this in great detail, and you don't need to impose any value judgments, let other people decide what is great success or adequate success.

Just produce some numbers, which ones are financially viable, which ones, how many registrations has each new GTLD have got to date. What was the forecast in the application, there's several ways of measuring this without imposing value judgments, providing enough data that new applicants can know what they're letting themselves in for.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Christopher, I think, yeah, I know we got a few minutes left.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr   Just a big of adminis trivia. There was a, (Cheryl) for the record, there was a planned transition break between this session ending and next breaking out, et cetera, starting. I would suggest providing we do it efficiently, it would be good to close off these questions even if we bite in a little bit to this, you know, getting the three work groups started part at the end. I think it would be wise to try and bring this to a close. I just wondered if people like (Robert) were wondering what's going on, I thought we might let them know. That's my unilateral position, do you agree with me, Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, so I thought this was 3:30 to 5. I thought it was 5:15 to, oh, then my fault. I threw us off, sorry. Yes, so let's, I think, did anyone else, was anyone else in the queue? Okay. Then why don't we then break for ten minutes, so at five after five, and then we will finish up with any last items on this.

I do want to thank Trang Nguyen and others from ICANN org and the council that may have come for this session, that was really helpful and I think this is just the start of discussion, but one that points out that we need to be starting these discussions now if we expect a program to launch and new GTLDs to start sometime in 2021. Thanks.

END