Was just notified that at the last meeting the ALAC assigned the ANgWG a task: Create a statement on "the state of gTLD expansion"

While I do not remember* a conversation asking us to take this task on, it seems like a reasonable request. I will present it to the WG and see if we have any takers for the task.

> * to be fair I was so lost in the end of the ATRT2 process at the end of Dec 2013, I would have probably agreed to anything just to make people leave me alone and never have relaized I did so.

Help, we are floundering. Help I say! Help!

We have not been able to find a suitable way to get the new gTLD program questionnaire (now completed and translated) out as a questionnaire.

Don't know why, just know that we can't seem to make it happen.

We will be working on a letter to you all requesting that you help us unclog this process. I regret coming to you all for plumbing services, but unclogging this process is necessary.

Please send help.

On the third part of the Outreach evaluation project.

The plan was to take the questionnaire responses and let that drive us to the remediation that is required. If we keep waiting for the questionnaire to start on this process, we will miss the opportunity.

One thing is clear, though, the NewgTLD program needs remediation. I think there is consensus in the group on that.

And anecdotaly, as well as based on statistics kept by others, we know some of the areas that should be looked at.

The co-chairs have discussed starting that report, subject to later refinement based on the questionnaire responses, without waiting for the first questionnaire responses (and if things continue the way they are) without even waiting for the questionnaire to get distributed.

Unless I find another willing victim, I plan on putting the first stake in ground on the wiki in the next few weeks, and to call a meeting to discuss it.

We have also requested a slot in Singapore based on the idea that we will have at least this document to discuss.

Otherwise, we are doing nothing.

We are member driven and members have not driven. People, WG members or others, who want us to work on something need to submit a draft statement and the group picks it up from there. The only time we get anything done is when someone does that. Often it was one of the usual suspects who did this, but we have all gone on to other projects and have put this one on the back burner. No one has done it in a while.

One can ask, do we still serve a purpose? I am not sure. If we don't start doing something, probably not.

• No one has proposed, e.g., a comment where we put some effort in the disaster that is community in the new gTLD round.
• Or proposed a comment on the PIC work to make sure that it really works as a third party grievance mechanism (which for one thing means it won't cost an arm and a leg. Right, dream on!)
• Or the name collision problems which have ISPs all in a dither because it is going to force their customers (that us right?) to call them with complaints of lost access.
• or, well you all get the idea

All sorts of things we could be working on, but we aren't working on any of them.

That is about it, except that I did manage to write in this diary two months in a row. I am so proud of myself.
17 December 2013

Seems we have not reported in a while.

That is because we haven't really done anything in a while.

We have the Questionnaire questions, we have them translated, but we still do not have a deliver mechanism. Its amazing that we can't seem to find a way to have the questionnaire implementation issues resolved. I wonder if there are any administrative issues lurking, that I just can't see.

It is time to get the work on the recommended remedies for the poor outreach to developing economies work underway. But we need to start having results from the questionnaire to analyse as part of that effort.

In other words, we are stuck.

Please help.

27 August 2013

- Achieved group consensus on adding Evan Leibovitch as co-chair. This was communicated to ALAC.
- Finished preparation of poll on the Outreach evaluation.
  - Currently in process of being translated.
  - Poll will be ongoing with month snapshots
  - Outreach will need to be wide - still working on a rolling plan
  - Polling will start as soon as all the translations are ready.
- Issue brought to group on a statement related to the Community Priority Evaluations guidelines put out by sole provider Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU).

1 July

- The groups went into a slow down mode for several months.
  - One of the reasons was the unavailability of the chair to push, prod, nag and do a bunches of work. Chair has barely been able to keep up with monthly meetings.
  - About a month ago, chair put out a request for help to the members of the WG and informed ALAC chair of the performance problem with the chair.
  - Evan Leibovitch, a previous chair of the group, volunteered to help.
  - Evan and Avri, the current chair, spoke and agreed to ask the ALAC to make Evan a co-chair.
- The Theory document, which is part of the overall project to document what went wrong with the gTLD program outreach, the applicant support program and At-Large objection process utilization (only in the charter by extension) has WG consensus for transmission to ALAC.
  - Since that consensus was only reached on 1 July, it will be submitted to the ALAC in time for their next meetings.
- The group is still discussing what should be done with this document, but suggestions include:
  - Submit to At-Large review
  - Submit to full community review
  - Send to Board - though this may want to wait until the full project is complete
- Next step in the Outreach evaluation and recommendation project is to complete the survey and start it. After that:
  - Results will be evaluated
  - Will be combined with results of any review that might occur
  - And recommendations will be discussed
  - And a WG consensus final report will be released to the ALAC.
- The WG held a webinar with SARP representatives. They were helpful in informing us of the conditions they worked under and of some of the reasoning that they used in making decisions that seems inexplicable to some in the WG and elsewhere.
  - The group seems to agree that there should be next steps.
  - The group hasn't figured out what the next steps are yet. This will be discussed in future meetings.
- The WG continues to work on ongoing issues with the new gTLD roll out.

26 March 2013

a. At-Large Review Group

- completed its initial tasks and made recommendations for objections to ALAC
b. After the approval of several of the Objections by ALAC, WG met to recommend a Post Objection Filing process. This has been documented and sent on to ALAC as a consensus recommendation.

c. The Outreach Evaluation and Recommendation project stalled

- A special meeting of the WG was held to get the project back on track. Decisions included:
  - Set aside the Theory paper to work on the survey.
  - Yoavi will take the lead on the survey work and there will be a meeting on this project at Beijing.
  - Participants in the Project are asked to come to that meeting with a well thought out proposal for at least one question that they recommend the survey consider.
  - There was a recommendation that the work of this chartered activity be broadened to include investigation of the reason for the lack of outreach and take up of the ALAC Objection process. This would require a charter update form the ALAC.

d. Various tasks continue in the Roll-out issues project. Work continues on

- Public Interest Commitments (PIC)
- Metrics (in coordination with other efforts)
- Tracking Rights Protection Measures (RPMs) changes, e.g. TMCH
- Tracking String Contention Sets

e. Applicant Support. The results are out but still not understood. There will be discussion on this in Beijing.

22 January 2013

a. Group met on 7 Jan 2013,

- next meeting scheduled on 4 Feb 2013
  - may need to reschedule

b. Outreach Evaluation and Recommendation:

- draft report on Stage 1 - theory formation due at next meeting
- work being done on Stage 2: survey

c. Applicant Support

- Requested update on SARP
- Told we would get one once they were done.

d. Roll Out Issues - No significant chances

20 December

A. I have pretty much been missing in action for the last month.

  Cancelled meeting for this December as I was not prepared and had not sent out notification in time

B. Did not have chance to get updates from team members who working on the Outreach Evaluation and Recommendation subteams.

  Some of who are ALAC members and can add to this report if they like.

C. Was asked if the ANgWG wanted to recommend a statement to ALAC on TMCH Strawmen

  Did not seem like there was any bottom-up drive in the ANgWG to do one.

  Declined the offer on behalf of ANgWG to recommend a statement on TMCH Strawmen

Next Meeting early in Jan.

27 November

Outreach Evaluation and Recommendations

We had a meeting on 26 Nov to discuss this work item.

- We walked through the draft proposal found in and attached to this email. In general the plan and the target dates for the activities got approval from those on the meeting. If anyone on the group has comments on this plan, please let this WG know as this is the basic process that we will be following, barring any serious concerns.
- There was general agreement of working in teams. At this point there are two teams that need volunteers.

A. Theory formation

- work to be completed by the end of the year
This task, which was already started with the blue sky sessions and augmented with discussions in the Baku IGF, included collecting all of the possible reasons that can be posited for the failure in both outreach for applications and applicant support. Once we have these, the group will be responsible to documenting this for later review in our initial report.

B. Survey

- Work to be completed before Beijing
- Dev sent out an initial sample to get this work started.

This task includes two parts:

- Creating a short questionnaire
- Doing post questionnaire outreach

- Staff will be helping us complete this task

Additionally Evan raised the question of perhaps obtaining funding for professional help in this task. At this point we do not quite know what might be needed. Further discussions need to be held before we ask for any funding.

Volunteers: We are currently recruiting members of the group, and others, to work on the various teams.

Rolling Issues

Currently working on two topics:

- "Private" generic-word applications
- Additional RPMs

All other issues either closed or completed or on hold.

---

28 Aug 2012

- Switched to meeting monthly until summer.
- Had extensive discussions on issues with New Gtld Roll out. Each topic has a token holder who is working with other WG volunteers to produce discussion documents. Topics include:
  - Trademark Clearing House Issues
  - URS issues
  - Private generic-words applications
- Submitted Charter Item 2 Extension request to ALAC Chair.
- ANgRG is functioning smoothly, reports at all ANgWG meetings.

---

24 July 2012

- ANgRG group up and running
- 1 EURALO member stepped down to satisfy CoI possibility
- Applicant Support Work item completed
  - Group participated in discussions of how to appoint CMR
  - Cintra appointed as CMR - this will limit her work on the Objection process as it could be seen as a Conflict of Role.
- Request in draft to ALAC on extending charter to:
  - Investigate the failure of the ASP
  - Recommendations for remediation
  - Draft Letter to ALAC on At-Large New gTLD WG charter item 2
- Roll out issue work getting started.
  - At-Large New gTLD Rollout Issues Workspace

---

June 2012 - missed submitting written report

---

22 May 2012

The group has 3 chartered work items and spends each meeting reviewing the status of each and trying to make progress in each.

1. The Applicant Support Program

Currently the CMR proposal is being reviewed. The JAS WG reviewed the process and appointed 7 people as CMR volunteers:

Alain Berranger, Alan Greenberg, Andrew Mack, Avri Doria, Cintra Sooknanan, Rafik Dammak, Tijani Ben Jamaa
The issue has been discussed in the ANgWG and there was general support for the actions taken by the JAS WG.

2. The Objection Process

The approved process was initiated and the RALO have been picking their representatives for the New gTLD Review Group. All but NARALO have submitted and they are close to completing their ballot. Next step is for ALAC to vett the candidates picked by the RALOs and to pick the ALAC chosen members. A meeting was defined for the Prague meeting to kick off the work of the New gTLD Review Group.

Additionally the tool for the New gTLD Review Group has been created and has been presented in a webinar. Training on the tool will be provided to the members of the New gTLD Review Group.

3. Issues with new gTLD roll out.

This process is just starting. there is a historical record of all of the concerns that people had before the rollout that should be folded into a historical, context setting document before the review of this round is set to begin. The WGs roll out review process involves first creating a list of issues that At Large members bring up, reviewing the topic as a group on whether it is worth following up in detail, finding a volunteer to research and document the issue in more detail and then folding it into a report at the right time.