ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Work Track 5 (Geographic Names at the top-level)
Wednesday, 30 May 2018 at 14:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-track5-30may18-en.mp3

Adobe Connect recording: https://participate.icann.org/p3c5yjjt0hb/

Attendance is on wiki agenda page: https://community.icann.org/x/5BcFBQ

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 now started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team Track 5, Geographic Names and Top-Level Call taking place on the 30th of May 2018.

In the interest of time there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect Room. If you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourselves be known now?

Hearing no one, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for recording and transcription purpose and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this I'll turn it back over to our co-leader, Martin Sutton. Please begin.

Martin Sutton: Terri, thank you very much and welcome everybody to the Work Track 5 call, and thank you also for joining so promptly. That's much appreciated.

So first of all if we look at the agenda and move to the first slide. I think I've got - oh, everybody's got their own control, as we're back to using Adobe Connect and we'll have the ability to have orderly queues and we certainly welcome that in terms of trying to manage our calls more effectively.

So the agenda for today, we'll be focusing again on the process map but starting to explore how we think that improvements could be made to that. We'll also be referring to the working document that's been prepared, and I'll talk a bit further about that before we issue it to the work track members. And then towards the end we'll just cover what preparation work is underway for ICANN 62 before turning over to any other business that needs to be raised. Does anybody have any questions or additional comments about the agenda?

Hearing none, we'll carry on then. So for our normal check, I know things rapidly change each week so just in case, is there any statement of interest updates that any of you would like to share? A quiet week then. Okay so we'll move on to the next slide, which is regarding the process (unintelligible).

I'm moving it too far. So in terms of what we did at the last meeting, we reviewed the process map that had been prepared, which highlights all of the different stages involves that impacts applications that may be a geographic term. One of the key objectives of that process last week was to make sure that we captured the reality of treatment in the 2012 guidebook and it's reflected in the process map itself.

So with regards to that we did not hear any particular objections to the content within the process map but I just thought I'd give it another opportunity today so that if you've had a chance to review that or were unable to join the call last week that you could have the opportunity to raise any

concerns with what's described in that process map and that it is a good reflection of the 2012 guidebook treatment.

So does anybody have any questions, concerns before we go further with using that as a basis for further discussions as the next part of our meeting today? I can't see anybody queuing. No comments in the box. So I hope you take that as right then that the process map was a good reflection and we can use that as basis for further discussions. Okay. Thank you for that.

Now I'm not sure - am I supposed to be moving the slides here or…?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Martin, it's Cheryl here. Everyone has their own ability to move the slides. If you just say that you've moved to, you know, Slide 5 now for example, that will help us run the slides ourselves.

Martin Sutton: Okay. So the process maps that we had gone through are on Slide 5 and 6. We'll come back to this shortly because we've already gone through the actual stages in fairly good detail. So I would like to move on to at this stage is thinking about suggestions for future process improvements.

And what we've got here on Slide 7 is just breaking it down into five different segments that we would like to focus on and identify areas that you feel could be improved in the process map and flow for any applications that are for geographic terms or coincide with geographic terms.

So the five different sections that we've broken it down into is stage one, submitting of the application. Stage two is the geographic names review, and in then stage three, the objection mechanisms. Four is the string contention set, and then five is contractual requirements. So that takes us into sort of post-delegation phase.

Now before I open the mic up for any comments, what I would like us to do is to actually work backwards. So if we go back to Slide 5 and use that as our

starting point for referencing here, if you look at stage five, the contractual requirements is the post-delegation phase, we've had a lot of comment in from various members of the work track that have mentioned that wherever possible we should try and leave the application process as open as possible.

And in doing so, concerns were raised on the contractual side post-delegation side, that there is always some vulnerabilities and concerns that need to be addressed. And what I would like to do today is to explore whether those post-delegation controls, either by the contractual requirements or any other controls that we've built that are also available, are these adequate to protect the needs of various parties and the concerns that have been raised and see whether we need to improve that area first.

In particular there have been many comments about what happens if an applicant applies for a certain string, that it coincides with a geographic term or place, implies in their model of operation that it will not be used in the context of a place, a geographic term, but then subsequently after post-delegation after a period of time, decides to change that model. And so that was an example of where post-delegation is there any concerns that we need to try and capture and prevent from occurring or manage in an effective way.

So first of all if I could open up the conversation to see where people may have some suggestions about gaps or improvements in the post-delegation phase of this process map. I should stop talking and allow any of you to interject. Okay, so (Annabeth) and Christopher. So (Annabeth), please go ahead.

(Annabeth):   Thank you. I just wanted to check if my microphone works.

Martin Sutton: You are very faint. Just about but…

(Annabeth):   Okay. I will ask for a dial out and then I'm here if you need me. So give the word to Christopher.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, (Annabeth). Christopher, over to you.

Christopher Wilkinson: Hi. Good afternoon, everybody. Christopher Wilkinson. Am I muted? Can you hear me?

Martin Sutton: We can. Yes, thanks, Christopher.

Christopher Wilkinson: I think this question is by now quite hypothetical. There's very strong opinion that the non-geo use clause in the 2015 round should not be maintained. I have seen hardly any support whatsoever for maintaining that clause, which runs a serious risk of creating a loophole which will result in disputes in the future. I really recommend that the co-chairs stop wasting our time on this topic. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Does anybody want to respond to Christopher first before I do? I've got Greg in the queue. Greg, did you want to respond directly to that, would you?

Greg Shatan: Yes. I would respond with a barnyard epithet but I believe that is not part of the standards of acceptable behavior. I think this is very much a live issue as much as people who disagree with it would like to kill it off. Self-declarations of consensus and refusals to discuss it any further only show to me desperation rather than victory.

I think the contextual issue is very much alive. If want to engage is a nose-counting exercise we should do so. We haven't - so self-serving declarations of how much support there is served to do nothing substantive and waste our time, if we want to talk about wasting time. So I think that, you know, we need to face that issue directly and discuss substantively, but in the context of the current question, where there is a post-delegation change in the use of a TLD.

And it could be one where the chance is one that came due to - in spite of an agreement or letter of consent or non-objection or in spite of a limitation in their contract or application or (picks) or otherwise. Regardless, it would seem that some sort of a PDVRP is necessary and is appropriate. So I would encourage us to explore that. And when and if we actually do discuss the contextual reference issue, I'll speak more on that, but this question wasn't really about that but since it was turned into that, I felt I needed to respond on that point. So sorry for doubling down on wasting time.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Greg. I just (unintelligible) and then we'll move on to the next in the queue. In terms of your reference to a (pick) type approach, if there's sufficient do you feel in the contractual requirements that including a (pick) would be appropriately enforceable I suppose is probably another area that we would then need to consider.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Martin. Greg Shatan again. I have - that's a question I have not explored deeply and would hesitate to kind of hazard a guess on it. It's my belief that (picks) should be enforceable because they are part of the contract and if we want to have (picks) that are not enforceable they should be phrased as in words of encouragement rather than words of obligation or performance.

So I think it's actually something that we need to deal with, not necessarily in Work Track 5 but in this working group is to determine what is and isn't enforceable when it comes to commitments or statements by applicants. I would also refer briefly to statements made in the application as well raising that same issue. But I think the (picks) being in the agreement have a far stronger natural argument that they are enforceable. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Greg. I'll move on to Jeff and then we've got (Jorge). Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. Just a quick comment on overall just the comments that people made. And this is - Christopher, while I appreciate your comment, what we

have in this group is we have several people who are very comfortable at being vocal on certain topics, several people who have definitive points of view that want to make their points of view heard, but let's make sure that we do not confuse that with making absolute statements that everybody believes the same way that the vocal people do.

So let's be very careful on that, especially on a notion of throwing out the use designation. I do think that the use designation may have worked for cities for example where people applied for names that had nothing to do with those cities and therefore did not require any kind of communication with the government to get a letter of non-objection. I do think that if we went to those applicants that did get those names that they would be highly supportive of the notion that use makes a difference.

So let's not make absolute statements on this call or even in our email. Let the co-leads do their job in trying to gather the opinions and let the co-leads make a decision as to what arguments have merit and which don't, and let's stop telling the co-leads what they should or shouldn't do in terms of what they should and should not pay attention to. Sorry, that's just an overall comment. I will drop out now and let everyone else talk. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Jeff. And I think I'll reference this again later on when we talk about the working document that's being prepared and will be issued and circulated to the team members later. But for now if I could turn to (Jorge), please.

(Jorge): Hello. Can you hear me okay?

Martin Sutton: Yes. A little bit faint but I can hear you, yes. Thank you.

(Jorge): Hello. Good afternoon from Switzerland. I just wanted to react to the question which goes in the end to the question of conditions attached to the use of the top level domain and conditions that were being for on intended use. I would not like to get into a discussion on which belongs to the co-leads regarding

the assessment of what ideas have traction or not in the working group, but I think it's very important that we don't only focus on those people who are being vocal, and I'm one of those people, but that we consider the opinions expressed on intended views in the context of civility of these by many people across all the SOs and ACs.

And I think that out of the email discussion we see, at least to a large degree, that the notion of intended use is considered problematic by participants coming from all SOs and ACs, and I won't give you the exact numbers but I've been seeing around 20 people expressing their views on this. So I think this goes beyond some vocal people, it really reflects a large degree of concern with that notion of intended use.

And just to go back to the reasons of why that notion of intended use is problematic and the merits attached to that to those reasons, on one side we have the question that intended use and with some cross-contractual fixes to control the intended use means that we go into or seems to mean that we go into a framework of post-delegation or objections during the delegation process.

So the applicant would have already made significant investments and the relevant public authority related to that geo name or city name would have to be monitoring the application process and particularly were made aware or they realized that the application had a string with their geo name in it they would have to enter into a objection procedure which would have to be defined.

So we - this creates a situation where conflict, in my view, is more probable because the applicant has made significant investment and the public authority has not been consulted beforehand and has to let's say intervene ex post in relation to the application. And let's also consider the merit of the reason that these strings are unique.

So once they are delegated away, the relevant public authorities and the local communities would, in principle, not have any access to that resource and they would have not been asked or consulted in the prior proceedings to present in the applications, which is what the letter of an objection framework provides.

And for instance in Switzerland the intended use really is not very relevant when we are talking about settlements, to take that example. If for instance the TLD for the city with the name of the city of birth would be delegated to take a non-capital city (unintelligible) and the intended use is not really relevant because the city has the right on that name irrespective of the use. Sorry? Yes?

Martin Sutton: Sorry to interrupt. What I'm conscious of is time here and what I've heard is probably what we've captured previously in a lot of the email conversations and previous conversations in our call.

(Jorge):   Okay, if I could (unintelligible) I think it's important to take these principle concerns very seriously and then you have also the concern on the practical part. And business that the (unintelligible) excuse me - one second only. I don't hear you very well. The - it is very important to not to forget that the contract is between the ICANN and registries with some links to a registrant. But the third parties, which won't make use of the TLD at the secondary domain as registrants has no such contractual views. So any enforcement measure based on intended use has a big hole on that part. So I'll leave it by that and I hope that (unintelligible). Thank you.

Martin Sutton: So what I would request is that as we do have shorter times of an hour is that we do try to limit our comments. We have gathered an awful lot of information from the email exchanges. We've also heard probably repeatedly some of the same comments raised regularly. Now hopefully once we've circulated the working document that will reassure you that we've captured an awful lot of this information but taken out the repetitiveness of that.

And before I just go on to the rest of the queue, I just want to emphasize again what we're trying to do here. We have this process map. We're trying to backwards from this so that we spent an awful lot of time previously talking about the sort of stages where we have unavailable geo terms. We've then gone on to areas like cities and had long conversations around that.

This is trying to just make sure that we look at the overall process and don't disregard certain elements where there is strength in having those controls, and this one particularly is a contractual requirement. So this is post-delegation. This is related to geographic terms, whether they are used in a geographic reference or used differently because they have other means and uses and to make sure that we have confidence in the controls can be used effectively for any of the concerns that have been raised previously. And I mentioned one of them, which is this change of model.

So I'd like us to focus on that for the next ten minutes to see how we can draw out any other comments. We've certainly had the (pick) raised by Greg, and then we'll work backwards through the process map to see if we can collect any other areas of improvement that we haven't heard before. I would also ask that we prioritize anybody that hasn't spoken before. So if you don't mind, Greg, I'll ask (Taylor) to come forward and speak prior to you and then refer to you next. So, (Taylor), could I ask you to come to the mic?

(Taylor Bentley): Yes. Can you hear me?

Martin Sutton: Yes I can. Thanks.

(Taylor Bentley): Excellent. Well first of all let me just - so this is (Taylor Bentley) from Government of Canada for the record, and let me just thank you for this process map because it all seemed to come together in my mind and in my notes once I saw it visually. And just as a comment, I think what we see here and maybe part of the difficultly is indeed how it's mapped out.

What we see is five different vectors in which protections can be put in place. And I think everyone has a different idea of how the range of protection on each vector should be implemented going forward in order to see the result there that they're looking for.

And so I think that this is a really useful way going forward as far as looking at each one of these points, one to five, each one of these vectors, and really laying out the full range of protections available and mechanisms available, both existing and hypothetical, to really get a better sense of what combination we need to see and what balance can be struck between application phase versus the post-delegation phase because I think with few exceptions there's - I don't think anyone's imagining that the solution is all in the submitting application phase.

And so I think before folks laying out their entire vision of what they see for one to five, we need to fully lay - map out the full range of protections on each one of these vectors to get a better sense and fully evaluate them and not in a vacuum. So I hope that's helpful at this stage and, again, thanks for laying this out, and looking forward to contributing further. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, (Taylor). Great feedback. Appreciate that. I think the benefit of starting with this process map is that if we do consider what improvements could be applied to it we can then use it to replay against various types of situations and see where we feel that that would actually be addressed in an appropriate manner for the type of application that comes through. So I appreciate that comment. Greg, I'll turn to you.

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan for the record. I'm not going to respond to every item in (Jorge)'s filibuster since most of it was off topic and redundant but just briefly I found the arguments to be unconvincing. And when we do get around to the time when we're supposed to discuss those thing then I will. Now I won't. But I will say that kind of condemnation of curative and objection type approaches I

think is ill placed. Generally speaking in the history of ICANN policy and implementation as long as I've been doing it we've tended to be very conservative about preventive measures, gating mechanisms and blocking mechanisms accept for technical reasons. And even then we were very careful with the, for instance name collision issue.

The tendency is rather as you say to have an open process and then to allow those who feel that they have rights that are being abridged to come in and complain about them and to provide the necessary and appropriate mechanisms for those both objections and VRP proceedings, compliance and other such things. So I don't think we should be discouraged from using the arrows in our quiver nor should we change methodologies to create rights and to create blocking lists based on presumptions about rights that as far as I'm concerned have not been proven. And if we are going to change our philosophical underpinning then I do want us to move beyond this group to consider all sorts of other blocking rights and preventive rights in the new light to given this policy shift. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you Greg. And on that focus on sort of the curative side of things that has been taken into account as well so we've heard back to on numerous occasions from different parties. So it is, you know, we have we do have extreme views here that we're trying to manage and work through so I appreciate the input for that.

If I can just refer back to this post delegation area so we've got it listed down here some contractual requirements. But a lot of the concerns that have been raised before when referring to geographic TLDs is the issue of user confusion and the potential for harm so perhaps fraud, et cetera. So what I was hoping that we would also be able to capture is are we comfortable that the contractual requirements as they are, are appropriate to being able to manage and either prevent or at least address those issues if they arise at a stage so interested to hear anybody's thoughts on that. I've got (Taylor) you have your hand up. Is that an old hand or is that a new hand?

(Taylor Bentley):   Yes actually it's a new hand for the question you just raised.

Martin Sutton: Oh, excellent perfect. Please go ahead (Taylor).

(Taylor Bentley):   Thanks. So I would just refer to some very recent cutting-edge work I guess being done on ICANN with regards to the release of two letter country codes or two character labels to the second level. And from the last GAC meeting ICANN staff and I actually presented quite a few new mechanisms that were being explored as kind of a post, I mean obviously we're post delegation at this stage, but for enabling and (unintelligible) monitoring and enforcement ultimately of any kind of confusion.

And indeed this is how trademark law works in Canada and other countries where it's a matter of enforcing confusion as it is available. So there are many mechanisms beyond ICANN that can be considered, so not just a UDRP but through domestic trademark which is in place ultimately post delegation to prevent confusion, So that's an element to be considered and the ICANN ones could also be considered. I don't know if that's necessarily part of the 2012 process but considering this is ongoing from the 2012 process I think it is part of ICANN's ongoing implementation of post delegation mechanisms. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Thank you (Taylor). And wherever we can leverage from experience and in similar areas that would be great so to understand that there could be improvements perhaps in a monitoring and enforcement scenario that could help strengthen the post delegation controls that could exist in this respect. So, I do like the way that you've introduced the idea that, you know, there has been quite a bit of work on two character codes at the second level and perhaps there are ways of learning from that to and apply that into the gTLD build. Thank you. Does anybody have any other comments or input regarding the sort of section by contractual post delegation area?

We can of course continue to converse over email exchange. So I'm happy to move backwards to string contention as I see no others in the queue. So in terms of stream contention I think this is useful to bring out to the point particularly on two characters country codes. And this area of digit letter two strings, two character strings. So that there are mechanisms that we already have in place to try and ensure that there is a reduced areas of confusion with the ability to pick them out at this stage. I just wanted to really open it up again though just to see if that is an area in terms of when we're talking about geographic terms whether it's two characters, three characters country names and beyond, is that - is there anything there that we should consider that could be improved under that particular control mechanism? I'll open it up to the floor. Okay hearing none I'm not sure if (Annabeth) is on the call.

Christopher Wilkinson: This is Christopher with his hand up.

Martin Sutton: Sorry? Who's got their hand up, sorry?

Christopher Wilkinson: Christopher Wilkinson?

Martin Sutton: Okay, Christopher please go ahead. You're not showing up in the Adobe Connect, sorry.

Christopher Wilkinson: No the …

Martin Sutton: Okay.

Christopher Wilkinson: …Adobe Connect meanwhile has crashed here. We first we lost sound and then the screen disappeared and currently it's not responding to an application for reconnection. Two points, first of all I discount considerably all this discussion about post delegation monitoring and control. Let's be frank, who on earth is going to do the post delegation monitoring and control on behalf of more than 100 governments, more, several hundred local

authorities and a situation when other work tracks are talking about 1000 new applications per year. Who is going to do that? It's totally unrealistic.

The - everything must be upfront in the application. Secondly, I don't know where this point fits in the agenda but, I'd just like to draw attention to the fact that other Work Tracks are discussing reserve names and consider that the existing ceiling of 100 reserve names per application should be maintained. I think to be realistic any large GEO name application will have, will have to have far more than 100 reserve names. So I think WT5 should keep an eye on that question and not leave it entirely to the other work tracks. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Christopher thanks. I believe if you could send anything straight to the list which explains the reasoning or the need for a differentiation or reserve names I think that will be useful to share because I don't think that's apparent to all of us here. The other point there in terms of monitoring and enforcement it already happens today. We've got ccTLDs where things happen. We've got law enforcement that I have to monitor, take action when they're alerted to issues and threats, similarly with trademark owners, they respond. If users feel that they've been defrauded in any way or scammed, they will obviously alert that through as well.

So there is already an abundance of monitoring and enforcement activities that takes place within the ccTLD environment as well as beyond in the gTLD environment. So I think I just wanted to make that clear because it, you imply that, you know, nothing really happens (unintelligible). And that would be…

Christopher Wilkinson: I'm not implying that nothing really happens but I am assessing for future reference that the scale that is currently being contemplated is on an entirely different level from what we've had to deal with in the past. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Okay and I've got Greg in Ireland so Greg please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Greg Shatan for the record. Martin you said in part what is going to say regarding the fact that monitoring is an everyday circumstance for many people from different points of view, hardly something that you seem to be unusual. And I don't think the scale of 1000 TLDs a year or whatever it might be, we had 1800, you know, that all came to light simultaneously. Most monitoring is done, in, you know, an automated process of some sort. I don't think there's any issues of scale. And I think the issue here more is sort of inattentiveness. I hesitate to say laziness, lack of resources, lack of interest, lack of knowledge. We do have to up our educational game for the rest of the world to avoid the idea that this is some sort of closed game only for those who show up. But the cure for that is not to make everything preventative. It is to make sure that there is – there are fair processes reasonably available, reasonably well advertised for those who are engaging and looking for issues where their rights are abridged. And this is a perfect opportunity for appropriate preventive measures. I disagree entirely that this is an area which any of this would be inappropriate.

We do need to think about specifics in some fashion but, you know, there are the implementation issues or even, you know, ways to make the monitoring concept a little bit easier. I'm not asking that this be done on a blank slate and people should be entirely told how to do it. But I do think that the ever resourceful private sector and the technical employees in the public sector shouldn't be underestimated in their resourcefulness. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you Greg. Perhaps if I could just add a comment to that referencing back to ICANN 61, there was a session about new gTLDs and their different measures of success and it's apparent from certain levels that they have a record of no abuse within their particular models. So if they are highly restricted tlds.brands there was zero abuse reported for those that have active. And there's a couple 100 already active in .brands although 500 I think who are delegated, some of the numbers that we've seen are highly restricted domains. If as a consequence that they have a string that matches a geographical term there may be little requirement to do enforcement

monitoring and enforcement where there is little abuses seen or no abuse seen. So I'll turn it Alan you had your hand up. Did you want to go ahead?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you and someone seems to have put my hand down. I'll try not to be repetitive and I'll be brief. We have all sorts of things within ICANN, within gTLDs where we monitor by essentially by complaint and on occasion that more send to active proactive monitoring on ICANN's behalf if something becomes really egregious. But in general respond and/or we should be responding when there are complaints. And I think that is quite reasonable in this case as well.

The other issue that Christopher raised was the concept of reserved names. And I'm taking the assumption that if we were to have reserve names that are geographic that they would come out of this group and not some other group on reserve names. And if that's not the case I think that needs to be made clear. But I'm presuming that anything geographic reverts to this group regardless of whether it's reserved lift or some other methodology by identifying it. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you Alan. I think just to be clear and to make sure that nobody misinterprets any of this any reserve list at the second level certainly not we're not addressing that…

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I'm – we're talking about the first level here.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. I just wanted to make that clear too to everyone. Thanks for that. Does anybody else have any comments? I know we've moved back away from the string contention element but can I just…

Christopher Wilkinson: Just a minute, Christopher here again. They discussion in WT1, WT2 is about reserve names in the second level.

Martin Sutton: Right. So this group is not assessing anything at the second level, okay? Do we understand that from the terms of reference? Okay so if I can just go back then just check does anybody have any comments or ideas of areas of improvement regarding the string contention section of this process in relation to applicants with their geo-related plans? Otherwise we'll move, we'll move step back onto item three which is the objection mechanisms. I'm just conscious of time so we'll just open this up for a couple of minutes and then I'd like to cover off the other items on the agenda. So in terms of objection mechanisms we have had quite a lot of discussions on the matters of non-objective for instance but this is really focused on the GAC early warning, GAC advice and the objections that can come from anywhere in the community. So it's - does anybody have any immediate comments on that? Otherwise we'll probably stop it there and allow that to continue on the list.

Okay so we'll leave it there and move on to Slide 9 which refers to the working document. So what has been one that we'll see over the last number of weeks is that as we took the shorter meeting calls there was a lot more growth in terms of email exchanges. However coincidental that is it was very useful in terms of trying to pull together a lot of the different perspectives from the Work Track members. And we been working with staff who work diligently to build out a working document or what some describe as an essential data capture tool. I'll refer to it as a working document or collaborative document for the time being.

Now this will take the form of, the format of the initial report. See others have been working with other Work Tracks and within the working group you'd have seen the structure of each of the different components of the PDP Working Group initial reports. So we'll follow that same format. And populated so far a lot of the information describing some of the background treatments, previously all of the discussions that we've done where we can draw out some references of opinions, again trying to strip out any replication but drilling down to the key points.

Having said that it's still a sort of bulky document so it's heading towards 30 pages long already. And what we would like to do is to circulate that after this call and allow members to review that and start to feedback their comments, in particular focus on whether it does capture elements of the conversations that you feel have been presented either through email lists and through our regular meeting calls. So that would be the first area that we'd ask you to consider and to see if there is any gaps that need to be added to. And what we will do is give you the ability to go in and not amend the actual document but apply comments so you can highlight the particular text or section that you're referring to and add in a comment so that we can as the co-leads we can review all those comments and then consider any changes to the actual content in the document.

So I'm pleased to say that that's in a stage where we're happy to share that with you and seek your input and I do appreciate all the work that's gone into this from ICANN staff to collate all the information that we had previously gathered in different structured tools. But now this is starting to look very much like the report that we will work with and create an initial report in the coming months. So does anybody have any questions or comments regarding the working document? It' probably just more information at this stage but if anybody has any questions I'll happily take those at this stage. Okay so that's clear then. Thank you.

We'll move on to Item 4 which is ICANN 62 preparation on Slide 11. The co-leads are currently looking at how to plan for the content of the sessions that we have for Work Track 5 at ICANN 62 dedicated to the GO names. We have two sessions right one at the beginning of the meeting on the Monday in the afternoon and then again at the more towards the close of the meeting on a Thursday. If you remember this is a shorter four day format meeting dedicated to policy. So we will be able to focus on probably on the first session bringing the community up to date on what we've done, where we're at and ideas of where that will be leading to so that we can give them strong

indication that when the initial report output is likely to come from Work Track 5.

But however so we will try to minimize the amount of time that we need to do that though we may consider ways to brief the different SOs and ACs prior to ICANN 62 so that we can allow as much time as possible for interactive sessions starting from part of the session on Monday and through to the session on Thursday. So if you are intending to be in Panama it will be great to and surely you mark your diaries for the particular sessions that we've got standing for Work Track 5 and also for those that will be participating remotely too, you know, to gather the information and join us for those sessions. There will of course be the overall PDP Working Group sessions as well. I believe they're also on Monday morning and - is there someone I think there as well if I remember rightly but information will be circulated. Does anybody have any questions or comments on ICANN 62 preparation or any suggestions even that you might want to put forward? So thanks (Jeff) for the comments. So no leaving early on a Thursday we need you. Okay so okay (Annabeth) I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

(Annabeth):   Hi it's (Annabeth) here. I just wanted to mention that I know of that all the different SOs and ACs also have special sessions about this. So when those things ccNSO, and then GNSO, and ALAC they will be talking about this for their members but most of these meetings are open for everyone. So if you don't have the possibility to go to everyone look after the program in the different communities so you can join the discussion one way or another.

Martin Sutton: Thank you (Annabeth). Excellent point just that really we want to take the opportunity at ICANN 62 to make sure the rest of the community is up to speed and ready at some stage shortly in the future to accept an initial report to review and feedback with their comments. So I'll close that off for now and we'll move to any other business? I have one item just briefly to mention which is regarding the timing of our meetings. We have four the past month now been running the sessions weekly with periods of 60 minutes. Now we

won't be looking at reviewing this and deciding whether that is something suitable to carry on but we will continue this until ICANN 62 when we will make a decision and welcome any feedback in the meantime regarding the frequency and length of our meeting to make sure that these are working effectively for all of us to progress the work.

So if you do have any comments you'd like to share on that topic please put that to the list with an appropriate title in the heading so that we can track any comments that you might have. Your feedback is very much welcome as we start to look at that in the coming weeks. Okay I'll stop there for now and if anybody has any other business please come forward as we have one minute left allotted time.

You all want to go I can see. All right so I'd like to thank everybody for your participation today. Please continue on the list. If you have any comments that you were unable to put forward on the call today they're very much welcome and look out for the working document that will be circulated later on. Thanks very much everyone.

Woman: Thanks Martin. Thanks everyone. Bye for now.

Woman: Hello.

Woman: Thank you.

Terri Agnew: Thank you everyone. Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Operator (Princess), if you could please stop all recordings to everyone else please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END