

**ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP-Sub Group A
Thursday, 29 November 2018 at 15:00 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-gtlds-sub-pro-a-29nov18-en.mp3> [audio.icann.org]

Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p8ghodzfppo/>

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

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

Michelle DeSmyter: Welcome, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Subgroup A meeting on the 29th of November, 2018. On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Crystal Ondo, Jamie Baxter, Jeff Neuman, Jessica Hooper, Jim Prendergast, Kathy Kleiman, and Robin Gross. From staff, we have Emily Barabas and Steve Chan and myself, Michelle DeSmyter. As a reminder, please state your name before speaking for recording purposes. And I'll turn (inaudible) back over to Robin Gross. Please begin.

Robin Gross: Thank you very much. Let me briefly go over our agenda for today. We'll update SOIs, and then we've got a -- the heart of the matter to discuss today, the public comments on section 2.2.1 (ph), which deals with continuing subsequent procedures, and section 2.2.2 that deals with predictability, and then any other business. I also wanted to ask folks if you thought we should -- we had -- go only 60 minutes today, which was our original plan, but then we moved it to 90 minutes because we had to cancel the last meeting due to low attendance. So, we thought we would do today's meeting for 90 minutes, but then we got some objections from members on the list about doing that. So, we thought, okay, we'll cut it back to 60 today to accommodate those concerns.

So, if anyone doesn't mind, we will go back to the 60-minute plan for today. Anybody object to that? Okay, I see -- Kathy says "I object," but then says "great" in the chat, so I'm not quite sure what that is requesting there.

Kristine Dorrain: Robin, this is Kristine. Can I get in the queue?

Robin Gross: Yes, please, go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Hi, thanks, Kristine Dorrain for the transcript. And Michelle, could you please add my name to the attendance log as well? I'm audio-only for the next about 15 or 20 more minutes.

I don't object, except I just wanted to point out that when we had the very, very late nights and (inaudible) call that was canceled for subgroup A, one of the things we had talked about at that time is the fact that we would basically make that up by trying to have one more 90-minute call to make it up. So, I do understand the concerns of the people

that the meeting invite was sent around for 60 minutes, so that's when people were sort of (ph) signing on. But we had discussed verbally that we were going to have a 90-minute call. So, I don't object today, but I would like to propose that, at some point in the next week or two, we do have one or more 90-minute calls just to try to make up time. Thank you. I'm not going to (inaudible). I just thought I would throw that out there. Thanks.

Robin Gross:

Thanks. Yes, I appreciate that, and I think that's kind of a good explanation of what happened and how we got here. So, I think that that's fair to say that today people weren't quite prepared for 60 minutes, but -- or excuse me, for 90 minutes, but in the future, we will endeavor to make sure that there is plenty of notice so people understand that, if the call's going to be 90 minutes in advance, they'll know that. So, that's our mistake for not getting it out on the list soon enough what we had discussed before about doing today's meeting for 90 minutes. So, we'll go 60 minutes today, and then make sure folks are prepared for 90 minutes for the next several meetings. So, does that sound okay to folks?

Okay. I don't hear any objection, so let's go forward. So, the next issue would be the update of statement of interests. Does anyone have any statement of interest that they would like to take this opportunity now to update us on? Okay. I don't hear or see anyone on that, so let's go forward to the next issue on the agenda, which is digging right into the spreadsheet. Hopefully folks have seen the spreadsheet and had a chance to review the submissions, the public comments that are listed on there and some of the issues that we've pulled out of those comments that are relevant to this particular subgroup. And Emily has just kindly posted a link to the doc, and it's also in the -- on the screen there for people to follow along.

Okay, so let's just go forward, then. Section 2.2.1, continuing subsequent procedures. Okay. Okay, so the first comment to look at was from the Internet DotTrademark Organization Limited, and it was pretty brief. And really, the only aspect of that that related to our subgroup's discussion today is their support for future procedures, and they want there to be future opportunities to apply for new gTLDs. And to be fair, future applications should be organized under a similar framework as the 2012 round. So, I didn't think this was a comment that was divergent or anything. It's more support for what we had done the last time, and so I thought that was helpful. But I don't think there's anything we necessarily need to do, an action we need to take about this particular comment. But I want to open it up. Does anyone have anything they want to -- any comments on this particular comment, or the suggestions therein?

Okay. I don't see or hear any. Let's go on to the next one, which was from the ALAC. And this one also is support for future procedures. The ALAC supports the preliminary recommendation in principle. However, please also refer to our responses to section 2.2.3, applications assessed in rounds. So, if you cross-reference that with 2.2.3 and the recommendation there, it's that ALAC said they do not want the future procedures to be first-come, first-serve. So, you put the two together in here and their support for future procedures, but they can't be first-come, first-serve. Applications should be assessed in rounds. So, that's really the heart of this particular comment, from what I could tell. Does anybody have any comments on this comment, or how it should be treated? Okay. I see in the chat box here Kathy has suggested should that comment be moved to be included in the question about rounds. Okay, that's a good thought. We might want to do that. I see Jeff has got his hand up. Jeff, why don't you go ahead, please?

Jeff Neuman:

Yes, thanks, Robin. This is Jeff Neuman for the record, also I guess one of the co-leads of this group. I thought maybe before drilling down, I know we started to drill down in some of these comments. But, I thought, maybe just as a general matter, to tie all these comments together, I think it's fair to say that, in general for this question, I don't think other than the one comment from Christopher Wilkinson, I think -- let me just scroll down, sorry. I want to make sure I don't want to miss one here -- I think that in general,

most of the comments that came in support the introduction of additional new gTLDs. With the -- sorry, with the exception of Christopher Wilkinson's comment, and then the GAC comment, which is -- I wouldn't say the GAC comment is complete divergence, although it's classified as such, I think the GAC comment is that they just want to make sure that, before another one starts, there's a cost benefit analysis. So, I don't think -- and that there's adequate consideration of the CCT review team report. I just wanted -- I thought it would be helpful to kind of make sure that we're all kind of reading these comments the same way, and if we were to tie them all together, other than Christopher Wilkinson, I think that none of the other comments oppose the introduction of additional new gTLDs. Is that a fair statement?

Robin Gross: Thanks, Jeff. Yes, that's really my understanding, as well, from reading these. However, there are some little nuggets of information in some of the different comments about you should seed (ph) this up, you should blow this down, this should be done this way, the SAS (ph) done that way. So -- and I thought that, for those comments that are generally in agreement but had a little nugget, we would want to just maybe highlight that little nugget. And if there's something that we have (ph) to talk about or take back to take forward from that. So, that was just sort of what I was thinking in terms of why we might want to look at some of these comments that are general agreement, because they might have a little suggestion in addition to general agreement.

Okay, I see we've got a couple hands up; Jeff, and then Jim. Jeff, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. And yes, totally understand. I think we obviously should then go down the levels, but -- and we will. But I just want to start out with the premise that we didn't get any comments that outright opposed additional -- adding additional new gTLDs in general. But yes, there's definitely, and I'm sure Jim will bring this up too, there were definitely comments as to -- you said timing, and -- but there was no one that said I don't think we should ever add new gTLDs ever again. So, I wanted to start with the highest level, then drill down into the subtleties, because I think each of those, even the high level needs to go back to the full working group. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Yes, I think you're right about that. Thank you very much. Jim, please go ahead.

Jim Prendergast: Yes, thanks, Robin, Jim Prendergast for the record. So, yes, no, I think you're right, Jeff. The only thing with the SSAC one that sticks out at me is I don't know what their position is, because they say a lot of things have to happen before -- their position is that you need to take into account a lot of other things that need to be finished before requesting input. So, again, I get this is a situation where having a little more clarity from the SSAC on what their position is would be helpful through a little (inaudible) -- that's a tough word to say -- little L liaison if they've designated one yet or not. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thank you. And I see in the chat box Kathy has suggested that we could make a list of what commentators want to see as a condition precedent to new gTLDs. And yes, that sounds like a good idea, and I tried to (inaudible) some of that information out on the very last column in a spreadsheet, if there was something like that, a condition that they wanted to see. So, that's been pulled out there, but again, that's just sort of my interpretation of it, and if there are other interpretations of the comments, then please bring them forward or additional interpretation facts that should be discussed, that would be really helpful.

Okay. Was there any more thoughts on that? Or shall we go on? Okay, let's go on to the next comment here, which, let's see, from the brand registry group. Again, it's another comment that support for future procedures. However, they want to see speeding up the process and consider targeting -- or targeted smaller rounds to move forward. So, I wanted to see thought about this suggestion. This is one suggestion that speed up the

process, and we've got a couple more like this. But we also have a couple suggestions in here that are more like slow down and do it more orderly. So, this is one that we're going to have a little bit of divergent views on, so I think it would be helpful to have some discussion within the group about this. So again, this one is -- we need to speed up the process. We need to consider targeted smaller rounds to move forward. What do folks think about this interpretation, this comment? Yes, Jeff? Please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Sure. So, I think -- again, I think what should go to the full group, right, is the high level of -- and I put this in the chat -- high level that no --well, actually, I should say other than one comment, no one has really objected to the concept of adding additional new gTLDs. Some commenters believe that there are -- I guess to use Kathy's language, condition precedents before we start another round. Others believe that we should speed things up and potentially have a brand round, or some other kind of faster round. So -- but that's the type of thing that needs to go to the full group to kind of just summarize for them, basically saying we think there's a consensus for additional new gTLDs in general. Some commenters, including the SSAC and ALAC and whoever else is in there believes that there are conditions precedent before we launch a new round, and here's the conditions. And other commenters, like the VRG and others, believe we should speed up, and here's their condition. Has the working group -- that's where we get into a substantive discussion with the working group at that level, but I don't -- I'm not sure we should take too much time here to discuss the substance other than do we understand what the commenters mean. Do the comments make sense? Do we need additional clarification? So, as Jim said, the SSAC one, which I'm not sure why I don't see that in this section, and maybe that's -- and maybe I'm just missing it, and maybe we need to add something in here for this section. But that's the type of thing that we should go back and clarify that information, but I'm not sure we need to have a substantive discussion on how we as individuals feel this should come out. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thank you. Yes, I think that's right. So, again, this is the comment that's generally supportive. And if anyone has any different, I guess, a different interpretation or something else that we need to bring to the forefront about this particular comment as it relates to a particular subgroup and the issues that we're talking about today, that'd be really helpful.

Okay, I see Anne has her hand up. Anne, please go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks, Robin. It's Anne for the transcript. I just actually think that it'd be good to keep a side list of the conditions that are listed, because it strikes me that some of them could be the same as the things that were mentioned in Barcelona in relation to going ahead and constituting an IRT quickly when GNSO recommends to the Board. And I think it would be good to have those handy, because I think they are gating issues, and we just don't want them coming up later at the wrong time. It'd be good if this group could agree on what those are and are not. And to the extent the public comment clarifies those, it'd be great if staff could keep some bullet points. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Thank you. Yes, that's a really good suggestion, so I think we'll try to come up with another column that more clearly sets forth the conditions precedent on some of these comments.

Okay. Shall we go on to the next? Anyone have any more thoughts on this one? Okay. And the next one is from the business constituency. Again, it's another support for future procedures, though other reviews must be completed first. So again, this would be a condition precedent that they want to see before we can go forward, a gating mechanism. Did anyone else have a different take on that, or some other aspect we should be bringing forward from this comment? Jeff, yes, please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. And I don't know if this is stated elsewhere in the BC comments, but can we ask the BC what specific reviews they are thinking about other than -- well, no, we should -- this is a general question -- specific reviews are they thinking about, and then hopefully they can give us a list of those because I think there may be -- and I'm just kind of -- well, actually, let me turn this into a more objective statement. I want to make sure that the community agrees with the BC that the reviews that they're thinking about either haven't been done yet -- or I should say have been done yet, haven't been done yet, or may have been done but not to the satisfaction of the BCC, if that makes sense. So, I think that's kind a question that should go back to them, unless they've already listed that somewhere else in their comments.

Robin Gross: Yes, I -- yes, thank you. That's a good idea. We should follow up with them to get some clarification on what reviews are they referring to that need to be completed. Or perhaps if there's a member of the BBC who's on this call and knows, that might be a good time to let us know. Anybody have any thoughts on this? Okay. I don't see anymore, so let's go on to the next one, a comment from Neustar, which, again, is support for the future procedures. There doesn't seem to be anything other than that, other than general support to take -- that I started to sort of take out of that comment for today's discussion, but what do others think? There's some aspect -- additional aspect of this comment we need to bring forward?

Okay. I don't see or hear anyone, so I think this comment is pretty self-explanatory, and we can go on to the next one, which was from FairWinds Partners. Again, it's support for future procedures, but they wanted a predictable, scalable method. So again, this is one that is perhaps somewhat at odds, or at least may provide some tension, which speeded up (inaudible) I don't want to say is -- slow it down, but when you're saying you want scalable and predictable and that sort of thing, that's going to sort of weigh in the other direction. So, when we go back to the big group, I suspect this will be sort of one issue that we'll have to deal with, is the timing of the process, because we do have a divergence of comments from the group on that particular issue. Anybody else have any thoughts on that?

And I also think the next comment as well is pretty much the same thing, is the same point. It's from the registry stakeholder group. And again, it's calling a need for a predictable and scalable method. So, the FairWinds Partners and the registry stakeholder group on this issue are somewhat on the same page. Any other thoughts on this, or comments to bring out from the registry stakeholder group comment on this point? Okay. I don't see any, so let's go on to the next one. Please feel free to interrupt me if I miss your hand or otherwise don't see your comment.

Now, the next comment is from MarkMonitor, and again, it supports an opening around, as soon as practical, and urges ICANN to begin budgetary planning, so just structured as round followed by swift review, then perpetually open. So, this comment, when -- what really seems to be wanting to move forward as soon as possible and get the budget planning starting now. So, this is kind of what I don't want to say is directly at odds with the two previous, which said scalable, predictable, and this one is more, as soon as possible, let's get going.

So, did anybody else see anything differently, or -- Jeff says we skipped Valideus. Did we? We did. I apologize. Okay. But again, Valideus is one of these that is sort of on the same topic of timing. The comment that Valideus brings forward is they want to see ongoing, orderly, predictable manner, which is very similar to what we saw from the registry stakeholder group and from FairWinds Partners, but a little bit different from what we're seeing from MarkMonitor, which wants us to go quickly. Were there any other points on any of these? Because these all sort of deal with the same issue of timing,

the registry stakeholder group, the Valideus comment, the MarkMonitor comment. Any thoughts on this, the issue of timing, or other points to bring out from these comments?

Okay. I do not see or hear anyone, so let's go on to the next one, which would be from the NCSG. And this is a comment that was moved from the general tab for our initial meeting. It was a comment that had been put in the general tab, and then when we went through it during our first meeting, we decided it belonged in section 2.2.1. So, this is the comment that, again, it's support for future rounds. Does anyone else have any other thoughts they wanted to add in on this particular comment, what we need to bring back to the group on this one? Any thoughts?

Okay. I don't see or hear anyone. Let's go on to the next comment. This is the comment from Christopher Wilkinson, who does not see any urgency or need for additional new gTLDs. So again, this is one that is divergent from the others, which do say to go forward with TLDs, new gTLDs. Did anyone have any thoughts, any other points we needed to discuss on this comment?

Okay. Not seeing any, I think we can move on to the next one, which is from the GAC. And this one is -- does not see any further -- does not support further rounds until there is a review of the cost and the benefits for new TLDs and specifically taking into account the recommendations of the CC-RT report. So, I think this had initially been categorized as divergent, or someone says, or more precisely, a condition by which the GTL space would be expanded. My reading of it is little more of a qualified divergence, that what -- very similar to what we talked about before, it provided that these conditions precedent are met, that may go a long way to deal with the objection with respect to new rounds, going forward. So, it is a divergence, but again, I think it is a qualified divergence, where several things are listed, the cost-benefit review, for example. That is what they want to see happen before we go forward. So, it's not really a -- there shall not be no more new gTLDs. It's more like these other things need to happen first. That's sort of my reading of it, but I see we've got a few hands here now. So, let's see what others think. We've got Anne, and then Jeff, and then Jim. Please, Anne, go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, thank you, Robin. It's Anne for the transcript. I tend to, on this GAC comment, agree with you that what's being discussed here is really more of those bullet point gating issues that I was asking earlier that an action item for staff or somebody is to track these things as bullet points that have been mentioned in public comment. But I tend to agree with you. It is not a statement of -- we don't support a next round. I don't think it goes that far.

I did want to -- I'm sorry, I wanted to backtrack just a little bit with respect to how we are dealing with Christopher Wilkinson's comment, and that was to suggest that -- there was a call earlier this week regarding recommendations about taking data. And unless I'm misreading this, a lot of Christopher Wilkinson's comment relates to taking data that we discussed on a call earlier this week is a bit outside the scope or charter of the working group, but I just wonder whether an action item in relation to Christopher's comment might be to roll that into that recommendation about further data being taken rather than just kind of saying yes, we see your comment. We're not doing anything with it. Bye for now. Could we somehow roll that comment into what we're doing in the -- what may end up being a recommendation for some other group to take data. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Thanks. Yes, that's a helpful suggestion. So, we'll go back and look at the specifics, kind of data requested there, and see if we can fold that into the discussion, the collection of data points. Okay, I see (inaudible) connected in the queue. Jeff, please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, a couple points. First, I agree with the assertion that this is not a -- this is not really divergence in the sense of it doesn't oppose new gTLDs, but it's more its own kind

of -- it wants to be assured of certain things before around starts. And also, that jives with the -- we had a comment period called CC2, Community Consultation Two, or maybe it was One, now that I'm saying it, where -- it might have been one actually -- where the GAC was very clear to say that it does not oppose new gTLDs at all. So, combining those facts, I don't believe the GAC is saying that they don't want new gTLDs, but they do want to be satisfied about these things.

Number two is the reason why I have not set conditions in this case and tried to talk around that by saying they want to be assured of certain things, or they want to see these things happen, is because I see there's a fundamental difference between comments that say certain studies need to happen before we do a round, or ICANN needs to make a determination on root scaling before it starts. Like, those are kind of objective, tick the -- check the box we need to do, and we can measure it. I see a difference here because the GAC is basically saying they want to be comfortable with everything, and they want to make sure that -- it's almost like an opinion, feeling as opposed to an objective, tick-the-box, this needs to happen as a condition precedent.

So, I disagree with the notion of putting something like this as a condition precedent, but more just -- I mean, we obviously need to note it, that the GAC wants to be satisfied that these elements are met. But, because it's opinionated, it's an opinion as opposed to a definitive task. I don't think we can or should label it something like a condition precedent. Hopefully that distinction makes sense.

And a similar thing with Christopher Wilkinson's comment. So, Christopher's comment is an opinion, right, and opinions are great, and everyone can have them. But, there's -- in his comment, this is his belief, but it's not based on something that we can objectively turn to, or studies that have been done, or, frankly, even -- it differs from what the CCT review team has found. So, it's kind of hard to put this comment into any other context other than this is Christopher Wilkinson's opinion. And that gets me to kind of the data comment and Anne's comment, which is the CCT review team has reviewed these issues. The CCT review team has reviewed whether they believe the TLDs have added to competition. They've reviewed what data they've had, and they've made a determination. The reason I think it's sort of out of our scope is because we really shouldn't be duplicating their efforts. And so, to the extent that the CCT review team called for a future study on things like parking, I'll note that they didn't put that as a condition precedent. They just put it as a higher priority thing that should be done but not block the next round. So, I wouldn't label that as a condition precedent.

And finally, on the GAC comment, the question I have for the GAC that I would like to pose for them is I believe that ICANN did do an economic study on the costs and benefits. I don't know if the GAC liked the results of that study or agreed with the results of that study, didn't agree with it, or even just maybe forgot. I don't know. So, the question back to the GAC is to basically make a reference to what ICANN has done, and then see whether that was not -- that was sufficient, was not sufficient, what else needs to be done, so sort of a clarification, because they do make a statement here that says there should be a review of the cost and the benefits. I believe ICANN probably would say that they've done it, and so I think we need to kind of clarify what it is the GAC means by that cost-benefit analysis other than what's been done by the CCT review team and the separate independently-commissioned study ICANN did. Thanks.

Robin Gross:

Thanks, Jeff. Yes, and I think your point about the GAC comment being not quite a condition precedent is an important distinction, because they're not really saying, once you do the cost-benefit analysis, we go -- we're in favor of it. That's not quite what they're saying here. They just want the analysis done so they can consider -- further consider whether or not they're in favor of it. So, it's not quite the same thing as the condition precedent. I do take that point. Okay, Jim, please go ahead.

Jim Prendergast: Yes, thanks, Robin, Jim Prendergast for the record. Yes, Jeff, just to pick up on your point, I do remember back in 2009, 2010 maybe in there, that there was a cost benefit analysis done, but I don't remember if there was one done after the launch of a round, and that's maybe where the GAC is headed with their comment. But we should probably get some clarification around that.

The other question I have, and this may be a plenary level, but I'll throw it out here now because we are talking about the GAC. At one point, there was talk about when it comes time for determining consensus, comments from larger groups, either constituencies or advisory committees, tend -- Jeff, you were saying that they would -- I don't want to use the term "carry more weight," but they would factor more heavily into the co-chair's consensus call determination. Is that something we need to be concerned with at that level -- at this level and the subgroup level, or is that something that will be bumped up to the plenary level when discussing all these comments? So, for example, hey, the GAC has said this, and I think we're all politically attuned enough to know, but when the GAC says something, we kind of have to pay somewhat more attention to it because the comment in a comment period could easily lead to formal GAC advice, and that kicks off a whole 'nother scenario. So, I'm wondering, do we need to wait (ph) it here, or did we wait till we get to the plenary level to do that calculation? Thanks.

Robin Gross: Yes, thanks, Jim. I see Jeff has typed in the chat that this would go to the full group to weight in. I think that's right. I think we're not necessarily in this group going to be deciding which do we agree or not agree with different comments, but just really bringing them -- pulling out the important pieces of information and bringing it back to the larger group for decisions. Okay, Anne, please go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, thank you, Robin. It's Anne for the transcript. I guess my comment about how to treat the GAC comment is similar to Jim's in that -- Jeff, you were saying, well, this GAC comment, it's just an opinion. These are just opinions. Well, that's really all public comment is, period. It's opinions. In a case of the GAC, the case of the ALAC, in the case of the SSAC, they are actually things that end up as formal advice to the Board.

In terms of the possibility for delay in a next round, there's probably no greater possibility for delay than the bottleneck that normally occurs when the GAC provides formal advice that they feel had -- to the Board that has not -- policy advice that's not been taken into account in the PDP process. So, we somehow have to stop this bottleneck. We somehow have to treat these GAC comments with enough respect that we avoid the bottleneck. So, that I think is the process improvement that's desperately required within ICANN that should be discussed in the full working group. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Thanks, Anne. Jeff, you're next. Please go ahead. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. And thanks, Anne. I didn't mean to sound like I'm dismissing it. It's just that I'm trying to think of what the full working group can do to address it. With some of the comments, it's -- and even the economic study, which is why I want to send the clarification. If the GAC can come back and say, look, there was no economic study done, or there was but it wasn't satisfactory because of these five things, that's great. But I don't know what the working group can do if someone just makes the comment that -- an opinion comment that doesn't have criteria by which you can measure it. So, if someone just says, hey, I don't think new gTLDs have any value, okay. I mean, that's -- it's an opinion, and it's valuable, but there's nothing that the full working group can do unless that person that also -- or the group that makes the opinion provide some sort of criteria by which you can turn it around or address the concerns. I think that's what I'm trying to say, but maybe not in a great way.

So, again, if the GAC says here that, on the one hand, they shouldn't do another round until the cost benefits economic study is done, that's one thing, and that can be addressed. But, if -- like Christopher Wilkinson comes back and says I don't think it's added any value, I don't think it's -- whatever else, the other things that he says, there's nothing for this group to do to address that unless there was specific asks in there. That's what I'm trying to say, Anne. It's not to de-value it. It's just that what can the working group do to address the concerns. Hope that makes sense.

Robin Gross: Thank you, Jeff. Kristine, you are next.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. This is Kristine Dorrain for the transcript. I feel like -- and maybe I missed this stuff because I dropped the call for a couple minutes while I was coming in, but I feel like Jeff's provided the answer to this pretty early on in his over-arching summary, which is to say that we recommend that the full working group, when it deliberates, have the following over-arching comment here that says, overwhelmingly, all commenters, with the exception of one, agreed that a subsequent procedure of new gTLDs was appropriate. We have -- may have disagreed a bit on the details. I love Robin's term, "nuggage" (ph). I mean, there may be little pieces where we are not 100% aligned on the how or the when or the where. And as far as the GAC is concerned, even the conditions precedent, whatever it is, we don't all agree on.

However, one commenter expressed the concern that the new gTLD (inaudible) was unnecessary and shouldn't be considered, end of story. And yet, that point when the Board makes its recommendation or adopts or doesn't adopt, it will know that there was one divergent opinion. We have addressed it, but there's nothing, I think as Jeff said, to do. And I feel like that was said early on, so I don't think we have to do anything more as much as just note that there was one commenter that diverged, and everyone else's were mostly suggestions for what they wanted to do slightly differently, because that -- I just feel like we've decided this already. Anne, does that help at all?

Robin Gross: Thanks, Kristine. I think that's really helpful. Did anyone else want to weigh in on this point, or the GAC comment generally? Yes, Anne, please.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I'm sorry, but -- this is Anne for the transcript -- I have to disagree with the notion that we can refer to GAC comment as one commenter. I think it's, unfortunately, a bit of sticking our heads into the sand to look at GAC comments as -- I mean, we've got the GAC liaison from the GNSO. We've talked for years about how there needs to be more cooperation. We've begged and pleaded for the GAC to give early input into the PDP process. We know that they have power under the bylaws, and that it requires a Board vote of 60% to override their advice. Why do we continue to wish to pretend that GAC advice is the same as any one commenter? It's simply not the case. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Thanks, Anne. Thanks. I actually think that Kristine was referring to the Christopher Wilkinson comment when she was discussing the one divergent one. So, I think the GAC wanted little bit more nuanced, in that it was really calling for this cost-benefits analysis one. So, (inaudible) a little bit of a misunderstanding about which comment was being referred to there.

Okay. Does anybody else want to weigh in on the GAC comment or any of these others one that we've been talking about? Anne, your hand is up. Is that a new hand?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh, sorry for the misunderstanding. I thought we were still talking about the GAC comment. But I do think that, when we summarize this in the full working group, we have to note that the GAC -- it's not really a full endorsement of a next round. We're going to have -- we have to talk about that. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Yes. Thank you. I think that's totally fair. Okay. So, were there any other thoughts on the GAC comments calling out for cost-benefit reviews? Okay. I see Steve Chan types in the chat regarding the GAC comment, "Perhaps it's better to call it concerns rather than divergence." Anyone have any thoughts on that? I think it's a little bit stronger than concerns, because I think it's -- I mean, it really is kind of specific in what it's calling for. It's just -- but I also think divergence is too strong, but that's just my view. Okay.

All right. Any other thoughts on the GAC comment? Okay, let's go on to the next one. Let's see, this is a comment--.

Jeff Neuman: --Robin?

Robin Gross: Yes? Yes?

Jeff Neuman: Robin, this is Jeff. Sorry. The study I was thinking about, just for the record, was the 2015. I think that was phase one, and I think there was another one. I posted the link on there that sort of looked at issues that I think may be considered by ICANN as their post-launch economic study. So, that's what I want to refer as a question to GAC. There may have been a phase two, I think. I've got to look back at it to see if -- how that doesn't satisfy the GAC's -- or whether it does satisfy the GAC's comments. That study was done, and if not, then what other things need to be done to the GAC -- or what other things need to be done according to the GAC. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Yes. Okay. Thank you for that. Anybody else have any comments on the GAC comments? Okay. Not seeing anyone further, I think we can move on to the next one, which -- from John Poole, and this is opposition to the recommendation. He disagrees with the threshold recommendation that there be no changes to the existing policy. The existing policy is the product of an incompetent, conflicted, and/or corrupt Board of Directors, organization, and community, and has been an unmitigated disaster for the global Internet community. And then, it goes on to quote Jon Postel and Esther Dyson. So, I think it's fair to characterize this one as divergent. Anybody have any thoughts on this one? Jeff, is that a new hand? No. Okay. All righty then. I think everyone agrees it's fair to characterize this one as divergent, and we can move on.

Okay. And so, now we move on to slightly different topics, 2.2.1.e.1. The issue is the 2007 final report noted that success metrics will be developed around the new gTLD program. What are some specific metrics that the program should be measured against? And then, we've got a comment from ALAC on this. And again, this is generally agreement, in agreement with the benefit of metrics and identification of potential metrics. So, ALAC lists a number of suggestions that would be -- that could be potential success metrics for us to develop, and yes, this looks like a really good list. I know we're not really supposed to be discussing the substance, but I would say here we've got a good list that we can take back to the full group and get some additional feedback on. Anybody have any thoughts on this one? Okay. Oh, yes, Jeff, please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, so now we're kind of at the second part of the question, right, about the success metrics. And I think those -- I think this sort of gets into the discussion that we were having the other day with the full group, so I think these comments should all be included in the full group discussion. I'm not even sure we need to necessarily go through the three comments here today just because I think they're more relevant to the discussion the full group was having.

Robin Gross: Okay. And I see in the chat box that Cheryl agrees with that suggestion. So, again, we've got some good suggestions here for metrics, and the thought is here that we bring these back to the full group. Any opposition to that? We've (inaudible) go through these once here today. Okay. I'm not seeing any new hands or hearing any voices. We've got

-- looks like about three minutes left in the call. Oh, Kathy has asked me to read her comment. She says, "Since it is a broad request, the working group can create, and the public can add." Is that the comment you wanted me to read? "To a future of metrics," yes. Okay. Okay, so that was the comment.

All right, then I think we've gone through then the 2.2.1 on continuing subsequent procedures. And then, now we can move on to 2.2.2 on predictability. Okay. Now, however, we've got two minutes before the top of the hour, and so I'm wondering how far we could realistically get into that in two minutes, so we might just want to start with that next time. Anybody disagree with that? Yes, okay, so Cheryl says this is a good time to break, as well. Okay. All right. So then, I think we've done a good bit of--.

Jeff Neuman: --Robin?

Robin Gross: Yes, please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff. Just real quick with the last minute, just thank you, everyone, for showing up. I think it's great that we had a good people -- or a good people -- good amount of people showing up. Just a plea, if we can get more people to attend these calls. I know that there is a lot of registries on here, and I love my registries. I think they're great. But it would be great to see if we could also encourage others -- thanks, Anne and Kathy -- so there are some from other areas, but it would be great to see if we can encourage additional attendance by non-registries, non-contracted parties, just because I think it's not much what we're trying. We're doing outreach, but there are people, and I've heard it during many full group calls that claim that this process has, quote, been taken over by contracted parties. And to the extent that we can try to do some outreach and get additional people that are not contracted parties participating, I think that's going to be better for the group overall. Thank you. That was it. Thanks, Robin.

Robin Gross: Thank you, Jeff, and you've pretty much wrapped us up there. I just want to point out that our next call will be two weeks from now on Wednesday, the 6th of December, at 2000 UTC, and that one will go for 90 minutes. And we will be sending out invites on that shortly, so look for that and -- on your calendars and see if you can bring somebody else along to join the meeting. And thank you all for your participation today. Bye-bye.