ICANN Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WG
Wednesday 01 June 2016 at 2200 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WG call on the Wednesday 01 June 2016 at 22:00 UTC. 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.

Woman: Good morning, good afternoon good evening welcome to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on 1 June 2016 22:00 UTC. In the interest of time today there will be no rollcall as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. So if you're only on the audio bridge could you please let yourselves be known now?

Jeff Neuman: Okay. It sounds like no one just on the audio bridge.

Woman: Thank you. And I'd like to remain all please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and keep phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. I would like to turn the call over to Jeff Neuman.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you. This is Jeff Neuman. Apparently not everyone appreciates my humor on the chat but anyway welcome to the call. It is June 1. So welcome to a new month. And I look forward to seeing a lot of you in just a few weeks in person. In the meantime, you know, you see the agenda on the right-hand side of the screen if you're on Adobe to which we will be - the meat of or the substance of the meeting will be to discuss the community. I forgot what cc

stands for now why am I blanking here? But basically the outreach document that we're going to be sending out for constituency common or community comment there you go.

So we'll spend most of our time on that. We do have one item so far of any other business which is to just or confirm the initial work plan that we have. And if anyone has got any items for additional or any other business I'll take that now. Is there any other business that anyone could think of at this point in time? Okay hearing none we'll also do another call for any other business when that agenda item comes up so if you think of something between now and then we can add it to the agenda.

The - so first I want to just see if anyone has any updates to their statements of interest that they would like to discuss or to reveal at this point in time? Seeing no hands raised and hearing no voices I will assume that all statements of interest are up to date. The next we have as you see up on the screen right now review of the action items. So they are pretty much the same as last week. Steve Chan, are there any updates to the action items that - from last week?

Steve Chan: Thanks Jeff. This is Steve Chan from staff. As you said there hasn't been much to change. You know, we're in the midst of working on cc1. The biggest change that will likely come as a result of this call is that the work plan will be considered adopted at least for the time being until further detail is discovered I guess by this working group and put into the work plan itself. So as you said I don't think anything much has changed. We're still working on getting a liaison for the RPM Working Group. As I said the cc1 is the bulk of what we're working on right now. And I think let's see I think it was Item 24 it was regarding collecting data on applicants for the 2012 round.

So some sources have been produced and provided for consideration but I think perhaps we'll get into the details of whether or not those are helpful or sufficient once we get back into the more detailed discussions about the

topics. And I believe that one was in regards to the potential limitations on application either from a single applicant or as well as applications in total for the round or other mechanism. So I think that's it and I'll hand it back over to you Jeff. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks Steve. And this is Jeff Neuman again. You're correct the - that question on or those stats are related to the question on application limits to for to help us analyze if there were any issues. Obviously this all these subjects are going to go out in a constituency comment. And once we receive the input back we'll come back and revisit all of these questions again. So hopefully by that point we will have all of the data we need to analyze along with the - any comments received to those questions.

With that I'm going to go on to the next subject which is this - the main part of the meeting which is a discussion on the community comments number one. Avri has done the bulk of the work at this point so kudos to Avri for getting a great start and Steve Chan also as well. So I will turn it over to Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri speaking, hopefully I can be heard. And while there may have been a time when it was true that I did a bulk of the work I think during the last week me, Jeff and several other people on the drafting team (unintelligible) the documents did a whole lot of work. And all I really did was accept changes in and crank out the PDFs that I sent you all.

So basically many edits were made some of them sensitive some of them just in our grammar and (unintelligible) and such. And where we're at now and where I see the status is wanted to take a walk through this just to make sure the people were fine with the documents in terms of the way it's written now. We need to get it released by next week if we want to make all the time schedules for having documents released before Helsinki. We would want to start…

Jeff Neuman: Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: …Avri this is Jeff. Is there way you can either come closer to your mic or - it just sounds pretty - it sounds a little faint and muffled?

Avri Doria: Faint and muffled okay. Well I can certainly raise the volume of it. Give me a second.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you.

Avri Doria: Yes one second levels all right the level up is that any better?

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Avri Doria: Hopefully that's better. And I apologize for if I don't have lots of energy. We had a meeting until 4 o'clock this morning and did not quite catch up on sleep. But in any case so where we're at at the moment is we need to finish this if we're going to get it out. What I'd like to do today is a walkthrough the document make sure that there are no problem areas still. There are some comments that people put in the margins. I want to make sure that those have been dealt with if not I want to deal with them. Hopefully we can finish the discussion during this meeting if not we'll have to take them to the list but again saying we have very little time.

                 After this meeting my suggestion and we had a discussion in the leadership group that Steve Chan will take over on the pen basically clean it up and polishing it and bringing it together so that it's ready for proper release into the ICANN document system in this whole process there and getting the common period started. So don't know if there are any issues on the process as I've just spoken of it. I'll stop for a second to see if there are any hands.

I see nobody's hands I hear no shouts okay moving on. So one of the things we had here was a comment still pending from me is, you know, does a constituency comment go out as a letter? I think the answer is, no it doesn't. There is a cover letter and then there's a document. So this letter will need to be tweaked to be appropriate as a cover letter but I don't think that's a substantive issue.

(Carlos) did ask are we going to personalize the request to each SO AC chair as suggested during today's call? My assumptions was yes. Steve I would ask you does that seem reasonable? I mean what you normally do.

Steve Chan: Thanks.

Avri Doria: I see your hand up sorry. I should have seen your hand up and called on you instead of just asking you a question.

Steve Chan: Sure. Thanks Avri. This is Steve Chan from staff. And I'll cover two things one is just to answer your question the documents can be customized to the SO, AC or SG or C. So in theory it can be customized although I haven't heard any particular or specific request to make them I guess specific to the particular organization. So while we can I haven't heard any actual concrete suggestions to do so. The other - why I actually raised my hand was just too…

Avri Doria: Steve if I can interrupt for a second?

Steve Chan: Sure.

Avri Doria: I think we were just talking about the cover letter not the whole document.

Steve Chan: Sure. So we can do whatever the group wants. Whether or not we want to have it as a cover letter with an appendix or if we want to have it as a continuous letter it's really up to the group I think. Whatever the group thinks

is preferable in terms of it's - how clean it is and how easy it is to read and to take in.

Avri Doria: Thanks.

Steve Chan: So sorry Avri this is Steve again. If you're looking for an opinion I think maybe it is cleaner to do - to position as a cover letter with the questions actually is an annex.

Avri Doria: Okay. Does anyone in the group object to handling it that way? If not we can call that one decided and move on to Steve's next point. I see no hands I hear no calls. So okay so let's call that - it'll be as you say a letter with an annex. Okay Steve you still have your hand point you actually raised it for three.

Steve Chan: Thanks Avri. This is Steve Chan again from staff. So what I want to do was just provide a little more detail around the steps after this meeting. So the thought is that staff who would collect the inputs from both the comments collected on the Google Document as well as from this meeting itself and produce a sort of final document that would be distributed to the working group. And I think the thought is that we would leave that open for suggestions and comments. And up until and perhaps through the meeting on 6 June after which we would call it final and then make final arrangements to distribute the letters to all of the organizations.

So my thought is that we'll make the final edits as opposed to a Google Document. It'll actually be a Word document that will be shared with the group and also provided on the wiki. And I think that's all I had to say about that. So just wanted to add a little bit of clarity on the process and welcome any comments to that process. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And thank you for correcting me on the dates. I had squished things that had two weeks to get done into one week in my mind. And so

thank you for correcting me on that without actually saying you were correcting me which is really quite nice. So any comments on the process as explained by me and as further explained and clarified by Steve? Anyone object to following that process?

Okay seeing no objections moving on. Okay and we did already take the first two comments here the one I had and also (Carlos)'s. So I'm assuming (Carlos) that that answer is satisfactory if not let me see your hand? Okay. And the other issue on that topic. Okay then the next, and also from (Carlos) was this is a gentle reminder did the request have a deadline? And this was referring to the request for the history of previous letters and consensus advice, et cetera, to the board. And is this initial one also a constituency request? If all questions are negative I would suggest not to start this letter with this sentence, but move it somewhere down the letter. I see no issue with doing that. I don't know if you're comfortable with that Steve just sort of sitting in your recasting of this any response or comment? Okay. Hopefully - okay there a no problem. Thank you, Steve.

The next comment further down is called constituency request. Maybe we should agree on one single definition of the exercise. This indeed is a constituency comment and we're making a request so it's a request for constituency comment. I think it's fine to pick one wording. I expect that there is one official wording in the guidebook for PDP Working Groups and we just need to look it up and find it and use that one consistently. Any issue with that as a response to that comment?

Okay and we have a comment and (Reuben) considering the cc1 documents get out June 10 what would be the deadline for responses? Well I think that the issue is that the paper as revised or the constituency request as revised from Steve would come out sometime this week. And hopefully the meeting on June 6 would essentially be the close unless there's a pending issue that we need to deal with that we can't close on the sixth at which point we would

have to do a 24 or at maximum 48 hour last call would be my first guess in the process.

Oh did you mean, how long was the comment period open for? In which case we began at 35 days or allotted in the PDP manual. But we may want to consider is there's often comment periods that cut across a face to face meeting are actually extended by either the length of that meeting or twice the length of that meeting to deal with the fact that many people are traveling. So we could certainly, you know, make that an open question that on June 6, you know, and see how different people feel about 35 days or perhaps 45 days to account for the Helsinki meeting in the middle.

Okay anything further on those issues? Okay and (Carlos) added a headline that I never accepted and I just did. So are there any other issues on this first page that anybody has? I want to deal with the comment but I also want to give people a chance to look at a page and indicate whether they currently have any issues? So I'll pause for a second to see if there are any other issues with Page 1 before we move into Page 2.

Okay. I see no comments. I'll move to Page 2. Okay (Carlos) added a header which I've just accepted. Okay. The comment first comment I had which was one about referring to separate documents if it's the first part in the cover letter we've already discussed that. I expect that Steve can modify this language appropriately. And I'll leave that there. Then (Carlos) was kind enough to add another headline re-coordination with other efforts and thank you (Carlos) for the organizational additions to this. They help.

And then we go through and we have the listing of efforts. We had some discussions on that list at the last meeting. And this is where we've got it now. Any other -- I get distracted reading the comments in the chat sometimes -- any other comments on Page 2? Nothing I'll move on.

Page 3 we have Jeff has a comment. I would think we want to say at least two this is the first of at least two okay. But I think that change has been made. Yes I indicate done. And then I guess there was a bracket that Jeff wanted to add and a closed bracket that Jeff wanted to add that I've just accepted. Then there was a message that I put in from Steve which is 35 days is generally the minimum amount of time. We've already talked about that and we've left open the option of do we go with the minimum 35 or do we call it 45 so that we've allowed for extra time given Helsinki? And I don't know if anybody has comments on that one now or we can hold back (36).

Okay so anybody have any other comments on three? Okay I see none now we move on to the content. So to start out with the six specific issues question one. I think there's been quite a bit of wordsmithing in these questions so we should take a look at each question as we go through.

(Carlos) though had a really biased question, is there a need for policy changes in applications prefaced in new gTLDs narrow in their approach? Should there in fact be additional new gTLDs in the future? I don't know (Carlos). If you want to speak to that or what change because there's already sort of been dealt with or do you still have an open issue that you would like to make or do you wish to call this unresolved or the floor is yours if you wanted.

(Carlos) it was not an open issue it can be marked resolved. So I guess (Carlos) (unintelligible). It doesn't look like we have any further explanation to add into this one. No one has suggested any further explanation. So with that - okay question one has been reworked the 2007 consensus policy above expressed the commitment to a continuing mechanism for the introduction of new gTLDs. Are there any facts in our circumstances that have changed such that you believe that this should no longer be the policy? Please explain? This seems to cover well. And many people contributed to this bit of wordsmithing. It seems to me to cover the discussion we have. Are there any issues on it as it now stands?

I see no hands. The question about (unintelligible) has sort of been overridden by the wordsmithing so I'll - with that I'll delete the further (unintelligible). And then (Carlos) had a comment I would use the word ongoing as per original documents instead of continuing. So there is that. I don't think I'm doing the echoing although I do hear people talking in the background. So somebody has got there mic on other than me. Okay but I can't see who it is but it looks like they've muted or rather it sounds like they muted.

Okay and I note disclaimer (Carlos) didn't mean to be a pain in the neck but was asked to take a look at the draft letter from the point of view of English as a second language. (Carlos) normally respects Avri's check (unintelligible) he knows that's a silly mistake but thank you.

So does anybody have a preference of using ongoing instead of continuing? I have no reason not to use ongoing instead of continuing. Does anybody object to the substitution? I see no hands. I see no objections. So we can go with ongoing. Hopefully all those that did editing are still happy with the sentence. I'll leave it there though without accepting it so that Steve can see that it's there if there's any further discussion that comes up later.

Okay so I'll mark that as resolved. Then with the next question with the absence of continuing mechanisms be risk to competition? (Carlos) comment risk to healthy development of the DNS market or something more neutral the competition verdict is not out yet. Since (Carlos) did not make this tech change in the text it wasn't just accepted. Does anybody have an issue with it? Yes (Christina).

(Christina):   Hi thanks. Separate and apart from the point that (Carlos) raised I'm not sure that risk to competition is necessarily what we're trying to get information about because it's - and I guess what I'm wondering is whether or not what we're really asking for is with the absence of a continuing mechanism be

anticompetitive or have an anticompetitive effect? Because it's possible to have a scenario in which a particular set of circumstances is not necessarily procompetitive without it being anticompetitive. So I guess what I'm not entirely clear is what the information is we're trying to get here?

Jeff Neuman: Avri are you still there?

Avri Doria: Yes, no I was speaking with mute on, sorry. Jeff I see your hand is up. I expect it's in response so please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I was just going to say I think I'm the one who changed a lot of that language. And I agree with (Christina) that her formulation was better than -it was - I had meant to cover so I as the person who changed that language I actually like her changes. Avri just double checking that you're there and not on mute.

Avri Doria: Oh but yes I was on mute again. Thank you. So yes I typed in the change. And Steve edited my spelling mistakes. Is that correct? Is everyone okay with that change? Any objections to it? Okay seeing no objections (Christina) just reading your note would you want the comment - compound sentence of anticompetitive or likely to have anticompetitive or just is it just fine as it is? It works for you. Okay thank you.

(Christina): I think it's fine. I think it's fine like it is. I don't have a strong preference one way or the other.

Avri Doria: Thank you. So moving on I see no hands on this one okay. So the next one was also a wordsmith are continuing mechanisms for the introduction of additional new gTLDs necessary to achieving sufficient diversity in terms of Internet names, please explain? And were there any comments on this? So I had one that said what does this mean? What does it mean to make a diverse set of names more diverse? And I again there was a (Carlos) response. Again basic assumption is choice and trust. I have no objection to

it. I am comfortable with people having an idea what it means so I can resolve my question. Does anyone else have a question here? Does anybody else have an issue with the wording? No issue with the wording all that resolved.

Okay anything that we missed on Page 4? No moving on to five. Is it too early in the review cycle in the previous round to determine the full range of benefits of the 2012 round of new gTLDs? And that should be a question mark. Should introducing additional new gTLDs and/or the timing of continuing mechanisms should that impact the decision to introduce additional new gTLDs and/or the timing of continuing mechanisms for new gTLDs?

Does that sit well with everyone or does it sound awkward and was adjust my reading or is that second sentence hard to parse? Does that impact the decision to introduce new gTLDs and/or the timing of - no I guess it's okay. Any issues on that one other than my reading style? No okay.

Then moving on considerations are there before deciding on continuing mechanisms for new gTLDs or to introduce policy changes? There was a certain amount of wordsmithing for that. Are people fine with that as it stands now? Okay no comments. And then the ubiquitous any other issues relating to this overarching theme? So any questions on five - Page 5?

And also I guess we're sort of at a new point of fair stability on this first question moving forward. I see no hands. Okay, moving onto page six, question two.

There was a certain amount of wording to the front paragraph. In fact by and large I think I'm going to end up removing most of the - or Steve can - is most of those paragraphs started out as verbatim lists in the issues report. All of them have been modified heavily at this point. The footnote to those have been removed in some places. I see no one has added a further explanation so that comment can be deleted. Any comments on this first paragraph

rewrite? I don't think I'll read it unless somebody specifically requests. A hand - yes Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. Looking at it, I think I'm looking at the Google Doc and this is the sentence that begins the six subjects. I think that the grammar falls apart toward the end.

Avri Doria: What page are you on Greg?

Greg Shatan: It says page 2 of 17.

Avri Doria: Okay so you've gone back to page 2. Okay, thank you.

Greg Shatan: Sorry. I was kind of multitasking so I've fallen off the horse.

Avri Doria: That's okay. Just if somebody does jump back and isn't on the same just (unintelligible).

Greg Shatan: I can just mark my…

Avri Doria: No, it's fine. We've done it - we've done it here. Okay so where was the paragraph?

Greg Shatan: It's section 2 - constituency request survey on six relevant subjects.

Avri Doria: Yes, okay.

Greg Shatan: It's kind of a run on sentence but if we're not going to break it up - it should be specific questions on which the PDPWG seeks your input, not that.

Avri Doria: Okay, I see that it is being edited as we speak so thank you. As I say, there may be some grammatical fixes by Steve and (Julie) when they take over to make it more readable that we can review next week but thank you for that.

Okay, should I go back to page six where I was or did you have another one in this area?

Greg Shatan: No. Please go back to page six and apologies for dragging us backwards.

Avri Doria: That's okay. We cleaned up something so I feel good about it. Okay, back to page six. Page five - so I was asking basically whether there was anything on the top write-up. I see no comments. I thank you for the delete space. I've deleted the further explanation since no one felt the need for one so questions.

Should subsequent procedures be structured to account for different types of GTLD's? Then there's a - I see no points on that. Several possible types have been suggested including - and then it lists the types. There's been some editing within the right field. Are there any issues with the enumeration - the two sets on page six and ends on page seven - the 1, 2, 3, 4 I think 9 bullets - 10 bullets. Any comments on those at the moment?

Yes so someone will need to review the program and smoothness of language so it looks like it's not 15 people writing it but one. That's a master editor scale which I'm sure we will see. Okay, anyone have any issue on those bullets? No? Okay. Before moving on from page six, any other issues on six? Seeing none, move onto seven.

So the following questions refer to the list of types. Are types missing from the list? And the (unintelligible) first question (unintelligible) do all types belong in the (unintelligible) list. Perhaps it should be do all the enumerator types belong in the list. So those are not really enumerated. They're dotted but anyway.

If categories - and this was one - what areas of the application evaluation contention resolution and/or contacting processes did the categorization have an impact? Any comments on that one? Seeing none, okay. This was one

that I rewrote just before the meeting because there had been a comment suggesting that wasn't clear so I tried to clarify it. Let's see if I succeeded.

If different types of GTLD are defined, should all types be offered in each application window? Is it acceptable for an application window to open for only one type of GTLD - for example a dot brand only application window? And I see hands. Jeff first and then (Carlos). Jeff please.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, from - thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. From my point of view that does clarify what it was trying to ask. I would say to open for only one or a limited number - or a limited number of types of TLD's. I know that was not a great Wordsmithing there but…

Avri Doria: Right.

Jeff Neuman: I think you hopefully get what I'm trying to get at.

Avri Doria: Yes, I've got that there but it needs to be fixed so I will not accept the change but it's just, you know, we can go back from smooth language. And (Carlos) I see your hand's went down. Was that also your issue? Only one on a limited subset for one type. No, I don't want to get into Wordsmithing on the fly here. Okay, any other issues on that one?

I have a question. (Carlos)'s question was type or categories. We've been using type here. Other people have used category. Is there an issue for switching from one word to the other? I think of a category as a box that contains different types of types but I may be wrong on that. Is there a preference? Yes Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: I kind of like using - even though I'm the one who put types - I kind of like categories just because that's a term that I know that the GAC has used often. So if we put it in there in the language they've been using, I think that might be more easily understandable.

Avri Doria: Okay. Is there any objection to making that categorical change throughout this section in fact whenever we talk about types which compare to categories? That would be a carefully done global change so I'll just make a note on that at the top of this section which was types (unintelligible) at the first use. I'll just add a comment - global change to category. I didn't spell it correctly. Global change to category. Okay.

Hearing no objection to that one, going back. Don't - oh wow. Okay. It's different - okay so that one - any other issues to this overarching theme? Okay, do we have any other questions open or about the content of page seven? Hearing none, I'll move on. Page eight.

Again a little bit of Wordsmithing in the original there. Further explanation can come out since none was added. Any questions on the original? Okay (Robin) of course the GAC is the only group who can categorize in this process. Thank you. I admit I was the one that was adamantly against categories in 2007 and - but we're moving beyond that.

Okay so the question - should we continue to assess applications to new GTLD's in rounds and if not, how could you structure an alternate mechanism for assessing applications while at the same time taking into account - taking into consideration public comments, objections, evaluations, etcetera. Are there any issues with that relay? I see none. Moving on.

We're at the bottom of page eight. Any open comments on page eight? Okay. Page nine - first question. How would the assessment of application in a method other than in rounds - we should probably put the rounds in quotes again since we did in the previous one or drop the quotes from the previous one - whichever - but something for consistency. In a method other than in round, impact right folders if at all. Any comments on that one? Okay, seeing none.

Do rounds or other cyclical application models lead to more consistent treatment of applicants? Any issue on that one? Any questions or comments? Yes, please Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I think I had a comment there. I'm not sure I understand the question or what we're trying to get at.

Avri Doria: Okay, yes. Oh that's right, you do. Sorry I missed that in the slide there. It's a little down on the page.

Jeff Neuman: That's okay.

Avri Doria: Rounds and others - right. I think that I picked up the original writing of this one because in the blue sky there had been comments made and I forget whether it was the pro or the con. I'd have to check but I think it was in the pro is that rounds give a more consistent treatment to at least the applicants within a round and that there's a consistency there opposed to just sort of a steady progression or at least that was one of the points that was made there so that's why it was passed into a question.

I'm not really sure how to make that one clearer and that's why I didn't attempt to do so, so thanks for bringing it back up. Does anybody have a suggestion? Do you have a suggestion Jeff since your hand is still up?

Jeff Neuman: Well I mean you - I think we could start with the clarification you added in what you - how you explained it - which is within that round - put something like within that round or cyclical application, not the end, right. That's one thing that'll help it be more clear.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) restricting applications to something like does restricting applications (unintelligible) I think. Does restricting applications surround other (unintelligible) lead to more consistent (unintelligible)? Does that work?

Any objection to that edit on the fly? Okay and Jeff, I'm assuming - yes understood and you think so.

Okay so then seeing no other comments on this one, I'll move on. Should grounds or other cyclical application models be used to facilitate reviews and process improvement? Any comments, questions? We're moving on. Any ubiquitous - oh no - do rounds lead to greater predictability? Any comments? Okay, next question. Do rounds add latency to an application leading to longer times to market? I think that's how I need the comma. Any questions with that one? Comments?

Do rounds create - oh okay before I move on - any last questions or other questions on page nine before moving on? Okay, seeing none, we'll move on. Do rounds create artificial demand and artificial scarcity? Comments, questions? No. Moving on. Does timing between rounds lead to pent up demand? Questions? Okay, I see an answer. I mean I see a comment. (Samantha) - maybe and/or rather than and. And that was for the previous one - do comments create artificial demand and/or any objection to that change?

Okay, I've put that one in. Thank you. Does timing (unintelligible) lead to pent up demand? No comments. And any other issues related? Any other comments on page ten? There's seven more. Okay, I've got a comment. Redundant - okay explain please. What is redundant? The pent up demand. There's timing (unintelligible) lead to pent up demand. I' not sure - I'm sorry I don't understand the comment. Maybe somebody - maybe you can go or someone can explain. I don't understand.

Steve by saying enumerate, you mean we should give each one a number? I think that's fine, yes. Okay, I did when I was doing it but I see absolutely no blue knots and that would definitely make it easier for conversations and for (unintelligible) back when we have to do - take these responses and work on them. So yes, thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Avri this is…

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) have demand. Okay, I see. So we have - it's artificial demand in one and then it's pent up demand in the other. I understand. Yes Jeff, I see your hand.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, that's what I was going to say. You got it. Those two questions together are kind of redundant.

Avri Doria: Are they? Is artificial demand and pent up demand the same? Okay, in which case I guess so suggesting that one of those questions be deleted. Is that the suggestion?

Jeff Neuman: Or are you asking with the next - with the second question - does the length of timing between rounds have an impact on pent up demand?

Avri Doria: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: That is (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) between rounds lead to pent up demand.

Jeff Neuman: And then you could ask the power up if so what is - again I'm not - you can Wordsmith later but if so, what is the ideal length of time between a round?

Avri Doria: It needs Wordsmithing and spelling but the idea is there. So what is an ideal time between rounds? And there are areas that what is the ideal interval between rounds. Okay. Any questions or issues with those changes? Does that work for you? Okay (Robin) unmet demand might be better than pent up demand. Any objection to changing pent up to unmet? No objection.

But we've got Greg that kind of likes pent up. Well I made the change but it hasn't been put in yet. So I'd like to - we have an unmet versus a pent up. Are there any other opinions on unmet? I think there's a slight different meeting between the two of them but are there other points of view on that? I see typing. I wonder if anybody would like to speak.

I don't feel strongly about it. It's just a suggestion. (Unintelligible) are not synonymous. Any other opinions on it? (Robin) if you don't feel strongly about it and one person does feel strongly with no other opinions, do you mind if I unwind it?

Man: Hi, this is (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: If you don't mind. Thank you (Robin). I have unwound it. Thank you. Okay so we now have the pent up time between rounds lead to pent up demand. If so, what is an ideal interval between rounds? And we have to get consistent because sometimes we have rounds with quotes and sometimes - I mean with quotation marks and sometimes we don't and so probably need a global change - more consistency on that. Okay.

And then it was any other issues to this overarching theme. And any other issues on page ten? Okay. Oh yes, thanks for your hand. I'll pause and please tell me how to pronounce your name but please go ahead.

(Boran): Good evening. It's (Boran) here (unintelligible). In my opinion the two questions are redundant and if we go back to page eight and page nine again just to get more streamlining too on this document, does timing between rounds lead to pent up demand is a question which becomes redundant because during the process of the rounds the artificial demand (unintelligible) is any which ways being as (unintelligible).

So in my opinion we could definitely add - as Jeff said - that what is the right timing for the round which is not being mentioned anywhere but asking for a

pent up demand and asking for artificial demand I one question after the other does not pull through the round of explanation of creation of demand.

Avri Doria: So if I understand correctly, what you're suggesting is that on this question - the length question - that that first phrase be struck and the question be abbreviated to just what is an ideal interval between rounds?

(Boran):   Absolutely because that should take care of…

Avri Doria: Okay. What do other people think of that one? I have marked it as deleted but I'm not going to delete if there's objection. Oh, I see lots of hands. So I'm assuming (unintelligible) that your hand is the old one and Greg please.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan again for the record. I think we're losing a question if we cross out the reference to pent up demand. Pent up demand is not artificial demand. If anything, it's the opposite. It's genuine demand that has been unable to be satisfied.

So I'm not sure that the question of the ideal interval between rounds should be tied to the question of pent up demand. I think they're two different questions so I wouldn't pair them but I think the question of whether rounds leads to pent up demand - I guess the only - it's almost maybe too obvious to ask but it's certainly a different question than the question of artificial demand and if we'd like at least, you know, there's not a definite problem with asking questions which the answers may seem obvious because what's obvious to some may be disagreeable to others or not seen by others.

So I think we should put - keep the question in about rounds leading to pent up demand and I think we should ask more generally what is the ideal interval between rounds and why because there may be a number of issues that lead to the timing between rounds being an issue for better or worse. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay so I have two suggestions here. One is that I put back in the question about pent up demand and that I separate into a separate question what is an ideal interval between rounds. Okay, I hear a little bit of echo. I see that (Christine) is dropping. Thanks for being here and thanks for contributions. (Unintelligible) is pent up demand is (unintelligible) due to external forces. We know (unintelligible) has to drop sooner today as well. Okay, anybody that drops, make sure that you get on the list as soon as possible on any of the other issues that you may have on the last pages.

We do have another bit of time scheduled for this meeting. (Unintelligible) anything scheduled for 9:30. Correct Steve? Okay so Greg is saying there's three different concepts here. Okay, thank you Steve. So does anybody object to putting back in the question about pent up demand? What did I do? Okay. And take it to two questions. Okay and (Adam) please explain. Okay, thank you. And any other comments on that one? Okay so I'll accept that. (Unintelligible) is shown. And then it's one that becomes a question of its own. What is - okay.

Okay, moving on. Any other issues on that? And then okay there's some (unintelligible) redundancy and Jeff what would you propose to the three questions? That's what would you propose and I think that's what we've got now, right?

So are there any comments or is it time to move on on this? Thank you Steve. Okay, so I'll leave that as it is for now. Any objection to going from the two questions to the three questions with the rewording? Okay. I'll move further. We'll be aware that we may see further discussions on this particular issue on the list. If anyone is still feeling uncomfortable with where we've gotten to on this if there are further discussions needed on different meetings, overlapping meetings and redundancy.

Okay so any other issues on page ten? I asked that once before but we came back to it. Okay. Moving to question four and page eleven. Again further

explanation is no longer - whoops. I went too far. Any issues on the top paragraph which had some Wordsmithing? And we'll have - I see Steve doing a little bit of cleanup. Okay, moving down to the questions.

Was the round of 2012 sufficiently predictable given external factors and the need to be flexible? Any issues on that wording? Okay, moving on. Do the changes implemented as the result of the establishment across community working groups and the adoption of the principles from the policy and implementation working group suffice to maintain predictability of the application process while at the same time providing (unintelligible) for the needed flexibility to address changes of circumstances while at the same time providing - that doesn't need to be changed. Anybody have any issues on that question?

Okay, I see none. That's it for page eleven. Any other issues with page eleven? Okay, moving on. What are the impacts on applicants and consumers from a process that lacks the stability? I see a hand. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. I think this is one that I had reworded. Now rereading it, maybe we should have impacts on applicants, consumers and other third parties because there's other parties other than consumers and applicants that are affected.

Avri Doria   Okay. I don't know if we want to presume that the consumers and applicants are third parties but we could just say or third parties.

Jeff Neuman: Right so you could say what are the impacts on applicants…

Avri Doria   Applicants certainly aren't third parties.

Jeff Neuman: So you could say what are the impacts on applicants and other parties from a process that or and other entities or something like that.

Avri Doria   (Unintelligible) one recommendation as in related party. (Carlos) is saying applicants and users summarized as consumers, CCC. So (Carlos) do you have a recommended wording? So consumers equals applicants plus users by CCC definition.

I don't know that we've necessarily adopted definition and if we did, we would have to explain it and give it somewhere anymore. So at this point I would prefer saying applicants and users impact on applicants, users and third parties or and other parties and related parties. How about that - applicants, users and related parties? Does that work for people?

Does that work sort of taking bits and pieces of various suggestions? Okay Jeff, you have your hand up and you say okay. Your hand is down and the okay remains. Okay so applicants and related parties from a process that - what are the impacts on applicant users and related parties? Oh, what happened? Consumers (unintelligible). Oh, okay. Never mind. Two of us editing at the same time is just confusing so I will leave it alone. Okay are people fine with that one now? And then we have the - any other issues?

Okay (Carlos) thank you for the check. Okay, page 12. Any other comments on page 12? No, moving onto 13 - question five. Okay we start with a comment here on the first line that says the subject of early engagement was unanticipated by the design groups to require any type of policy development specific to new GTLD's addressing groups. So we should probably spell out drafting group but this was one that was taken from the issues report so that we should probably clarify as to what this DG is here. So that needs clarification. Is that what (Carlos) and (Ilia) did not get or that was something different?

Yes Greg, I see a hand and then Jeff. Greg, please.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. I actually raised my hand on the previous item.

Avri Doria   Okay so will you hold that for a second and try and get this one finished and then I'll come back to you?

Greg Shatan: Sure. I actually have a comment on this one as well.

Avri Doria   Okay, please.

Greg Shatan: The question asks about community engagement but the introduction talks about early engagement. So I think, you know, maybe that reference should be community engagement rather than early engagement? There's no definition of early engagement and I'm not sure the community engagement - it just strikes me as - I know the word engagement is not saying (unintelligible).

Avri Doria   Okay. Okay, there's a change there. I'll come back to you for the other one later. Are you (unintelligible) Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Oh, sorry. Yes, I was. This is Jeff Neuman. Yes, I was a little confused by this entire section and I didn't really provide too many edits because I - and now I think things are becoming a little bit more clear. I'm not sure we need to ask about community engagement during the PDP itself but I think what we're trying to get at with this section is how can comments from the community or issues that the board has faced after the application window opens up be addressed and how can we involve the community more.

                  So if we got rid of - I think because the PDP's already underway and I don't really think we should be asking a question of how can we get greater involvement in this PDP itself. We should just be striving for that anyway. Every PDP should be doing that and I think that's where I got confused. And when Greg said early involvement too, that confused me as well.

So I would recommend deleting the first question and even the post PDP to really just drill down on the rest of the questions which says that, you know, how do we account

for community involvement and how do we encourage community involvement in the application process and other processes during like - I'm not saying this well at all - but basically during the evaluation process.

Man: (Unintelligible) the evaluation.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks.

Avri Doria   Okay. If I can put on a personal comment hat. I'd raise my hand but I don't see any other hands up at the moment. I actually am slightly uncomfortable with that because I think that yes, the PDP is already on and that we already have a working group and yet we certainly do still have opportunities to become more open and to take advice on, you know, how open we're being and coming back with a no, it seems pretty good or it would be good if we did webinars every 13 weeks - something so it just basically is taking the process from beginning to post.

                    So that was sort of my notion. Just because we've started this PDP does not mean that we may not find ways to improve our processes along the way. And the second question is the next step. Once we finish, do we have enough - a sufficient number of mechanisms in line for how we continue? So I'll take off my personal hat and go to being the avatar here, Greg and then back to Jeff.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan again. I think the problem kind of stems from the question itself - Q5. How can community engagement be improved in the processes? This implies there are two processes or processes and I'm not sure what they're referring to. If you look at Q4, the term process is used to apply to the GTLD application process but here in Q5 we seem to be talking about the PDP development process that we're currently engaged in. So I think we have a language problem.

If we do want to talk about both the PDP process and the actual application process, I think we should be clear and concrete in our language in doing so. Right now the introductory paragraph refers entirely as far as I can tell except for maybe the last sentence to the PDP process and not in any way to the actual application process where there may be, you know, the need for community engagement. So I think we need to figure out what we're talking about and then state it in clear and unambiguous terms. Thank you.

Avri Doria   Yes, I thought we were talking about all the processes from this one on through but okay. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I think in line with that and to address your comments Avri. Perhaps in this section we limit it to just the application evaluation and other processes that are related to the actual submission of an application and the evaluation of that and then at the very end of all the questionnaire, you could put like a miscellaneous section or not call it that but essentially put in at the end, you know, these are - this is a PDP group comprised of all these groups. Is there anything we can do to improve what we're doing as kind of like a last set of questions? So you're separating the topics and it's not quite as confusing.

Avri Doria   Okay, does anyone object to removing those two questions and coming up with some words at the end or just leaving it alone? Okay. And I guess there may be some Wordsmithing that's needed to the initial part to make sure that the question - the explanation here is consistent with the narrower context of the questions.

                  Now I have two pending questions. I think that (Carlos) and (Ilia)'s unclear to me as well has been borne out by this whole conversation so I want to make sure that the conversation and what's happened has now made it clear and two, I want to go back to - okay (Carlos) says yes - and two, I want to go back as I said I would and then forgot to Greg for his earlier question as soon as I find out if no one else has any other issues with this. Steve I see your hand.

(Steve Chan):   Thanks Avri. This is (Steve Chan) from staff and I guess I just want to take us back a bit to I believe where this topic came from and it was I think highlighting things that were brought up later in the process, perhaps even implementation that were raised by - perceived to be raised very late in the game. That could have perhaps been identified earlier in the process and maybe not made into such a large issue at the end.

And so I guess in my head community engagement would be both during the PDP as well as the implementation and actually hopefully not after implementation ideally in my head. So I guess I'd be in - I guess I'm in support of your thinking Avri in that it's both things. It's both the PDP development as well as the implementation stages to make sure that the community involved is educated and engaged as well as they can be. Thanks.

Avri Doria   Thanks. Does moving the question that has been stricken to that final question section and putting it with the other - any other issues - does moving those two questions to their solve the issue for you? I decided that for me it wasn't one that was worth a lot of argument over but I'm curious what you and others think of that idea of keeping those two questions but moving them since the logic that you and I are seeing on this question is not a logic that seems to work for others in the group. Jeff, I see your hand.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks and I hear what you're saying Steve. Sorry, this is Jeff Neuman. The - but a lot of those issues didn't arise or I don't think could have arisen during the PDP or even post PDP implementation until people actually saw what the applications were that were applied for.

Now obviously we have the lessons learned and so now we think we have ideas but a lot of new things could come in the next round that we never even considered and so the question, you know, things that come to my mind are the plurals versus singulars. At that time we just didn't think of it or we didn't think it would be an issue if we did think of it.

Same thing with closed generics. Now a number of us knew that closed generics would be applied for but we didn't necessarily think that that would be an issue until it was an issue when people saw the applications. So I do think there's two different sets of questions.

One is how can we make sure we've considered all the issues before the application window opens and involve the community but I do think there's second set of questions is which is okay, once the community is made aware of other issues either because of the applications themselves, how can we encourage community involvement in resolving those issues? So I do think that there's two completely different sets of questions.

Avri Doria   Okay, yes. I think that in the question one thing that is unstated is that I guess in some there's an assumption that if you had the community involvement all the way through, you have fewer of the post application questions and then there's another side that sort of says no matter how much pre-work you do across community and within community, there's still going to be unknowns that become questions post the process.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, this is Jeff Neuman. Absolutely. Look, there are very creative people out there. There's very creative applicants out there. So I think both will be the case no matter how much pre-work we actually do.

Avri Doria   So I've decided that I'm fine with moving those two questions to a separate section at the end. They still get I mean a page of questions. I'm fine with that. Steve does that logic work for you as our ETF check? Okay, thank you.

So any other - and we have about eleven minutes left in this meeting. Any other - so we've moved those two questions and there's very little left on page 13 in terms of questions. Any other issues on 13 before I move to 14? No? Okay. So then on 14 we start with what will be the first question in this section. Is there a time at which the application procedure in one application

window should be frozen until a new application window is opened? Any issues? I see none.

Next one. If the board is faced with questions that cannot be addressed by the policy recommendations they were sent, must the board bring the issue back to the GNSO and PDP process on any questions or issues? And - yes Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, I actually was too slow. It's actually on the question beforehand. Since we asked that a similar type of question in the last section when we talk about rounds I think, can we ask the question or just add a couple of words at the end of the one that says is there a time that which the application procedure in one application window should be frozen until after a new application window is opened for - maybe for policy development or for consideration of policy based issues because then that would be a different question than what we ask in the previous one which is on rounds.

Avri Doria That opens the policy review.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Avri Doria Does that work?

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Avri Doria Okay, let's put that in. Any comments? Okay Greg, yes please.

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan again. I'm sorry but I'm finding this question is now unintelligible. I'm not sure what policy review is in this context. Now are we talking about the policy development process that we're engaged in? I'm not - and what does it mean? It really means something very different for the policy - for an application window to be opened, you know, for actual applications as opposed to policy review.

So I guess I'm not sure whether we want to ask only about the time when a policy review may begin and if you think about it if we're engaged now in policy review for subsequent rounds, would that even occur to us that pending applications should somehow be frozen? That doesn't seem to make sense to me. I'm not sure…

Avri Doria   No, I don't think there was a - it wasn't that the applications were frozen. It was that the application procedures be frozen.

Greg Shatan: Well what does it mean for the application procedures…

Avri Doria   We're not pushing applications all the way through this application process. The procedures were being tweaked and (unintelligible) and changed so the question I believe is sort of saying is there a point at which you start accepting applications that the procedures are frozen and next time we review the procedures.

Greg Shatan: Yes, I guess it's…

Avri Doria   I think that's what this question is trying to say.

Greg Shatan: I guess it's not - it's not speaking to me and this is the only language I speak. So I'm having - I'm really wondering what a second language speaker of English will do with this question. It just needs help and I'm sorry I'm not editing on the fly very well at this point in the evening but I think we need to have…

Avri Doria   No, I guess we'll just mark this one way.

Greg Shatan: Just maybe a WTS.

Avri Doria   Okay. I put a comment in there, you know, it needs - we're going to help. And we'll come back to that one and while you're here, I keep forgetting to come back to you for the earlier question you had and so I better do it now before moving on. You could tell me what page your previous issue was on.

Greg Shatan: Page eleven.

Avri Doria   Page eleven and the issue is…

Greg Shatan: Again maybe this has something to do with the overall structure of this document. We started out with one question for how can changes be introduced into the new GTLD application process without sacrificing a predictable process which seems to me to be asking a fairly specific question about whether changes between rounds somehow make the process less predictable.

                    Then the actual questions that are being asked, you know, are quite different and broader and the introductory language again goes not to the question of predictable process for applying but more to the issue of the process of undergoing a PDP review. So again the logic of this whole thing is just not making sense to me. Maybe I'm just not processing this document correctly as to what it is, you know, we're trying - what the relationship is between the big questions and the headings and the subsequent questions and the introductory language before the questions.

                    You know, I'm thinking about trying to put this in front of, you know, constituency that I help facilitate. I just feel like we're going to have a big problem with when there's just one example of that, trying to figure out what it is we're kind of trying to (unintelligible).

Avri Doria   Okay, I added a note about rewording to the - I'm totally confused. I really have no idea what your issue is but hopefully others do. I see another hand up. I have - sorry. Please.

Man: Hi. This is (unintelligible). I think the way this document is worded is…

Avri Doria   You're very, very soft. I have trouble hearing you.

Man: (Unintelligible). Can you hear me now?

Avri Doria   Okay, that's a little better. Thank you. Yes, that's better.

Man: Okay, now the - I think in my opinion the way this document is worded and
                the flow of the entire document is I think the entire part is broken into two
                parts - A the document is throwing questions from the various FO's, AC's or
                SG's to the PDP working group saying that please review us and there's a
                communication here and B, the document is also trying to talk to people
                which are consumers or the applicants which and going to them directly and
                interviewing them. So I think that is where the English language per say is
                being a little confused here.

Avri Doria   Okay if I can respond, I think the questions are - I think the questions are -
                and perhaps the struggle is this is not absolutely clear. The questions are not
                to this group - the wording of the questions and certainly I'm asking questions
                about that. But the questions are for the stakeholder groups, to the
                constituency and to the various FO's and AC's other than GNSO.

Man: Correct.

Avri Doria   These questions are all directed outwards to them. They're not directed to our
                applicants. They're not directed to users except in so far as applicants are
                members of constituencies and users are members of constituencies. So
                there's really only one audience for these questions.

                Now in asking the question there's certainly questions about implications to
                various types of humans. So I don't see where the duality of questioning

comes from. So am I hearing a recommendation that we totally rewrite the document in a different style?

Man: This is (unintelligible). I think - in my opinion I think that could be a very good idea just to reword the flow of the document and arrange the sequence of the questions again which will - once we go through this - why because and Greg pointed out the predictable process on page eleven - the question that he was just asking and on page 13 we were struggling with the policy review on page 14 - that new application window's open for policy review.

So community engagement so perhaps a question from this section could just be picked up and sent to the other section and a question be brought from the other section to this section. So perhaps a little restructuring on the entire document may be recommended. This is my opinion. The group is - it's presented to the group.

Avri Doria   Okay. I guess all I can say is I'm fairly confused but if you have specific concrete discussions - I mean recommendations of things you would, you know, slice and dice and switch around, you know, I'd definitely have to say at this point please make them to the list since we have used up all the time of the meeting I believe. We've used up all 90 minutes but I have no concept as to how I would do what you're asking.

So if you have specific things please, you know, make the suggestions on the list. It would have been good to have done it before we got to this point while it was on the document but Steve would be able to take your comments and see if he could produce something and then we'd have to talk about it among the group to see if that switching questions around would work.

The questions were pretty much formed out of all the various discussions we had on the specific questions but if you have suggestions on exactly what changes you would want to make, please make them and then the group can comment on them. I find it hard to comment on them in the abstract others

have commented but as I say, we've used up our time and unfortunately we did not get - also you mentioned questions on 14 and we basically got rid of the questions except for I guess the one that we still have some wording problems with and then we had basically one more question left.

So I guess what we're going to have to do is continue the discussion on the list since we've used up our time for the meeting and I'm still turning over the editing pen to Steve.

I suggest that anybody that has any issues with any of those in the rest of the document, please send an email to the list on those other issues and then Steve and the rest of us can start to deal with them and then come back to this - these issues at the next meeting and we'll start at question five and with any cut and paste re-switching that has been done between now and then, we'll start with there and then we'll go through and make sure that there's no other open issues in the rest of the document if that's okay with people as a way to break the - break the meeting now, continue making process and finishing up at our next meeting.

Okay and I apologize, Jeff. I'm handing over to - the meeting back to you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks Avri and the any other business is quick. We can just go through that really quick which is that we've had the work plan out there that we've discussed the last two meetings. Obviously the work plan can always be revised but we're going to take that work plan as adopted by the working group with the caveat that we can always revise it. So with that said, the next meeting is scheduled for the normal day which is Monday on June - I think it's sixth - and at 1600 UTC so we'll see everyone then. Thank you very much. We can end the call.

Avri Doria Okay, goodbye.

Woman: Thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you. Again today's meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop the recording and disconnect all the remaining lines. Everyone enjoy the remainder of your day.

END