

**ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call
Monday, 1 August 2016 at 13:00 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: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-01aug16-en.mp3>

Attendance of the calls is also posted on the agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/-AibAw>

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

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Woman: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the new gTLD subsequent procedures working group call on the 1st of August at 13:00 UTC.

In the interest of time today, there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room so if you're on the audio bridge only, please let yourself be known now.

Judy Song-Marshall: Hi there. Judy Song-Marshall just joined.

Woman: Thank you, Judy. I would like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. Thank you. You may begin.

Avri Doria: Hi, this is Avri speaking. I'll be chairing the meeting today. We do have (Jeff) with us. So in terms of the agenda, the first thing we'll do is I'll ask about SOI. Then give anybody that has checked in late a chance to add themselves to the attendance.

Then we'll start talking about the (work track) for sub-teams in terms of how we're going to put the (unintelligible) together, plan and start working on them.

And we're going to have a brief section on the competition consumer trust and consumer choice review team and see if we have any inputs to the draft application survey. And that was sent with the agenda so I hope you all have seen it.

If it's possible, I'd like to ask Steve or one of the other members of support to put the URL froth in the chat so people that haven't seen it can get there but you should have it in your email.

Then we'll start talking about the (CC1), the community (unintelligible) - if someone can mute - so the 51 overarching issues preliminary findings, a look at who's comments have come in from which commodity components comments have come in for and see we can get a target for when the others will be received or statement that they are not sending any.

Then you'll go back to the discussions on the service - registry service provider back end accreditation type of issue. And then any other business. We have a, as I believe, 90 minute meeting scheduled, as norm.

Are there any comments or changes on the agenda? Does anybody have any other business that they would like to take on to the agenda at this point? I'll ask a question again when we get there at the end.

No? Okay, great, so we'll go with this agenda. Thank you. Okay, the next item is the SOI just remind everybody to update, to give anybody a chance to speak now if they have made any change that should be noted in this meeting.

Okay, I see no one. I do see that Steve has put the survey URL in. So, okay, just reminding people, keep your SOIs up-to-date. If anybody joined the call since the attendance - especially just on the phone, since the attendance was taken that wants to be included?

Okay, your names have probably already been (slated). Okay, so then moving to item three, (work tracks), the sub-teams. Steve did some work on them. We basically need to discuss issues like when they're going to start meeting. We have to get them organized.

They will then start meeting. They will have to pick some form of leadership that works with that team. In terms of starting them out, either (Jeff) or I will help get them started and we will be participating at all of them to some degree. I not as leadership of those teams, but we will help to get them started.

Steve, I knew you had a picture, slide on possible meeting times, remembering that we're going into a transition on a schedule where, at least once we finish doing the CC1 comments, and perhaps even during that phase, we need to discuss that.

The full meeting will go into that every other two weeks sort of schedule and each of the subgroups will be in every other week schedule, as well, which means we'll have five meetings to juggle in terms of scheduling. Steve, is it okay if I turn it over to you now to take over on that scheduling discussion?

Steve Chan: Sure. Thanks, Avri. This is Steve Chan from staff. And hopefully you could read the text here. If you can't, please go ahead and click the little plus sign to zoom in.

Folks, I think Avri sort of went through the - how we helped organize the meeting and so this is a suggestion. The thought is, as you said, to have groups one and two meet on the week one and then have - the meetings would rotate for each of those from 1500 to 2200 UTC.

We want to try to keep it consistent. With this many meetings for folks that might want to participate in all of the subgroups, we want to try to keep it fairly simple, as simple as it can be.

And so the same would apply for week two in terms of rotating the times but they you would have groups three in for meeting instead as well as the full group once we get to the point where the full group would only be meeting every other week.

I think Avri mentioned it, but the thought is that the full group would continue to meet on a weekly basis until we're able to reach at least preliminary conclusions on the overarching issues.

So I guess another thing I would point out about these times is, the thought is that these are suggestions. If the group, depending on the makeup of the group, if they thought it might be better to not rotate times, they could feel free to do so.

If they fell again it a third time, (unintelligible) complicated, the thought is basically to give the control to the subgroup itself to determine things like it's timing, it's leadership.

We would want some high-level things consistent like, you know, one of the first things that the group should work on is a work plan. We would want somebody to be able to speak on the progress of the subgroup.

But in general, the thought is to give much of the control to the subgroup itself to figure out how it works as the scope of work in the work itself might be different for each one. Hopefully that helps, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes, thank you. It took me a bit to get to the mute. I like to open the discussion at this point both on the schedule and on the general approach that we're taking with initiating with these groups and thank you, Steve, for including the part that I had left out about coming up with work plans that we'll then used to refine our overall schedule better in that, yes, notice that when I was talking about the leadership of these groups, we need to have some leadership.

There will be - there's already a leadership meeting going on between the chairs and the staff and sometimes the liaisons and that that meeting would also need to include the leadership of the subgroups.

But whether they're called repertoires, co-chairs, you know, what have you, that's up to the groups. We went into really try and be as, you know, bottom-up as they can be in terms of doing this so that they can find their own efficiencies.

So I don't see any hands yet. Are any comments on any aspects of this? And, (Jeff), of course, I don't know if you want to add anything. Steve, I see your hand up. Does that mean you want to add something?

Steve Chan: Yes, it does. Thanks, Avri. This is Steve, again, from staff. And I just wanted to note that in the sign-up forms for the subgroups, we had three volunteers for four of the groups for the leadership or repertoire or whatever names we end up with.

So for subgroup one, it was (Christie Taylor). For subgroup two, we had Phil Buckingham. For three there is no voluntary at and then for four, as (Rubin)

pointed out in the chat, he is volunteering as chief janitor for subgroup four.
Thank you, Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Chief janitor, that's what I meant about other titles that a group can pick if it feels that it is the appropriate title for the work being done. Great. So - and the way I would assume that (Jeff) and I will initiate these is that we settle on the first meeting.

And we can try and set the schedule for the first meeting, picking a slot as soon as we can on the mailing list. Steve, do we have or will he have - do we have the mailing list for each of these subgroups?

Steve Chan: Thanks, Avri. This is Steve again from staff. The working group mail lists are actually already set up. I've been added. I actually - I wonder if the secretary might be able to jump in and - so I'm not sure of all the numbers have been it already.

If you had, you would have received a confirmation email or a set of two. If you've chosen to join as a member, both the regular distribution list as well as notify the distribution list. But I can look...

Avri Doria: So if you're like me, that means it may have gone into a file folder that connects unprocessed email that you don't look at too often. So perhaps once we get the word out, and we'll use those lists to organize the first meeting.

I see a note from Kavouss that says some of us are involved in WS2 of CCWG. Is it possible to make arrangements with the team leaders of those nine subgroups to avoid to the extent possible overlapping?

It's certainly something I'm paying attention to since I'm in that situation. The steady-state two times - we've picked are different than the steady-state to times that the work stream two picked for doing its alterations.

Anybody that is in CCWG, WS2 will notice that we're borrowing a lot of their modalities in terms of setting this up, that I personally consider that both to be a superb example of how to set up these subgroup things and so to the extent possible, when they've got a modalities that I can feel, I do.

And, you know, that's what we've been working on. So at the moment, we've got off setting track times but, yes, we will need to keep some semblance of care. You know, it's one of those things that always brings out my desire for a global ICANN schedule but that's a dream. Okay, let me see what's...

Woman: Have we lost Avri or Steve because I can hear Kavouss typing but (that's all).

Man: Is there audio on this? All I'm hearing is occasional typing.

(Jeff): Yes, can you guys - this is (Jeff). Can you guys here me?

Man: I can hear you, (Jeff)...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Okay, sorry, I was talking on mute. I'm very, very sorry. All I could hear was the typing and such. Apologize for being on mute for so long. Okay, any other questions on this or are we ready to let this begin?

Okay, I'll consider that. Of course, we've got the list for further discussion. So I will move on. So on the competition consumer trust and consumer choice, we had talked to possibly (Jonathan) would be available. Is (Jonathan) available?

Avri Doria: Oh, thanks (unintelligible). So matter the floor over to you?

(Jonathan): Certainly. Thanks, Avri, and thanks, guys, for having me on the call. As we've had in several discussions about kind of the overlap between our two efforts, one of the centerpieces of that overlap is actually talking to people that apply for new strings.

And getting their sense of the application evaluation process and try to understand where the problems lie so that we might both make some recommendations for how to improve that process for subsequent procedures.

And so we are looking at a number of different issues with respect to the difficulty of applying, if you want an insider, for example, looking for the impact of GAC advice and early warnings and that process.

And, you know, again trying to understand why the - who applied and why, how they found out about it, et cetera, because we're also, in our group, trying to understand why folks from certain regions didn't apply.

And so we have that kind of going as a separate issue but some of that is getting answered here. So we're preparing to have Nielsen do a survey of all the people that applied for strings, whether they went all the way to delegation or not.

We've got questions for them and what we wanted to do was run that by you guys in case you wanted to add a couple of questions to the ones we came up with in lieu of doing a completely different survey.

I mean, it may very well be that you look at this and go, wow, we just need a whole different set of questions but if an end to the survey will help it to serve your needs, we wanted to put that in front of you before we put the survey in the field.

And that one of the questions that we will also ask is who's willing to have more detailed conversation, you know, after the fact, and so we'll have an

answer of folks that are willing to kind of discussed this with either your group or ours after the completion of the survey that we let you know about as well. So the question will be in there. But otherwise, substantive questions we were interested in hearing from you all. Avri, is that a hand up for me?

Avri Doria: Yes, that was just me putting a hand up because I wanted to make a personal comment about the questions when you're ready for those questions as opposed to just being in the chair slot.

(Jonathan): Oh, I see. Okay, I guess I'm ready. I mean, that's the notion. We're trying to put this in the field sooner rather than later and that's why I asked for a spot on your call to discuss it in case there was anything that we could do to be helpful to you. Avri, when you go ahead?

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. So - and you know, either you or I can run the queue. But I basically read this and thought of some questions and I was trying to think of questions that were pertinent to us but that, in some way, related to the specific audience that you had in the scope that it seems you're taking in terms of looking more at the past and the future.

So one question, though, I thought of, and it's one of the questions that we've been talking about or has been talked about, is would you apply, again, under the exact same AGB condition or something (else)?

It's basically, with the be willing to go through it all over again would be an interesting yes/no question because I think a lot of conversations that presume that there is one group or the other so it would be an interesting fact to have.

The other one I was thinking, which is similar to that one, and is kind of (neutral leaning) is, are there major aspects of the application process that you would want to see changed before applying again?

And then hopefully those would be people, if answered yes to those, those would be people that would be, you know, willing to be contacted for more. But those were two thoughts I had that I wanted to put in person.

(Jonathan): I think those are good thoughts, Avri. So, Eliza from ICANN staff, who's our data expert on our DCT team is also on the call here and we'll look at those as well and see about incorporating them or making sure those questions are part of how we ask others, et cetera. So we look at integrating those two, I think.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you.

(Jonathan): Are there other - yes, of course. Thank you. Are there other - I guess, it's not too long. I mean, if people want to - we can give you scroll control and just give you five minutes on the call right now if you haven't had a chance to. Does that make sense, Avri? Is that...

Avri Doria: Yes, that seems fine. Some...

((Crosstalk))

(Jonathan): ...exercise.

Avri Doria: Yes, some people say they can't hear me and we do have Susan Payne. So, yes, giving scroll control is a good idea and, Susan, please take the floor.

Susan Payne: Yes, thanks. Can you hear me?

(Jonathan): I can, Susan. Thank you.

Susan Payne: Oh, good. Excellent. They aren't particularly additional questions because I wasn't sure of the basis of which we're looking at this. But I did have some initial views I was reading it.

And they - it may be that it depends, to some extent, on what information it is you're trying to get from this but it seems to me that, for a few - for a couple of the questions you say, select all that apply - so, for example, number two, you say that.

But it seems to me that there are others where that would also need to be the case so, you know, how would you describe the TLDs you applied for? I'm assuming that you intended for it to be select all that apply but come I mean, it clearly needs to be because some applicants would just apply for various different types of TLDs potentially.

And then, when you get to somewhere around about nine or so, it - again, it may depend on how consultative you want this to be but, you know, if you're an applicant for what hundred strings, you probably received GAC advice from some of the - you might have received GAC early warning on some of them.

You didn't probably receive it on all of them. That would be the same for the picks, the challenges you face probably depended on which application you filed for, so on.

So I don't know whether you feel the need to have that kind of (constant state) but it seems to me that scope to build that it would be useful because people answers will be different depending on each of their applications they're talking about.

(Jonathan): That - so, Susan, maybe I'll stop you there. What you'll see is we decided to leave those is open ended questions to accommodate that very thing because it would get into a pretty long branch if we tried to turn those into quantitative questions.

Susan Payne: Okay. Okay.

(Jonathan): So the, yes, I received it will be binary but then it's going to open a text box for how did you respond? What was the impact of GAC (advice) on your application, et cetera?

Susan Payne: Okay.

(Jonathan): And so that's how we address that so I just wanted to make sure that made sense to you.

Susan Payne: All right, yes. Okay, that seems to make sense to me. Okay, and then going on to question eight, in particular, you asked about using consulting services or other outside firms can you may want to make a distinction between did you use a third-party is your backend provider or not?

Again, I don't know quite what - information you're trying to elicit here but some people may have used a consultancy in the backend - external backend provider in the backend provider probably gave them technical information in the consultant may be other information and it may or may not be relevant for you to know, you know, who is running the backend of their own registry and are needed someone else to help them with that.

(Jonathan): I mean, we know whether they're using the backend provider so I guess the question is whether or not we need to try to revise the question such that it would include advice from that backend provider as a form of consultancy.

Susan Payne: Yes.

(Jonathan): Because we already know whether they're using one. And what we're trying to get at is whether - one of the questions we're looking at is - and it's very difficult proving a negative type of question which is, you know, why people didn't apply.

And one hypothesis around not applying was not feeling sufficiently informed her, like, not feeling like an insider because you didn't have, you know, knowledge of trying to reach out to, you know, (Mike Plaige) or Jim Prendergast or some of these people - for some of the law firms that, et cetera - (David Taylor)'s firm, et cetera, to do this process for you and so the process itself felt intimidating as a result.

And so the idea that a successful outlook, there's some correlation between getting help and being successful in your application I think could be informative. So that's what we were going after.

Susan Payne: Okay. Okay. And then just one more comment. I think on 14...

(Jonathan): Okay, thank you.

Susan Payne: On 14, I think maybe it needs something at the beginning that says something like on the presumption that there will be further new gTLDs. And the reason I say that is just because as it is, some of the people responding may think that there shouldn't be further new gTLDs at all.

And if so, they might answer no to a question even though if they - if new gTLDs were going ahead, they may or may not (favor a round), if you know what I mean.

(Jonathan): I see.

Susan Payne: So assuming you want to get their views on - if they're on new gTLDs, do you think there should be rounds with some other kind of open process. I think you (should be) sure they answer that question and not a different one.

(Jonathan): Okay, that makes sense.

Susan Payne: And I'll stop now.

(Jonathan): All right, thanks, Susan. And I see Kavouss's recommendation in the chat to swap nine and ten and I think that that make sense as well.

Avri Doria: Okay, we have (Jeff) in the queue. Also I've seen a couple comments that I can't be heard. So I tried adjusting the volume. Again, I will watch the chat to see on whether I'm speaking to softly. I've also shut the air conditioner off in the background. Hopefully that will help. (Jeff), please take the floor.

(Jeff): Yes, thanks, Avri. And, actually, you sounded a little bit quieter so I'm not sure if you adjusted a lower or up. So actually my comment - there were a couple comments. (Jonathan), I think question 14, going back to what Susan said, actually seems out of place.

Because all the other questions seem to ask about the past and this one is kind of asking about the future. And there are different definitions of what rounds mean and I think it's one of those questions that is little bit too complicated to ask in terms of one question in the survey. I would actually...

(Jonathan): Well, I - go ahead.

(Jeff): Yes - no, no, so my recommendation would be there to define what you mean or put it sort of at the end after everything else. And then try to, like you said, define what you mean by round or - because in this case, it wasn't really a round. It's just - we had to start the process and had to and it because there hadn't been a process for nine years or whatever it was.

(Jonathan): That's right, so I mean, again, we left this is an open-ended question so just kind of get people's feelings on this. So it's not a quantitative question as much as it is an explanatory one that again, you know, might lead to further conversations after they fill out this survey.

And it's - I guess the question is worded in such a way as the kind of just open up responses because it's not - specifically talking about the past or the future but just whether or not they think rounds are an effective way of proceeding.

(Jeff): Yes.

(Jonathan): So, I mean, I guess we could sort of define that. I mean, if people just said no or something like that and didn't explain, I grant you, I'm not sure what we would do with that information but hopefully people will just share their thoughts if they felt strongly about it.

((Crosstalk))

(Jeff): Yes, so this was the subject of one of our questions that we sent out and we've gotten responses back from the GAC. We expect to get responses back from the registries which will, of course, include a number of the people that have applied.

Maybe it's one of those you kind of put a hold, we can see the answers we get, and then see there's anything you want to follow up on that as opposed to putting it in the survey.

I leave that up to you guys but that's something that we will certainly share with you, the response - well, with the public anyway. But we would certainly share with you the responses because we're expecting - have expected all of them back already but I know that there are some that are still working on it.

And I know that the registries have been working on it and have a lot of input from the applicants. So that might be something you might want to hold off on, is that question.

The other thing I would like to see here - I'm not sure the best way to word it. But there were changes that were introduced by the NCPC and the board that weren't necessarily as a result of the GAC early warning or GAC advice.

Or, you know, there were changes to the registry agreement. There were changes to the - name collusion was a change to that. There were certain people that applied for names that, you know, obviously weren't allowed to proceed based on, like, you know, dot home and dot corp and others.

And then there were changes of, like, not allowing closed keyword type registries. Those were changes introduced after the process began, not necessarily by the GAC although they had filed comments on alike others did.

So I didn't know if you wanted to incorporate questions on that in there as well since you talk about picks and you talk about the GAC changes, whether you wanted to talk about or get input from applicants on other changes that may have been adduced after you have submitted your applications.

(Jonathan): So, (Jeff), I think that's a really good point and I'm wondering if I could ask you to take a shot at constructing that into a question and shoot me an email about it. I think it's a good idea.

I wonder whether it's one question are multiple or if it's just, again, a chance to let people vent in a text box about that process since it's sort of different for a lot of them as opposed to being kind of a quantitative question to ask. Would you be up for trying to compose that into a question?

(Jeff): Yes. Yes, I'll try. Like, I haven't thought about whether it's one or multiple questions, just like you said, but at all kind of relates to some people's view of changing the goalpost after you start the process.

((Crosstalk))

(Jonathan): Right, of course.

(Jeff): Yes, what kinds of publications were introduced. And again, I don't know if you have any thoughts a round question as to whether you want to see the responses you got - we get - to see what you need to ask that question are not.

(Jonathan): Yes, I mean, I definitely know that it's one of the things that we put up as an issue of import and so I think we definitely want to see - and if you've got most of your answers in or something like that, I think that would already be interesting for us to see if we can.

So if there's some way to get the response of you got this far, I think we would be very interested in taking a look at them. We party circulated around the group the GAC responses that you got which was very helpful. So, I mean, maybe they can even share in partial form, responses are getting back from registries, I think that would be very interesting.

(Jeff): Yes, (one) can ask the registry members in this group but I believe that it should be filed I think this week, I think is the intent of the registries but maybe there are some others. I've actually been out on vacation so I'm not 100% sure of what that - when the comments are coming in. Thanks.

(Jonathan): Okay.

Avri Doria: Yes, this is Avri. We'll be asking the question in our next agenda item to see if we can get commitments from people in the various groups on one they'll commit or whether they are not going to.

Okay, I've got a list of three. I'll probably want to try and cut off the discussion after the three but, you know, if you've got some comment to make, please put yourself in the queue. So, Donna, I have the next. Please go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Avri. Donna Austin. (Jonathan), I'm sorry if I missed this but can you explain the first (part) of the survey that you're putting together for all applicants?

And also if we add - if this group as additional questions to it or would like to do that, does that take away from the intent of what you're doing and should are questions be separated from your questions? Thanks.

(Jonathan): Thanks, Donna, and I can answer some of those and I guess your last question is a normative one that I guess I don't have the answer to. But part of our review that is, you know, mentioned in a dependent clause sort of is to look at the effectiveness of the application and evaluation process.

And so we mostly talk about the review as a review of enhancements to competition consumer trust and consumer choice but we're also tasked with looking at the effectiveness of the application evaluation process.

And so we, you know, in her first meeting, kind of laid out the aspects of that, that the review team thought were most important for us to try and look at. And then included, you know, looking at why there weren't more applicants from the developing world.

It included looking at, you know, whether or not it was effective at preventing, you know, confusingly similar strings from being added. There was - and then a question about the - you know, the effectiveness of the process by which GAC participated in the application evaluation process.

Shouldn't it have been sooner and things like that? So - and then finally the results from a question raised about rounds. It's certainly the contention of some, and I realize that (Jeff), you know, subsequent meetings have come - developed far more nuanced views on this but it certainly the view of some that having around in a way that it was, was the route of many of the problems associated with the application evaluation process.

And so those were some of the questions that we're trying to look into and it occurred to us that one of the most effective ways of getting some of the answers, would be to just feel the survey to the applicants themselves.

And so we're just as interested in the ones that dropped out of the process and why they did so in trying to determine some trends there and figure out the answers to some of our higher level questions via the survey.

So that's our intention and - but we're also aware that you, in many respects, have a much broader mandate associated with the application evaluation process because you'll end up at least in theory, you know, changing the nature of the applicant guidebook.

I mean, you guys are more in the implementation role than we are. And so what I wanted to do was walk the line that you mentioned, Donna, which was open this up for additional questions.

If there were too many to make it too long, I mean, that's sort of the issue. But in this survey looks like it would be helpful for your intentions, and - (but for) three additional questions or something like that, I wanted to kind of make sure that we put it in front of you.

So I hope that answers your question. It could very well be that you need to do your own separate exercise because not enough of these questions hit on things that you're concerned about.

I know that both (Jeff) and Avri have mentioned as being backward looking instead of forward-looking and - so I think that we were looking at a finding space survey here and didn't do a lot about getting recommendations from applicants, but might do that as a function of drilling down with individual ones that expressed a willingness to do so. So that's what we're doing and that's why we're on the call today, Donna. I hope that's helpful.

Avri Doria: Thank you. We've got three people in the queue. I'm going to cut it off after Alan. Okay, so Karen Day, please.

Karen Day: Hi. (Jonathan), with regard to actually contacting the applicants, as you said, this is going to be very valuable for information from those that withdrew from the process.

Many of the applicants who used consultants to do their applications for them, the consultants were listed as the (contacts) on the application if the application has been withdrawn or for other reasons is no longer active.

How are you going to reach out to the actual applicants as opposed to their consultants because I think it would be important to get the actual applicant's input on this rather than the services provider?

(Jonathan): Thanks, Karen, and that's a really good point. And it's something that we will try to - you know, obviously we're aware that the contact information may be the consultants or service providers, (as) you said, and were going to do what we can to pierce that (veil) and get to the underlying applicants as well.

But as an initial pass, we're sending this out to the (assistant) contact information. Maybe, Eliza, it makes sense at the top to - since Karen raises that, I think it's probably smartest to actually make that one of the questions to - for us to gain an understanding of who, in fact, it is that is responding to the survey.

And that we can get a sense of whether we need to drill in further. So that might be a good initial question, Eliza, that we should try to incorporate so that we are in a position, then, to try and track down the underlying applicants to get the responses, as well, especially if the consultant feels that they're bound by some kind of confidentiality not to participate in a meaningful way.

So I think that's a good question, Karen, and it's one we're grappling with.
The - and will continue to grapple with it but I think you're right.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. I have Kavouss and then Alan. Kavouss. Are you on line, Kavouss? Are you unmuted?

Kavouss Arasteh: Do you hear me?

Avri Doria: I hear you now. Thank you.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, okay. Thank you very much. Just a question, I think at the beginning of all these questions, we need to make a general question saying that have you properly applied the procedures as contained in the applicant guidebook?

Because some of the questions you raised after, it depends on whether or not they have properly applied. So this is one question. And besides that, I suggest that, unless you have already gone through that, can we go through the question is a good, maybe, at least three or five (procedures) that are specific comments on that?

For instance, I have comments on 14 in question 15. But if you have done that before, I'll just (ask) my question in 14 and 15. If not, I suggest that we go through that one.

And I heard that - (Jonathan) saying that could you - that means the applicant - specify the effectiveness of GAC? How do you expect that an applicant talk about the affected us because it would be sort of the judgment without knowing the reasons whether the question is that GAC has been effective, is applying to your application are not effective. I don't think that that is a proper question. So, if you can clarify that are not. Thank you.

(Jonathan): Okay. Thanks, Kavouss. So I'm going to - I guess I'll just address your questions in order. The first one you said is a question at the top about did you properly apply?

And I guess I feel that that's a difficult question to answer because I suspect that an applicant is not going to say that they improperly applied. And if there was some kind of a ruling from ICANN that that was the case, then we already have that information.

So I'm not sure that we learn anything new from an applicant by asking the question that we accept maybe potentially putting them on edge. So, I mean, I - that's why I thought here, and that ruling was made by ICANN, we already know the answer.

And otherwise, it's not an answer. If it - if you're talking about a less technical version of that answer, I don't think they'll be able to answer. I didn't understand what you meant about talking about the questions in groups but I'm happy to hear your comments and questions 14 and 15.

So I guess I'm inclined to just come back to and - in a second and just hear your comments on those two questions. On your third question, we're not asking the applicant that - whether or not they found GAC advice to be effective.

That is the question we, as a review team, are being asked by the affirmation of commitments and now, I guess, shortly, the bylaws. So the - we're trying to figure out whether or not GAC participation in the application evaluation process was as effective as it could be.

And so that's a general question we're trying to grapple with, Kavouss, and so some of these questions are just meant to be inputs into that analysis by the review team.

They're not conclusions onto themselves and we're certainly not asking the applicants, do you think the GAC advice was effective? I hope that distinction makes sense. And if you would, I'd be happy to hear your comments on questions 14 and 15.

Avri Doria: Please, Kavouss, do you want to...

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, on the last question about the GAC that we, this group, would raise the question to GAC whether they have been effective, you need to give an example of their ineffectiveness, whether it is intentional or unintentional.

But, at least, we should not say you have not been effective or you have been less effective unless you provide examples saying that in this and in this area, it is assumed or is not assumed.

It is understood are considered that this has not been very effective and in that case, you should propose a sort of (a remedial) action that in the views of the group, this was the way that was expected that GAC should react. This is something that that should be done.

With respect to the question in a group, I said that would you like to go through questions one by one or in a group of five and five and so on, (to support) to see whether there is any view or any comment on that? If you have done that before, then I have some questions for 14 and 15, and you give me the (unintelligible) later on. Thank you.

(Jonathan): So, Kavouss, we're not going to go through them question by question. We just that everybody read the questions and so what people have been doing as just commenting on the questions that they have comments on. So I welcome you, right now, if you would, to give your feedback on 14 and 15 please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, my question on 14, (unintelligible) the question or the second part is that do you support another means - such as what, because you're talking about the rounds, whether putting around gTLDs (in an) effective (way) or not?

And you are asking what other means - such as what? That means one single round or such as what? This is a question about 14. And question about 15 is that, overall, how would you rate your satisfaction?

And the satisfaction of the applicant depends on the case. The case may be a reason for the dissatisfaction. For instance, there were (unintelligible) that had some difficulty, for instance, in GAC to properly agree with that.

So what you expect from the applicant saying that the satisfaction is this? I don't want to give a specific example and - but that - something is for years on the table of GAC and has not yet been replied. And you think the applicant will say that I'm dissatisfied with that without knowing the reasons and the argument of the people? Thank you.

(Jonathan): Thanks, Kavouss. So on your question on question 14, this is an open ended question and so another means is actually just invitation for people to suggest alternatives to the way that the first round of TLDs was handled.

So as you've had in your own meetings, there are number of more nuanced versions of these things. People have suggested, you know, two rounds a year or something, so that it still rounds but feels continuous and releases the pressure to apply before you're ready, et cetera.

So think it's just an open-ended question that we'll do our best to code after the fact that we wanted to give room for people to specify another means if they had their own theory.

As far as question 15, these are pretty general survey questions and it's about just sort of feeling like the trend among all the applicants about whether or not they were satisfied with how the process went.

Hopefully the other questions will correlate to their lack of satisfaction so we're not - we don't need to repeat the whole survey inside of question 15 but it's just an overall trend of whether or not the applicant, as a whole, felt like the process had been satisfying.

So I don't know, again, what will make of that answer but it'll be interesting to get a general impression of all applicants felt about the process and hopefully the responses that they provided and the rest of the survey will give some clues as to why or why not they were satisfied. All right. Thanks a lot.

Avri Doria: Okay, I have Alan next. Please, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Alan Greenberg. A question and then a comment to the PDP working group. (Jonathan), is this survey going to be anonymous or will he know answering it and can go back for further information, should we require it?

(Jonathan): Alan, that's good question. I - we're definitely going to include a question about whether or not people are willing to let us come back and talk to them. And so it might be - Eliza can speak up about what our intentions are to allow people to be anonymous if they want to be or - I honestly hadn't thought about that side of it, Alan.

So thanks for asking, but we're definitely trying to solicit, as a part of the survey, a willingness to discuss issues further, either with you or with us. And then I don't know. Is Eliza still on the phone? Is it a - is it our intention to make it anonymous for those who don't check that box?

Eliza: Hi, (Jonathan). This is Eliza. Yes, I'm on. So, yes, my understanding was that the intention was to keep their responses anonymous insofar as they wouldn't actually indicate who they're representing or which TLD.

Although I think from some of these questions you may be able to figure out who the respondents are and then, of course to have an option for those were willing to be interviewed, to provide their contact information at the end and (unintelligible) to go back to those with the visuals and do more in-depth interviews. But anonymity, at this stage, was, I think, our initial intent.

(Jonathan): Eliza, so then I have another follow-up question for you. And, Avri, I'm sorry, I'm taking over much more of your meeting than I intended. And we could take this off line if it gets extended...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: It's a substantive discussion. It relates to what we're working on so let's finish it up, but thank you.

(Jonathan): All right, thanks. Eliza, the - one of the things that I keep saying in this meeting is that there are things that we already know about some of these applications and we will lose the factual information in the context of an anonymous response.

And so - and we can take this off line but it may very well be that we need to supply some factual information on each of the applicants to Nielsen so that when they return the results they can include columns of the factual information about that applicant even if it's been anonymized, if that makes sense.

Not - you know, not - you know, about - I can't think of an example right now, but I mean, so there may be something we need to do to make sure that we have correlative data even with anonymous responses.

Not to figure out who they are but in order to look at some of the trends. So we can take that off-line. But it's a good question, Alan. So I think we're going to try to give people an option.

Maybe it will be an opt to - opt out situation but give people an option to be anonymous. But it is our objective to open up the doors of communication as much as possible. I hope that answer is helpful.

Alan Greenberg: Well, yes...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I'll just point out that in question number one, if you simply ask for number and don't give ranges at the top one perhaps being 15 and above, you're pretty well identifying a good number of applicants.

You know, so if you want that information to be valid, then probably you can't be anonymous or you have to group them together. The comment that was going to make is you started off saying that if we have a few questions we want to add, not too many, you know, so it doesn't double the length of this survey then we're free to do it.

I would strongly suggest that we try to identify some crucial things. From a very pragmatic point, you have funding for this survey. We don't have funding and the concept of working groups getting funding for things at this point is such that it we can get some information, what to do it. Let's not lose the opportunity.

If we went to do something larger ourselves later, we can certainly try. It may or may not happen but I don't think we should lose the opportunity of your offer. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And I see at least one checkmark on that. Before closing this off, I have been looking at the chat and I see one set of points that I don't think has come (up on) anybody's spoken points which was the question of - oh, what was it?

It had to do with (IDNs) and basically lost it. Okay, yes, there's the first part. Should this also include questions related to (IDNs) such as the process in deciding which languages they wanted to include in their TLD support and then their experience with (IDNs) and others which impact them?

And then it mentions the trademark clearinghouse. So I just wanted to get those read in. I don't know if I missed any other than I don't know if you wanted to give any response to that, (Jonathan), and if not (else), just, you know, sort of a closing bit on this.

I assume that you do invite people to contact you either by discussing it on our list or sending who their further questions, so if you could also cover that when we come back to you. Well, I'll come back to you now for closing on the questions.

(Jonathan): Thanks, Avri. I think that's a good question and I've seen additional questions here in the chat about contentions and how they're resolved, and as well, some even (Rubins) about voluntary picks.

So Eliza and I will go through this chat to identify things in addition to the ones that we've taken notes of your on the call and make sure that we get them. And, yes, I do invite you reaching out to us.

I think that, unless you have a process for reporting back discussions in your group in a timely way in terms of questions (we have raised in your meeting)...

((Crosstalk))

(Jonathan): That's true. We do. We have a couple, I guess. So maybe the liaison will be the way to do it because we - I think we're going to try to field this sooner rather than later. But Eliza has posted in the chat, as well, there's an email address to reach out to us directly at the - to the CCTRT staff.

And so you can use that address just to get a question to us and (Jeff) was going to take a shot at one of the questions that (he) had posed. Eliza, do you have handy when we were trying to - yes, (Carlos), that's just what I was about to ask. Eliza, will kind of deadline shall we set to get the feedback?

Eliza: Hi, (Jonathan). This is Eliza again. I - we don't have (a firm) deadline at this point but I think in the interest of trying to field this (questioning) sooner rather later, perhaps we could ask for comments by this Friday which is the 5th.

(Jonathan): Okay, that makes sense.

((Crosstalk))

(Jonathan): All right, folks, so comments by this Friday.

Avri Doria: Okay, fantastic.

(Jonathan): Thanks, Avri, for the time.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Want to thank both you and Eliza for the discussion, and members of the group for the discussion. And, you know, this is a good part of keeping coordination between the two groups so really I do thank you for your time and proceeding through the first part of our meeting waiting for this particular item.

Okay, seeing no hands, I will move on to community comment one, overarching issues, preliminary findings. I'm going to turn the floor over to Steve.

There are really two parts to this discussion at the moment which is, one, Steve has created sort of a framework for the responses to this section. So that's one part. I guess he'll do a quick walk-through of some of that. And then, also, just wanted to go through the list of those that we've received which is one.

But the list of those that we think are coming soon and seeing if we can get some commitment from the various groups on when they will (see). So I'll go down the list when we get there or perhaps Steve can and put you all on the spot. So, Steve, can I turn it over to you now?

Steve Chan: Sure. You sure can. Thanks, Avri. This is Steve again from staff. So as Avri mentioned we received a response from the GAC. And some parties have asked for an extension so I guess we'll have to consider doing that. But to - we actually send a reminder to the groups I believe last Monday I want to say just to remind them that the actual deadline we had suggested was 25 July. And then we gave them an additional week as we had not met last week. So we'll still work with hopefully you all can apply pressure as well we'll also work with our contacts to all try to push this along and get responses.

So I wanted to go through well before I do that I just wanted to remind folks that the document we'll be looking at right now is - was drafted by staff. So if there are suggestions, or perceived errors or whatever the case may be we certainly welcome feedback on that. And the other point I wanted to make is that we're obviously still waiting for CC1 responses from certain groups. So these preliminary findings can certainly be thought of as preliminary as we certainly intend to consider or fully consider the feedback received from the community groups.

With that I just wanted to go quickly through this just to hopefully help us take stock help us all take stock of where we are at this point. It certainly doesn't cut off further discussion on these topics but I think it would be - or the co-chairs and staff thought it would be good to provide a reminder of where we stand on the overarching issues. So I wanted to quickly...

Avri Doria: This is - if I can interject one second? When we come to questions on this I'd like to restrict on this pass sort of the questions of clarifications. I think that our next meeting is when we'll start doing the working walk-throughs of this. But I just wanted to say that as Steve - so as you're getting your question together please keep them to clarification questions. We will go through this with a fine toothed comb starting at our next meeting. Thanks.

Steve Chan: Thanks Avri. This is Steve just to ask a question. Your clarification from a staff perspective and as I mentioned we had drafted this so at least personally I would be certainly open to being told if there's any substantive issues where I've just gotten it completely wrong. I don't know if that falls under...

Avri Doria: I yes. I - that could lead to some very long discussions. Perhaps just note that someone's got questions and they want to discuss it further so that we can mark it for the next meeting. But I, you know, I understand and there's the list. But I just don't think we've got the time on this particular meeting to start going into substantive discussions on the point. I really just would really like people to get familiar with what's there and then move on to the discussions. They'll be plenty of time for us to tell you you're wrong.

Steve Chan: Thank you for the clarification Avri. This is Steve again from staff. With that we'll go through these fairly quickly then especially in the interest of time as we have not a whole lot of time left. So the first subject is additional new gTLDs in the future. In terms initial findings there is existing policy. And to this point the working group has not agreed upon a set of arguments or data points that would suggest the existing policy should be overridden to prevent

new gTLDs in the future. There's at least perceived demand as some folks have mentioned that they would intend to apply in the next round or whatever mechanism is used though there is data driven evidence that would be welcomed to validate those - that perceived demand.

So when example of where that information could come from is perhaps from the CCTRT survey or our own data gathering as well. So at least preliminary where we are in terms of anticipated outcome is the working group has agreed that there should be additional new gTLDs in the future. And so in terms of that there wouldn't be changes to the anticipated or no changes to the existing policy as it stands right now although we do anticipate additional information and data coming our way that could potentially effect that conclusion.

Seeing no hands or comments I'll move on to the next one which is in regards to categorization or differentiation of gTLDs. So for the findings the concept of categorization or differentiation was considered during the 2007 PDP. But it was ultimately deemed too challenging to identify differentiated processes and implement with really only hypothetical scenarios to consider at that stage.

So the thought was amongst the working group members was that the 2012 round provides some of those examples and helps provide a pathway for this working group to possibly to create those groupings and the resulting changes in the processes that would be needed. It was mentioned that Spec 13 was sort of a case study for differentiation. The purpose and usage of the TLD may warrant different application requirements evaluation - how the evaluation is conducted contractual requirements. So if and when the group determines that it wants to create group categorizations these - all these mechanisms will need to be considered and possibly adjusted.

One last point is that categories have differing levels of complexity. With some that may warrant consideration of carving out a discrete application

window. So preliminary the working group agreed that I think overall that they would think that categories would be beneficial but there's quite a bit of work to do identifying the specific categories. And this is a significant one but once the categories are determined what changes that will have with the application processes and as well as enforcement mechanisms that may be needed as a result of establishing different paths to obtaining a new gTLD. And so the thought was that with so many downstream effects or possible effects and a lot of these topics yet to come for this working group it might be good to place this topic sort of on the back burner until we get some of these more - some of these related topics. That's all I had for that one.

So moving on to the next which is future new gTLDs assessment rounds the concept of rounds was as a - result of Recommendation 13 from the 2007 final report. It was pointed out that many of the processes within the program such as the evaluation, objections, contention resolution these were all designed with rounds in mind. So if another mechanism was to be decided on these would all need to be revisited and made sure they continue to make sense the way that they're currently designed.

It was pointed out that rounds may have an impact on demand and market behavior. It's also been said that rounds are can be considered a unique mechanism in the ICANN environment when a lot of other things are accepted as they come up for instance RA registrar accreditation agreement. Although it's noted that gTLD strings are a unique and scarce resource.

The last point here is a round is not necessarily mean an application window and then or a recycle. It could also mean yearly cycles for instance where you have three months open for submitting applications and then the rest of the time perhaps taken for all of the other mechanisms like evaluation and strategic tension resolution. And then the following year you repeat and recycle.

In terms of anticipated outcomes it didn't seem like there was consensus on a direction here. So at this stage the staff considered it to be undetermined at this time. Again seeing no hands up move on to predictability or more specifically predictably should be maintained or enhanced without sacrificing flexibility.

So predictability was an important factor of the program. It was captured in the principles of the 2007 final report. The working group notes that there are a number of elements that have since the 2007 policy development and then as well the 2012 round there are things in place that promote and enhance the predictability or are intended to do so. Some of those things include establishing liaisons between the GNSO and other groups as well as encouraging early engagement. There's also new GNSO mechanisms that allow that body to provide guidance or perhaps to initiate expedited policy development processes. And this is even after the final report is adopted potentially by the ICANN Board.

It's noted that mechanisms that promote predictability should not be so strict that they stifle innovation and flexibility. And there's - so there's of course broad support for predictability as it benefits just about every party. And so the outcome perhaps should be to really identify the perimeters of predictability. And so in the anticipated outcomes I think it's been suggested that perhaps this working group might want to create a framework for predictability so - sorry just reading my own notes here.

Some elements of the framework could include determining what factors should be predictable for instance things like outcomes, time frames, input from the community public comment. And then also what the scope of acceptable levels of changes is and then how those changes would be dealt with. Again seeing no comments moving on to the next one its community engagement in new gTLD application processes.

So it was noted that community engagement is one factor that actually relates to the predictability topic that we just talked about. There are new community engagement mechanisms in place now that were necessarily present during the 2012 or 2007 development of the final report which includes the liaisons I just mentioned and then the also the GNSO mechanisms as well. It was noted that no matter how robust and inclusive the PDP and policy implementation process may be it's still likely that all scenarios will not be accounted for. And most importantly reliable and predictable mechanisms need to be in place to resolve those unforeseen issues. So preliminarily the thought is that there could be a framework related to committee engagement or perhaps it could actually be wrapped up into the overall framework related to predictability because it does seem to slot in quite well with that topic.

And so we have one last overarching issue. It is limited applications in total and/or for entity during an application window. So there were no limits imposed as a result of the 2007 final report. The scope of the limits at least in terms of the issue report was really envisioned to only pertain to a single applicant but that was expanded by the working group to also consider limitations on the total number during an application window. Some noted that limiting the number of applications per entity could be considered as anticompetitive. It was also noted that it limited the number of applications for entity could possibly allow for a more even playing field by spreading the allocation of a scarce resource.

It was also noted that applying application limits for an entity would be extremely difficult to implement and enforce and limits may cause unforeseen consequences. So the preliminary outcomes for this topic were that establishing application limits can be seen as anticompetitive and possibly contrary to the original principles of competition and consumer trust, et cetera. It was also seen that enforcing the limits is unrealistic to implement and therefore no policy recommendations would be envisioned for this topic. I think that's about it. I'm sick of hearing my own voice so back to you Avri. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. And thanks for going through it. I see no requests to make clarifying questions. I invite people to start discussing it on the list. Also the document itself is open for people to make comments. So I also suggest taking the URL there and, you know, starting to go through things and put comments and questions.

And in next week's meeting we'll start going through this in detail using the community comments that we have received as of that time making the deadline of Friday really quite important for initial consideration. It's not that other ones coming in won't be considered but it'll be far more difficult and far more troublesome to do so because it will start to take on the effect of being post-discussion. So it will need to be taking into account because of course they can come in later as comments but hopefully we'll have all of the content we need to start talking about this at next week's meeting.

So that brings us up to we only have 12 minutes left. So maybe I won't go through the list one by one because really we only have we have as I understand it we have registry saying that they are about to submit. I think we've had from one group NPOC that they will not be submitting their own. I have tried to find out for NCSG perhaps there's someone else from NCSG on the call to indicate when we were doing it.

I've sort of stood aside from NCSG doing it given my role in this group. But I have been nagging. I don't know if anyone else wants to give an indication of their projection of making it on Friday but if not I would just ask you all to try to get it to us by Friday. With that and seeing no hands I'll go to (Jeff) and the accreditation program.

Now we only have 11 minutes but we have no any other business at the moment. So I'd suggest that unless somebody has a burning piece of any other business we take any other business to the list and (Jeff) you can have the rest of this meeting should there be stuff to discuss the rest of the

meeting. And acknowledging up front that you have been on vacation for the last week so (Jeff), the floor is yours and welcome back.

(Jeff): Yes and thanks. And I also want to thank everyone for it seems like some of the discussion has already gotten started on the list. So I was glad to see that when I got back. I actually wanted to take a little bit of a step back just too kind of frame the issue because it seems like two weeks ago when we started talking about it there was some questions about process. And, you know, what we're really trying to achieve here and just making it clear what we're trying to do before we kind of go off the rails a little bit.

And so just to go back, you know, in thinking about this issue really the way I had thought about it or just issues like this where, you know, the working group or even work track teams may decide that there are certain subjects or high level principles which have general agreement within the working group or within the work track team or there may be certain subjects or principles that need additional or more specific detail prior to gaining agreement from the work track team or the working group.

I thought in their situations and where it would benefit how advice or expertise of subject matter experts that we should consider taking certain issues like this accreditation issue to request a creation of some sort of discrete ceiling consisting of anyone who is interested from that wants to work on it. But also trying to get ICANN staff and subject matter experts to consider those principles to make additional recommendations to go back to either the work track that was requested or if it's the working group as a whole that request it?

So I'm not I want to try to get away from using terms like implementation versus policy because then we get into all of these complicated discussions. But really it's where there are principles that may be agreed to by either a work track or the working group where it would benefit by having additional information supplied by subject matter experts, ICANN staff and others that are interested. So on something like accreditation programming it seems like

even some, you know, looking at the emails on the list and from the discussion previous discussions it seemed like there was a general agreement that having an accreditation program for backend providers may be beneficial in a number of different ways. And that if this is something that we do agree with then perhaps creating some sort of discrete team to look at these issues with ICANN staff and other subject matter experts may benefit the work track in this case because it's under work track one the work team one to consider the issue more fully.

So that's kind of the background as to what we were trying or my thinking's. So I hope that makes a little bit more sense than getting through this whole implementation versus policy discussions. And I know Donna this is something you kind of raised when we were asking about kind of the procedures to follow. So I just wanted to kind of throw it out first to see whether that makes sense. And then if so to just talk a little bit more about the substance. I know we have very little time left on this call. So it's something it's a subject that we do need to consider. And frankly it may be taken up by work track team one as one of their first items anyway.

Avri Doria: I see no hands.

(Jeff): Okay. Avri I don't think there's enough time to go really too much into the subject matter. Okay, Donna you have your hand raised?

Avri Doria: You have a hand. Yes Donna has a hand now. Thank you, Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks (Jeff) thanks Avri, Donna Austin. So (Jeff) I don't have any problem with, you know, the outline or the process that you've proposed. But I think on the accreditation issue I think there's – we're looking at it from a perspective of maybe this is something we need to clarify. We're looking at it from the perspective of any future round. I think we should also think about, you know, what are the other problems we're trying to solve with this as well?

So we understand that there's some challenges with, you know, switching out backend providers, you know, the process that ICANN currently engages in, you know, if you want to switch out your backend. But, you know, does that question actually fall within the remit of what we're doing with the subsequent procedures round? And, you know, how does that - how do those linkages work as well?

So, you know, I think it's good that we've started to put some mainly around the bones of framework but I think also, you know, accreditation can mean many, many things to different people. But I think it's understanding, you know, what else could it address outside of the process that we're particularly looking at here. Because I'm pretty sure that, you know, when we had this conversation at the GDD Summit, you know, the secondary issue while the main issue at the moment where accreditation is being discussed is that the challenges of switching out a backend operator at the moment that it is creating a lot of problems. So, you know, how do we incorporate that into the work that we're doing here which is supposedly about subsequent procedures? Thanks.

(Jeff): Yes, thanks Donna. And just to - from my own perspective unfortunately changing backend providers for existing TLDs does not fall within the remit of our group. However that said there are certainly and emails on the list certainly go to this as well. There's - they the two discussions can certainly benefit from each other.

And certainly thinking about an accreditation program can certainly benefit from the discussions already underway within ICANN about changing a backend provider and similarly the discussions from, you know, having this discussion within this group could certainly benefit ICANN so that they're not developing it in a silo.

So technically that issue of changing backend providers is not within our remit but certainly we can all I think we can all agree that they would certainly

benefit from each other which is another reason why I kind of wanted ICANN staff, subject matter experts, and this and the people within the work the working group to get into a room a proverbial room if you will to talk about these issues because I certainly think that neither one should be decided in a vacuum and certainly both can benefit from each other.

So the sooner we can create kind of this discrete team I think the sooner we can start talking about the subsequent procedures and getting ICANN staff involved. And I think the decision while not within our policy and remit will certainly benefit from our discussions. I think ICANN staff would benefit from our discussions. Does that make sense?

Donna Austin: Okay.

Avri Doria: We have Alan as a last hand on this discussion and then we'll close up. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I'm afraid I'm going to be a little bit negative. This is an important and an interesting discussion but I think it's secondary to what our main purpose is. So although I think we should make, you know, write a note to ourselves saying it should be addressed before we finish devoting resources to it right now before we've done some of the more crucial work I think is bad use of our overall resources and was not what we need to do right now to make programs. So I would shelf this till much later in this process. I, you know, it's perhaps something we can do and finish but I think it's a misuse of resources at this point. Thank you.

(Jeff): Okay. Thanks Alan.

Avri Doria: (Jeff) I'll give you the last word on it.

(Jeff): I'm sorry Avri you wanted to comment?

Avri Doria: No. I was going to say I'll give you the last word on it and then we'll close up the meeting.

(Jeff): Well yes so I appreciate Alan's view. It would be great to hear from others as well. And Alan perhaps maybe you can suggest on the list I know because we're getting off but perhaps some other items that you think are of a higher priority at least to what you would prioritize higher. Again one of my goals was to see if there were issues of general agreements which we could push towards working on further developing in parallel to the policy work that we do not all saved up for the end. But certainly appreciate your thoughts and would love to hear from everyone else as well.

Avri Doria: Great note to end on. I want to thank you all for being here for today's meeting. I was a little worried with 1 August that we would have very light participation. I see how wrong I was. So talk to you all next week. Hope to see some activity on the list. And we should start seeing email from us on the various subgroups in terms of getting them going over the next week. First thing will be trying to figure out when we hold the initial meetings. So with that I think you and enjoy the rest of your days and evenings. Bye-bye.

Woman: Thanks everyone, bye.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Today's meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop the recording and disconnect all remaining lines. Everyone have a good day.

Coordinator: Recordings were ended.

END

END