

**ICANN Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group
Tuesday, 28 March 2017 at 03:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on the Tuesday, 28 March 2017 at 03:00 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. Attendance may be found at:

<https://community.icann.org/x/6LDRAw>

The audio is also available at:

<https://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-new-gtld-subsequent-28mar17-en.mp3>

Michelle DeSmyter: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on the 28th of March, 2017 at three o'clock UTC. In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants online, attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room so if you're only on the audio bridge would you please let yourself be known now?

Great, thank you. And as a reminder to all participants, please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I'll turn the call back over to Avri Doria.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. And hello to everyone, and welcome to our first meeting after the face to face. And thank you all for being here. Okay so going through, that was the welcome, going through to the review of the agenda, first we'll do the SOI check, then we'll do a debrief on the ICANN 58 sessions, look for some work updates and especially just get views from people who

were there. It's kind of hard sitting in the chair spot to do (unintelligible) so it'd be really good to hear from other people how you thought it went.

Then we'll do a brief update on CC2 where it's at and it's getting distributed and such. Then the main substance of the meeting will be Item 5 which is the review of the recommendations from CCTRT. There was a – there was a brief discussion of it in our last meeting in Copenhagen, but we need to start taking a deeper look into it. And then finally just to talk about the CC1 status, the next steps, find out what's happening with any of the subgroups and how they're doing or whether they've gotten started or what we need to start them, and then any other business.

Does anybody have any other business at this point that they'd want to add? Okay, I'll ask again at the end. Is the agenda fine? Any amendments to it? Corrections? No? Okay, so we'll go with this agenda. Moving onto SOIs, does anybody have an SOI they wish to update before we go on with this meeting? Seeing none, okay, just want to remind everybody that if you do have a material change in your employment or circumstances around ICANN please update your SOI and please let us know at the beginning of a meeting especially if it affects this group and new gTLDs or anything like that.

Once again, want to check, has anybody joined who's just on the phone and not in the room? Okay, hearing none, we'll move on to the debrief. So we had quite a few meetings there, not only the major ones, the three hour, and we had meetings with GAC, we had meetings with all kinds of GDD and others.

So one of the things I wanted to do was just get each of the work teams to sort of go through and just give a quick update on did you catch anything, you know, were there any good indications? Was there something that'll move the work ahead or is there something that perhaps, you know, was a trouble sign ahead? Hopefully you don't mind me calling on your. I don't remember us actually talking about me doing this at our leadership meeting but if you'll indulge me.

Is there someone from Work Track 1 who would like to go ahead? Yes, Sara, please, thanks.

Sara Bockey: Yes, this is Sara Bockey for the record. Can you hear me okay?

Avri Doria: I can hear you fine.

Sara Bockey: Great. So, yes, so we had – we did some – well during the – sorry, during ICANN 58 we did a deep dive on a few topics. And so we had discussed the RSP program and clarity of application process and (unintelligible) and those are the topics that we'll be covering tomorrow when we meet at 1500 UTC for our Work Track 1 meeting. And so we're just going to briefly have a recap on what was discussed and see if we can do a little deeper dive on some of the topics that were raised and suggestions and ideas that came up during that.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. Any questions? Any comments? Anyone else pick up anything on the subjects in WT1 that they would like to feed back? Yes, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. Not necessarily on this Work Track 1 but overall I noticed that it seemed like the subsequent procedures and the next application window are seemingly getting much more interest than – so we may likely have additional volunteers participating and increased attendance because it's now starting to get, you know, now that the transition, the IANA transition is behind us, I think this maybe one of the next topics to garner some additional interest. So I think certainly we may see some new faces participate and, you know, hope that we won't have to rehash some of the topics we've sort of moved beyond, but I will say that I see much more interest.

And also want to encourage everyone to look at the calendar that we have, and so hopefully someone from ICANN staff could publish the link of that calendar again so that you can see about a month in advance what topics are

coming up in the next few calls to make sure that if you're interested in those topics or you know of others interested in those topics that you can show up for those.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks, Jeff. Yes, good bit of something. And in fact one of the things that we'll mention when we get to CC2 but I'll say it now and then say it again then is as those extra folks from your constituencies and your stakeholder groups look to get involved a great place to start them is on trying to answer some of the CC2 questions that we've got. And that will also help them get up to speed on issues that are being talked about.

Moving to Work Track 2, is either Philip or Michael?

Michael Flemming: Hello, Avri. Michael Flemming here. I will take the Work Track 2. So ICANN 58 was – we had a lot of feedback in regards to CC2 topics. Pretty much – some topics that we've covered up until now so hopefully with the CC2 will provide some additional input in regards to what we have covered, but more (unintelligible) that, my plans, or sorry, our plans for the upcoming two calls, rather than doing a recap is actually to keep heading in a new direction.

We will be looking at a continued – well (unintelligible) but we'll be looking at a continued discussion of closed generics. This is a topic that is very – has a lot that we need to look at, and we're going to be looking at the pros and cons and trying to look at the potential harm of what those generics might bring and whether or not there actually is any potential harm. So I look forward to having everyone on our call this Thursday at 21 UTC. Thank you very much.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Michael. Any other comments or questions anything anybody noticed about the Work Track 2 topics that they wanted to add at this point, really trying to make this as much a debrief as it were in addition to just an update that we always do. No? Okay, then we'll move to Work Track 3, and that's either Robin or Krista. I'm not sure – yes, Robin, please.

Robin Gross: Hi, can you hear me okay?

Avri Doria: I can hear you, thanks.

Robin Gross: Okay, great. So at our last meeting just before ICANN 58, we finished up the string confusion objections and the string similarity issues. We introduced the topic on community applications. And so at our next meeting on April 4, we're going to dive right deeply into community objections and discuss the community applications and community priority applications. So that's what's coming up next and that'll be about a week and a half discussion according to what we got planned for that.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. Yes, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Actually this is Jeff, I'll yield to Karen and then if I still have a question I will go after her, but I will yield to Karen.

Avri Doria: Oh yes, I got it backwards with the names before. Yes, please Karen. Karen? Am I the only one that doesn't hear Karen? Karen, I don't think we can hear you. I don't know if you can hear me. You may be having trouble with your phone? No, nobody can hear you. For a while I thought I'd lost connectivity again.

So, Karen, if you can hear me please type – you're typing. And, Jeff, you may want to – do you want to wait until Karen types or do you want to go ahead with your – she says go on, Jeff, she will type her update.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, sure. One of the things coming out of ICANN 58 especially with the governments was certainly an increased focus on the European Union's commissioned study on communities. And so I think we – there were a number of recommendations that came out of – within that report. I'm not sure if those recommendations have full support of the governments but

certainly I think we should do a little bit more of a deep dive into those recommendations to at least respond to them as I'm sure that the governments will expect that we address the – what's in that report.

I will say that it also came out that, you know, there's been additional interviews done for those reports and it seems to be focused on some of the applicants that – not – or that are still waiting for delegations so – or even before that, waiting for selection, they're still in the review process or the accountability processes.

So I think that CC2 questions with regard to communities and experiences which went out to not just – which are going out I guess to all applicants, hopefully soon, we'll get an update on that, they'll be able to type in their experiences. And I think Karen just reiterated that in the chat. So topics of interest from both the PDP session and the GAC of the community applications and the reports that I just referenced. And after Work Track 4, Avri, if you could make – just give – or we both should give an update on the Geo names what's going on with that.

Avri Doria: Yes. Okay, thanks. And one thing I would want to add on the reserve names side is I'm remote attending the IETF this week and the discussions continue going on about their special names and delegation for their special names. So at one point I'll want to bring that subject into our discussions to make sure that we've looked at that particular issues. I don't want to get into the details now but I just want to mark that as an issue.

And, Karen, I apologize for not remembering which group you were one of the co-leads of. Scrambled brains this evening. That's right, that would be for especially – well it's hard to be sure where that one will fall but anyway. Okay so it would be 2.

Okay moving on to Work Track 4, which is either Cheryl or Rubens. I don't see Rubens's name so Cheryl, can you comment?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I certainly can, Avri. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And Rubens and I didn't feel that there was any particularly new revelations coming out of our discussion with the plenary on Work Track 4, but it did reaffirm the work team views on the topics which included IDNs, the financial and technical checks and of course name collisions, which we are the last one, name collisions, we are going to be continuing to work on in our call next week.

One thing I did want to mention, however was that we were quite, I think, happy to have some of our CC2 questions edited and pruned down, I think that was a very worthwhile exercise. And I think that will make it easier for people to respond to our Work Track 4 questions in CC2. And also that we took the opportunity with my attendance, along with Avri indeed, at what was called the Asia Pacific APAC space, which is a meeting of all stakeholders out of Asia Pacific and Oceania that we have at face to face meetings and intercessionally.

And at that, while Avri was encouraging more people to join all the work tracks, I did make that point that of course if you have interest in IDNs, which one would assume a larger number of people out of the APAC Geo region would have, that they're more than welcome to join us in Work Track 4. And I think that's it from Rubens and I. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thanks. Does anybody have any questions or extra comments or anything they've noted with regard to Work Track 4 at the meeting? Okay, hearing seeing none. As Jeff mentioned, I'll start off that the Geo names at the top level when we were able to keep the discussion about the top level, was something that got talked about quite a bit in Copenhagen, and we're well on our way to organizing a special session on that in – excuse me – in Johannesburg and in preparation for that, we'll be having a webinar I believe it's the – is it the 27th or the 25th? I'm not really great about remembering dates, like tonight I'm not really great about remembering anything.

But at the 25th, thanks. And before that we've put out a call for expressions of interest both of people that plan to attend so that we can figure out how big a room we need and we'll be doing this twice, but also for people that have a issue to present, a solution to present, an argument to present on Geo names so that hopefully we can get everybody sort of understanding all the different points of view there are on the (unintelligible) before we get to Johannesburg.

So there's been a call that's come out. Please, if you plan to attend it, sign up and if you have a position on these, especially a well-formed position, please volunteer to put together one of the presentations. Jeff, was there anything you wanted to add on it? Emily has put the URL for the webinar in the chat. Jeff, was there anything you wanted to add on this?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Avri. This is Jeff Neuman. I would just add that we need to be very clear with whoever we talk – that we're talking about the top level, as Avri was clear in her explanation, there certainly was a lot of discussion between the GAC and the GNSO and the Board on second level geographic designations. And certainly that made their – within the GAC communiqué, very controversial. We are not talking about that, the second level, we are only talking about the top level.

So Avri and I and others, ICANN staff, we have our work cut out for us to make sure that the webinar is not – both webinars and the face to face are not hijacked, if you will, to discuss the second level issues. And that's not to say the those issues aren't important, they are, but we really want to keep focused on the top level for these particular sessions as they relate to the next application window.

So if you haven't seen the invitation go out, or haven't sent it around to your different communities, please look at what Emily has posted and send it out to everyone. Everyone's invited to submit a contribution and we had heard some rumblings at the ICANN meeting toward the end of it, some groups didn't feel like they were specifically invited, and we're not going around

specifically sending invitations to anyone in particular, it's to everyone. And so anyone that wants to add to a contribution, they can.

Obviously if we get, you know, a huge amount of contributions that are all similar, Avri and I and the leadership teams will work on making sure that all of the views are presented during the webinars in the best possible way. So please, go out to your communities, talk about this, it's really especially for Johannesburg, it's going to be an actual working session to try to come up with some sort of go-forward compromise position. So we're going to try it out and hopefully it'll work and it's through multistakeholder bottom up kind of session. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thanks. One thing I want to add to what Jeff just said, it's everybody's invited, nobody is on a list of names that we're going to go out and invite specifically. However, if you run into someone who basically seems that they absolutely need a personal invitation in order to be able to submit and I have encountered people over time that don't like just having group invitations and need a personal, so if anyone that any of you believe should be making one of these presentations and isn't volunteering, please let either Jeff or I know and we'll reach out to them, you know, just sort of saying, hey, would you like to submit?

So while we're not going to do that in any specific sense, if there's any possible presenter that needs that bit of encouragement, please let us know so that we can do it. Anybody else want to add anything on this Geo names? I guess another thing I want to add, while this one will not be about second level names, I am not sure that at the end of the day not in Johannesburg but beyond, we will completely escape that subject.

Anyone have a comment? No? Okay, in which case I can move on to CC2 status. I'll start and then I'll ask either Emily or Steve or Julie probably Emily, since she's been handling it for the last week, to fill in anything I've left out.

So the initial distribution was sent out the way we've been doing – we did for CC1, basically to SO, SG, I mean, AC, stakeholder groups and constituency leaders and a comment period has been opened. But basically took both approaches on this one to make sure that we got as wide distribution.

This – that we have reached out to the Global Stakeholder Engagement people to help us both with making sure that the questions reach as wide an audience as possible but also the news of the webinar. And there's a translation ongoing at the moment on the CC2 questions. And once those translations are done, those too will be added to the comment period.

Emily or Steve, or Julie, anything you want to add to that? Okay, oh yes, thank you, Emily. I see your hand.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Avri. This is Emily Barabas from staff. Just a couple of more things to highlight. We're also promoting CC2 as well as the Geo names webinar in the regional newsletters to try to get some geographic diversity in our responses and also in our attendance to the webinar. And we'll be sending out – I think this was mentioned at the beginning of the call but we're going to be sending out a notice to applicants from the first round about CC2 hopefully at the end of this week to invite them to respond and share their experiences about the application process.

And I think that was everything, just checking my notes. Yes. Oh and also just general promotion through social media channels and websites throughout ICANN to make sure that people know about both the webinar as well as CC2. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. And yes, I had forgotten to mention about the 2012 applicants. Thanks for bringing it up. Yes, Jeff, I see your hand.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I just wanted to thank ICANN staff for getting this done so quickly and, you know, I think the work we've done has been incredible. So I just want to

thank you guys for getting that out so quickly after the meeting and then to encourage everyone to go back to their stakeholder groups, constituencies, advisory committees, supporting organizations, and please make sure that they respond. It's not short questionnaires, as you all know, but please, you know, if you can start spreading the word about preparing a response to this, that would be fantastic, as the responses are due around May 1.

So that seems like a lot of time but that'll catch up with everyone. And then also to remind everyone that if a certain subject does not impact your group then you don't have to respond to it; don't feel like you have to respond to every single question. Thanks.

Avri Doria:

Okay, yes, thank you. And short answers are fine. You know, so if you only have a short answer don't feel that you need to write an essay. Okay, any questions about CC2, any other comments on the CC2 update? And really do thank everybody, you know, the Work Track leaders, especially for gathering the questions and for being really quite, quite pleasant about massive editing that was done over the period to get them out and very much appreciate the effort that they put in as well.

A lot of effort went into those so hopefully a lot of effort will go into answering them. And I really meant, if there are people that you want to bring into this from your constituencies, stakeholder groups, advisory committees, or supporting organizations, please it's a great place to start them on basically answering those questions especially if they have the knowledge of what's pertinent to your own particular group.

Michael asks, "Have any comments been submitted yet?" I don't know, I wasn't optimistic enough to go check. Never even occurred to me to go check yet. I'd be surprised. But I can check during the next part of this.

Okay, if there's nothing else on CC2 move on to Item 5, which is the review of recommendations from CCTRT. And we had a set of perhaps 10. Steve says

no comments have been received yet. And I'll turn it over to Jeff now who charitably offered to take this section of the meeting. So, Jeff, the floor is yours.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. It's Jeff Neuman for the transcript. And I believe we have some PowerPoint slides to display as well? Should have it on there. So while that's coming up, just to remind everyone the CCT Review Team was chartered under the old Affirmation of Commitments, and which is now subsumed into the Bylaws about looking at consumer choice, competition, trust and also to look at issues on the application process.

So ultimately they came out with their interim report with a number of recommendations either for future items for ICANN as an organization to act on or future work that needs – that they're recommending being done by either our PDP group, the Subsequent Procedures or by the RPM, the Rights Protection Mechanisms Policy Development Process Working Group, and then a few recommendations which they put out there which they weren't sure who would be addressing those items.

And on those specific items, we are going to have a call with – we being the leadership of this group will have a call with the leadership of the Rights Protection Mechanisms to come up with some recommendations to take back to our group as to who we think – which PDP group should tackle those questions.

So for this call, what we're going to do is similar to what we did at the second or at the working session, the second to the last day I think of ICANN 58, just go through the recommendations.

Now hopefully everybody's read the entire 100-page report, to go through the recommendations not – sorry – go through the recommendations and it's the intent of this group to basically submit a comment to the CCT Review Team, not on the substance of the recommendations in terms of how we feel about,

you know, whether there's competition, consumer choice, etcetera, but more on the work that was delegated to us or we believe should be delegated to us whether we have any clarification questions or just an acknowledgement to say yes, we think that that's a good question and that's either something we've already begun looking into or that's a good question, that's not something we have started to look into but something we can look into.

So with that background let's go to the next – or I don't know if everyone's got control of the slides or if you want – yes, okay. So it's fine if everyone has control if ICANN wants to just – staff, if you want to give everyone control that's fine.

So the first one that was given to us was – or recommended for us was Recommendation 10, and (unintelligible) actually going back and forth between the hard copy that I printed out in the old fashioned way and the – so oh one more thing is that CCT Review Team has prioritized each of the recommendations in kind of either two ways.

Either it's prioritized as a prerequisite meaning that this question or this subject needs to be addressed before we could open a new application window, or on a priority level, and the way that they set the priority levels was that if it was a high priority, then their recommendation is that – that that be implemented within 18 months of the issuance of the final report. If it's medium priority it's within 36 months; if it's low priority it just needs to be implemented prior to the next CCT Review Team.

Now with those high, medium or low, what's been said in the report is that it's not a – none of those are prerequisites starting the next application window. Okay, so with that said, Recommendation 10 is a recommendation of considering the costs of defensive registrations for the small number of brands registering a large number of domains. And basically considering how those costs could be reduced.

So this was an interesting one in that it was recommended to either our group or the Rights Protection Mechanism. And according to the discussion we had in Copenhagen, while certainly the Rights Protection Mechanism Working Group deals with the issues of rights protection mechanisms themselves, pricing and costs related to registration may not be something that's within their purview.

So my guess is that that group will probably try to give us this recommendation. And so this recommendation, again, they're focusing on – when they were looking through the sunrise processes and just registrations in general, that although there were not many sunrise registrations there certainly were a small number of brands that registered in a large number of TLDs. And so this was an issue that they wanted us to see if any policy needed to be developed on ways in which those costs could be reduced.

Michael says in the chat, “Will we be assigning these recommendations to individual Work Track or working group or just the full working group?” Great question, Michael, don't know the answer to that yet, in fact, these are just interim recommendations so they're not final yet. So if they look like they will be final recommendations I think that's a great issue for us to consider going down that path.

And it may be a hybrid approach whereby if there's certainly a topic that's specific to one work track it may be given to that work track but if it's an overall issue then they might be something we address at the full working group level. So no real answer to that, sorry, at this point.

Okay, any other questions on this recommendation? Does anyone feel like we should ask for any clarity on this question? Okay, not seeing any I'll go onto the next one. Recommendation 14 was a – or is a recommendation that basically says that incentives should be created to meet user expectations regarding the relationship of content on the gTLD to its name, restrictions as to who can register a name in certain gTLDs based upon five measures –

sorry, messages of trust (unintelligible) especially in sensitive or regulated industries and the safety and security of user's personal and sensitive information.

This was listed as a prerequisite. And just to go into the use of the word "content" which makes a lot of people nervous, according to an explanation from Jordyn at the group, (unintelligible) contents what it means is that, you know, is the domain name registered in the TLD, is it really related to the TLD itself? So are, you know, names being – is there any kind of incentive for entities to – that are within that industry or niche to register within that TLD?

And so one idea they threw out there was in theory you could have lower application fees, or TLDs that commit to having certain restrictions or verification, etcetera. So this was something that they wanted our group to look into. So Michael, you had your hand up, was your question answered? Assuming it was answered. Okay.

So this is an interesting one in that I'm not sure from a policy perspective we can necessarily have types of incentives but it's certainly something worth considering. And there's more background, if you read the full report, a lot of this came out of the – I want to say the Nielsen study, I think it was from the report that basically said that more TLD – content in the TLD was related to the string itself, more trust the public had in that top level domain. So (unintelligible) saying certainly high level of trust because of the restrictions put in place upon the – who can register a domain and enforcement and other aspects of it.

In the – for the third element to this, the safety and security of user's personal and sensitive information, there is a note in the text about looking at things like the new – what you call it, the new – (unintelligible) regulation which the name of it is escaping me right now so there's some notes in the actual text to look at that as well. Just reading the comments, okay, and the text. How

much of this can we can do from a policy standpoint is from Michael and (unintelligible) restrictions and level of trust.

Great, and Avri, if I'm missing anything in the chat, (unintelligible) or anyone to interrupt and...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. So...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...you have a comment from Donna saying that she's not sure that it is possible to – and then it's quoted "create incentives to encourage such things." So...

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Donna. That's a point that I shared with the review team as well. You know, especially from a policy perspective, and the only thought that they had come up with, and this is in the full report as well, is providing some sort of monetary incentives of lower fees or something for those TLDs that have restrictions, but, you know, I'm not – that's something that we'll talk about if this recommendation does in fact come to our working group.

Avri Doria: If I can add, this is Avri, if I can add, while it may not be possible we will have to have a good response as to why it's not, and we'd have to discuss it. This is the kind of thing that very much concerns me going forward that any of these things that we look at and say no, that's not something we're recommending in the policy because we really need to make an effort to be quite clear and explicit about it in any final report. Thanks.

And...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Michael, you're up.

Michael Flemming: I was going to let it be but I think that while we're talking about it a bit more I just wanted to kind of quickly point out that the way some of these recommendations are written, some of them use wording, so there are others are more of a direct – a direction or like an order, if you will, but I guess that's the right English word for it. But in that sense I think we need to be very careful about when we look at these and dissect these we need to communicate what our – what we can do with each recommendation and whether or not that's a consideration or if we actually have to do something or we have to act upon it.

I think how we need to – how we respond to these recommendations I think it would do well to better communicate that to the full group. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Michael. That's – this is Jeff Neuman – that's a great point. And so I do agree that we should figure out what expectations are of the CCT Review Team as to whether they want us to consider these things or like this one, Number 14, is written in a very script view, you should – you must create or you should create incentives to encourage. So that's a good point that we should go back to them and get their view on whether this is an instruction or whether we could consider the issue.

Greg, please.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan for the record. We might want to consider having someone from the CCT Review Team come and talk with the group and go over kind of some of the thinking or perspectives behind some of these recommendations. You know, divorced from any kind of underlying logic, they kind of lose – they seem rather unmoored or abstract, you know, and just trying to think about this myself, you know, why does this make sense? Why would anybody say this? You know, is kind of – goes back to the idea that,

you know, what they were looking at was, you know, consumer trust, competition, and the like.

So presumably this has some basis in improving those things or in, you know, findings that this is the way that things are falling short. So I think before we just kind of reject things out of hand we have to kind of, you know, I think get some idea ideally from the CCTRT kind of how they arrived at these, why these make sense and – because there needs to be kind of a dialogue and kind of tossing recommendations over the wall at us and us tossing back responses back over the wall is probably not the best way to deal with this. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. Thanks, Greg. Just to note, I think Jordyn from the CCT Review Team was in the working session, and I know there were a lot of conflicting meetings at ICANN. I'd encourage everyone to go back and just read the transcript from the Wednesday afternoon meeting, I think it was Wednesday, not Thursday, but someone can correct me, go back to the transcripts, read those. And then there also is good background on each of these – not necessarily the questions themselves but background on why they're asking some of these questions in the full CCT Review Team report.

I know it's really long and so I know it's – I know it's a little daunting to read it. There was some pretty good background. So, you know, let's make sure that I'm not disagreeing with the point of having a separate session with CCT Review Team members and possibly maybe even for the next call, but just to make sure that when we do go into that session that we've read everything so we're not just pretty much asking them questions that we have the answers for. So if ICANN staff – let's see if we can get some potentially for the next full group call just – Avri, I see you're on the...

Avri Doria: Yes, this is Avri speaking. A couple things on this, and thank you for mentioning that people should go and read the parts of the report because they do go into more detail. I just wanted to remind us of the stages, I mean,

at this stage, we're looking at questions and asking them to clarify. We will have a chance to respond to the questions when they come out with their draft.

And I think at that point I would actually say that that would probably be the better point to have the in depth discussions while we're developing responses as opposed to now while they're still developing the questions. But, you know, perhaps having one at our next meeting is good. But certainly having one after they've come out with their draft is good.

We also need to remember that their report doesn't go to us but it then goes to the Board that has a certain obligation to act on it and the Board's action on it will be sent down, I assume, to the GNSO and to the group. So there's still a couple more stages that this goes and a couple more stages where we can comment. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Avri. And I'm hoping by the time that this report is made final that, you know, for anything that we – any work assigned to us we should start that work even before the Board acts on it for many of the questions. So moving on to the next recommendation, sorry, is there any other – okay, so the next recommendation, which is Recommendation 33, now I've read this recommendation a number of times, I've actually, you know, read the report, background on this a number of times, and I still have questions on this one. I don't think it's very clear at all as to why our group would be doing this.

But I think what we're trying to get at it from reading the report as well as from the previous discussions, and background on this section, is that they're trying to basically – there's a theory out there that says that those TLDs with restriction would have in general more trust with the public than those that do not have restrictions. And that's both the perception from the subjective level as well as from objective level of the registrations that are in there.

And so they would like – they would like to see (unintelligible) comparing those. I'm not sure that again that that's – the selection of data is something that we would be in a good position to do. It's sent to all of the group so it's ICANN, the next CCT and both PDP working group. So this one I know I'm going to probably write with clarity – clarifications questions on this as to what the expectation again is, but there's not a prerequisite but it is something that they would like to see addressed within 18 months following the date of the final report.

So just looking at the chat, okay, I see Greg has mentioned that this recommendation is sent to everyone and Trang says I believe this recommendation requires ICANN to collect the data and provide it to the working group. The timing may not make sense or the priority level may not make sense. So that's certainly something that we can and should be asking question on.

Okay, any other questions, comments, on this one?

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Okay – oh okay, so while typing is going on I'll go onto the next one. Okay so Donna says it's a tough one to get (unintelligible) on. Okay, yes, Donna, I agree with that as well. Okay, Recommendation 34 is – it says to us, but I thought that was more – oh sorry, I'm going to my hard copy. Yes, it's your group included so it's basically repeat and refine the DNS abuse study to determine whether the presence of additional registration restrictions correlate to a decrease in abuse in the new gTLDs as compared to new TLDs that lack registration restrictions as compared to the legacy TLDs and as compared to legacy TLDs.

This one is high priority and I think in terms of the provisions – the background of the section that they refer to it's really Specification 11 and it's not just the new restrictions that are like for what you would think of as a

restricted TLD, it also includes the extra quote, Category 1 restrictions that are in certain TLD agreements, whether that's actually increased the security and having those safeguards has reduced any kind of abuse in the new gTLDs.

Looking at the chat, (unintelligible) going on. And, yes, some of these just say PDP working group and so they – it's a question as to whether it's us or the RPM group, we didn't necessarily know. I would think this one because it's not dealing with rights protection mechanisms, it was probably intended for us because we certainly will try to confirm that for the final recommendations.

So then we go on to Number 35, which is basically collecting data on the costs and benefits of having restrictions and those costs and benefits would include costs to compliance, cost to registrars, costs to registrants, and then, you know, comparing those to existing TLDs and then looking at the new gTLDs that have voluntarily included verification and validation requirements. This is not a prerequisite, it is a high priority and so I think that again I understand for this one why ICANN and future CCT Review Teams are being included on this.

It's comparing the selection of data as this recommendation is – I'm not sure whether that's really something that's intended for us. Potentially the analysis of that data and whether to have restrictions might be for us but (unintelligible) collection of data wouldn't really be meant for us so I think we should ask a clarification question in mind with what Michael was saying is, you know, what are the expectations for our group. If we take on this recommendation.

Avri Doria: And Trang makes a comment that all of the data collection is directed at ICANN Org.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thank you, Trang. Moving onto Number 36, this one talks about – or getting public comments on the impact of the gTLD registration restrictions

and competition, so to include whether these restrictions have created undue preferences. I mean, going back and reading these recommendations, this (unintelligible) to be the registration restrictions that are included in Spec 11 namely the restrictions with regard to sensitive strings or sorry highly regulated strings.

And so reading the background it seems to refer to those types of strings but we need to do some research the term undue preferences came out of the GAC communiqués in Beijing, Buenos Aires, and Singapore, I believe, they use this term but when they use this term from those communiqués – when the GAC uses those terms, it usually refers to an undue preference in favor of certain registrants or in favor of certain registrars. So that’s really where the competition comes in.

So what is the impact – so I think it’s asking what is the impact of new gTLD registration restrictions on competition to include whether these restrictions have caused TLDs to favor certain registrars or certain registrants unduly meaning without any good reason. And that’s – I just got that background more from reading the communiqués.

Avri Doria: There’s a comment...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yes, a comment from Kristina that says Rec 36 seems inconsistent with Recommendation 14. Am I misunderstanding?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, so in this one, this is Jeff Neuman, it’s a good question. So in the – in Recommendation 14 it was looking at meeting expectations of trust whereas this recommendation by undue – the word undue in this one refers to the communiqués from the GAC about creating basically unjustified – I would use the word “unjustified” instead of “undue” so whether it’s causing registries to unjustifiably favor certain registrants over others or unjustifiably favor certain

registrars over other registrars. So the way is that having an impact on competition.

So you're right, Kristina, it's very – we'd need some clarity on this. It took me a couple steps to reread the report and to reread some of the communiqués to get that (unintelligible) Board undue, so I think we should verify that my interpretation there is consistent with what they were thinking because I could be completely off. It wouldn't be the first time, but the word "undue" is used several times in communiqués from the GAC.

Okay, on – we need more clarity on what – sorry, this is from Greg Shatan, "We need more clarity on what more restrictions on competition are." Yes, so thanks, Greg. And again, this I think refers to the notion of certain TLDs – I think behind the GAC communiqués in Beijing and Singapore and Buenos Aires potentially, it was – I think the GAC was worried about these restrictions in top level domains that essentially created closed TLDs which favored registrants – certain registrants over other registrants that were unjustified or there was no real good reason to have those.

So that I think the background (unintelligible) I think a lot of clarification as your comments, and others, point out, is needed on this one. And this one is labeled a high priority. Now 38, Recommendation 38 is dealing with the – it's the voluntary PICs and the background for this one, which is a prerequisite, which was explained by Jordyn and some other members of the CCT Review Team, was that the CCT Review Team was trying to evaluate the PICs and whether they had any – increase in – I'm sorry – whether they have any relation to increasing the trust of the TLD or the competition.

And because they didn't understand the rationale behind why certain TLDs had agreed to these PICs, that they couldn't really determine whether these PICs would affect. Now putting aside that many TLDs have (unintelligible) these PICs, because they felt like they were forced to otherwise the GAC

would provide advice, they were afraid the GAC would provide advice rejecting their TLDs.

Putting that aside, I think between this question and the next one, which is 39, really go out – to the extent that we do have PICs or something like PICs in the next application window, which is a big assumption, if we do have that, that we should make sure that there's – if you look at Question 39, that there's enough time so that those PICs can be reviewed by the community and the GAC so that objections could be filed or the GAC could provide advice. And there's enough time.

But also to provide a mechanism so that the PICs could be reviewed by the next CCT Review Team so that this would be, you know, not only these are my PICs but, you know, why I have – I'm having PICs, and this is why I think these PICs would address whatever issue it's meant to address. So that's what I got out of reading the report and also in discussions from the CCT Review Team.

These are prerequisites so to the extent – and I clarified with CCT Review Team but we should probably do this in writing, they're not mandating that we have quote, PICs, in the next application window and beyond, but if we do have something like PICs, then these two recommendations should be followed. If that makes sense.

So Kristina says is the CCT effectively recommending that voluntary PICs should not be permitted? If not included in the original application? Kristina, that's a really good question. I don't think they're recommending that. In fact, there's another – there's another (unintelligible) CCT Review Team recommendation but is a question submitted by the GAC and one that we do need to consider is what if there is advice that's provided, is there a way to amend applications to address that as opposed to putting the GAC in a position to just accept or, you know, provide advice against it?

Greg says this refers to voluntary PICs, in quotation marks, so we wouldn't be mandating them necessarily. Good point, Greg. But both of these should be – we should seek clarity in our comments back to the CCT Review Team.

Okay, Recommendation 39, we already talked about. Recommendation 43, which is on Slide 10, refers to – this actually we did have some considerable discussion in ICANN 58 in that working session that we had. But it's really to set objectives for applications from the Global South which also includes defining what is the Global South. And they are basically recommending that we need to establish clear goals, measurable goals.

And although the recommendation says we should establish measurable goals in terms of number of applications, even number of delegated strings, the explanation we got from the review team was that they weren't necessarily looking for actual number or percentage of applications that came from the Global South but more just some way that the next CCT Review Team could assess whether the objectives of having our outreach or having a Global South program or a financial program whether it meets – whether the program meets the goals. And so they're trying to figure out ways in which they can, in the future, measure whether having these programs are a good idea or are effective.

So this is going to be I think a very difficult one for us to tackle. But certainly I would like to get recommendations from them in writing or I would like to make a comment in writing as to what they mean by measurable goals because what they say in writing in this recommendation and what's been told us in person were two different things.

And as Donna says, we can set objectives but that won't mean that they will be met. And I agree with that, Donna. My fear is always though if we set objectives and it doesn't meet those objectives, the gut reaction by many people is to say then it's been a failure. And I'm not sure that failing to meet

the objectives is necessarily a failure, but it could be we set our objectives too high or maybe even too low.

So Kristina recommends – or sorry, Kristina has in the chat, does, quote, needs to equal should in the must should (unintelligible) scheme? Great question, Kristina. I'm not sure – yes, so they do include the word "should." So I do think that that's something we should take a priority on as well. So good comment.

Okay, next Recommendation 46, this is a recommendation to revisit the applicant support program. And they make the comment that \$185,000 – that the cost of applying for a TLD and running a new TLD is a lot more than just the \$185,000 and so one of the recommendations beyond efforts to reduce the application fee, efforts should be made to further reduce the overall costs of the application including additional subsidies (unintelligible) support for undeserved communities.

This is set as a prerequisite and is already a subject of – is within Work Track 1, someone correct me if I'm wrong, I believe it's Work Track 1. So I think our comment on this one is that this topic is something that we're considering. And Kristina points out a great comment as well, (unintelligible) consistent terminology some places they call it Global South and some places it's underserved. We should put in a comment asking whether those two terms are interchangeable or whether there's difference in meaning or difference in – if there's a meaningful difference in using those two different terms. So we will definitely expect comments on that.

Going back to the chat, Michael makes a comment that we are limited in looking at costs that are outside the scope of ICANN – are we – sorry, I really think we are limited at looking at costs that are outside the scope of ICANN. ICANN costs are determined by the provider. So just in response to that, and this was pointed out by the CCT Review Team during one of the open sessions with – I had forgotten about, but at one point in time ICANN did –

and I think it was like in 2011 – 2011, ask registries whether those registries would like to be included on a list to provide support to underserved communities.

I'm not sure the term that was used at that point in time, but it was basically like if registries were interested in participating in the program to provide other forms of support, would they be interested. And as Jonathan Zuck and others pointed out, there was a list of – a number of registries that volunteered for this but no one ever – there was nothing done with that list or, you know, ICANN never – there's a question as to whether ICANN actually referred any communities or any applicants to these registries.

I could speak, you know, on behalf of one of the registries at the time that I was with, we had our name on that list but no one ever contacted us to ask us what services we could provide or would provide and at what cost. So I think that was – may have been a case where the ball was dropped or just not followed up on and so that was – that's another thing, Michael, that may not be outside of ICANN's mandate.

Good discussion here on the terms being used, on the chat. Michael says, be willing to subsidize or volunteer to do so is different than price regulation. I agree, Michael, (unintelligible) different things, sure.

Looking at some of the other comments, Krista says the costs of a backend could be associated with the application in this case. Okay so some good comments from the chat that we're capturing, more to the substance of the questions, as opposed to asking clarity. Keep those comments coming because we will collect all of these.

(Unintelligible), Recommendation 47 is dealing with the – as required by the bylaws, the recent bylaws, (unintelligible) the Board regarding gTLDs should also be clearly enunciated, actionable, I'm not going to read the whole thing. But in this one they are looking to see whether we could create more

structure to the process for the GAC to provide advice and early warnings and possibly even a template of how that advice is provided.

And so that's what really the CCT Review Team is expecting of the Subsequent Procedures Working Group, other recommendations, the other part of that recommendation is to – it's really intended for the GAC to make sure that whatever advice they give is actionable and so that there's no misunderstandings or as few misunderstandings as possible between the GAC and the Board when their advice is implemented.

Trang has a comment that goes actually back to Number 46, which is, "ICANN did not play matchmaker, it only provided the form for those which provides pro bono services (unintelligible). Certainly the program could be evolved." Right, thanks Trang. And I think one of the items that, you know, some of us just don't have any information on was did anyone contact ICANN and did ICANN then refer them to the list?

And I guess the question to the registries that are on that list did anyone contact them? That's something for us to look into. Trang says not directly. Okay. So thanks, Trang. That's helpful.

Okay, Recommendation 48, this is something that we're actually already doing so I think it'll be an easy comment for us, it's basically to make sure that the – that we review the community process for community-based applications, that we address the concerns that have been raised by different (unintelligible) groups and making sure that it's clearly – that any changes are clearly stated and reflected in the next version of the Guidebook.

Kristina asks which concerns were the CCT referencing? And if I remember correctly in the full report it talks about some of the concerns pointed out by the GAC in various advice that they were giving to the Board, in different communiqués, but we have to go back and maybe pull that out of the full report to make sure that we do understand what they mean by concerns. And

even if it's in there, Kristina, it's something that we may still want to ask questions on because it may still not be clear.

Okay, 49, Recommendation 49, which I believe again are things that we are already discussing and addressing, are really around the string similarity – sorry, the inconsistent results for string confusion. And so that deals with plurals and singulars, coming up with clearer processes and processes and the field processes, etcetera, for these types of disputes going forward. So I think this is one that we certainly have a good handle on at least that we're addressing.

And then finally, moving on to Recommendation 50, which is a low priority level and which I would actually suggest is not really or shouldn't really be for us because by the time this comes up it's probably not something that we as a group – we may not even be around as a group at this point. But it calls for a thorough review of dispute resolutions on all objections should be carried out prior to the next CCT review.

So while we as a group are looking at a number of these objections and trying to pull out issues from them, that's not really the kind of review that the CCT Review Team is looking for, they're looking for really kind of a catalogue of all the decisions made, all the objections received and really making the job easier for the next CCT Review Team.

And Michael says, "Is this really a – is this the only low priority?" and he agrees that as a prerequisite PDP to the SubPro itself, all of our core recommendations would be high or higher which is true. Kristina is typing. Can we persuade some law student somewhere to write a law review article that covers Recommendation 50?

Kristina, I would love to be able to do that, I think that has come up once before, I think we had asked ICANN staff potentially look into that getting maybe an intern or two in the DC office or actually anywhere where there's

law schools, to do this. That's something we'll certainly look into. I think it's a great idea. And if I were back in law school, maybe something or a professor, maybe something I would do.

Okay, Avri, with that let me give it back to you.

Avri Doria: Yes, thank you. Thanks for walking through. I have – we have 10 minutes left but I have a question – two questions on this, which is, when do we need to have these clarification questions to them? And how do we plan to go about assembling them? We talked about some questions here and they could probably be extracted, but does anybody have an idea? Because I don't have a clear understanding of when the clarification questions need to be based on their schedule of when they plan to release this draft. And I'm wondering if anybody's got that info.

And I see Michael's hand up. Do you have an answer to this?

Michael Flemming: (Unintelligible) a suggestion. I think that it would just be really healthy to rather submitting a written request for clarification for every single question, I think it would be more beneficial if we just reach out to the CCT RT team and – sorry, CCTRT, team is in the acronym actually, and ask them to come and perhaps present the materials or provide background.

And as Greg earlier stated, a lot of – like Jeff said – a lot of the clarifications that we are seeking are probably in the background in the report itself, and while we could read the 130-page report ourselves, having that consolidated or short presentation that kind of answers those – allows time for the questions, I think would provide us with a lot of – well, feedback as to what we actually need to look for.

And then the other suggestion would be the expectations that we need to set are something that's rather hot, that we do need the clarification on. I'm not

sure – I don't really feel that's in the current report itself now, but I could be mistaken.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, a little bit of – thanks, this is Jeff Neuman. Just a little bit of – I don't know if I'm – Michael's answer. I think we should get members of the CCT Review Team, and that might just be Jonathan, or any others that want to come maybe for the next full group meeting. But I do think that once we get the background, I do think that we need to put our request for clarity not on context but for clarity in the questions themselves I do think we need to put that in writing. And I do think that those go in as our, quote, comments to the CCT Review Team so that they can make it more clear in the final report.

Because really that's what we're asking for is that if they could add some more detail to clarify for us in the final report. So I wouldn't spend too much time with CCT Review Team asking them for oral clarity, other than background, but more submitting the – submitting the requests for clarity as part of the public comment so that it comes back in the final report.

Because again, clarity from one person on the CCT Review Team, even if it's Jonathan, may be very different than clarity from others that were involved in the drafting of the report.

Avri Doria: Yes, this is Avri. Noticed that when we were in that meeting with them. That they don't all have the same viewpoint on what they've written. Which is fairly normal. Okay, any other comments on this before we move on? We have very little time left in this meeting. So really not going to do more than mention the last topic.

And so the last topic has to do with CC1 and our three drafting teams. I don't assume any of the drafting teams, and let me just name them again, there was the one on different TLD types, there's the one on predictability and

community engagement, and then there's one on applications assessed in rounds as their brief topics.

Now the first one has basically 10 people signed up plus Jeff and I. The second topic has one signed up plus Jeff and I. And the last one I think had six, if I remember correctly, signed up plus Jeff and I. So at least with 1 and 3 there's a good number of people to get started. But I don't think we have yet.

So I want to make sure that these don't get lost and that we – and people can be working in the background, they don't have to meet a lot. But we do need to get going with those so I'm not sure what we need, do we need for us to assign at least one introductory meeting for each so that we can talk through, so that we can find out who wants to be lead editor on the drafting team?

We'd really like the drafting teams to sort of self-organize as I've seen many drafting teams do recently, to get the work done. But need to get it kicked off and it's been I think over a month now that we've been sort of had these sign ups – maybe not quite that long but it really is time to get going on them. So I don't know if anybody has any recommendations but also bring the question to the, you know, leadership team in our next meeting to see how we get this process going.

And if there's anybody in those teams that's really eager to be a lead editor and willing to just jump in and start developing a draft, be happy to see that too, sort of, you know, first person that puts words down doesn't necessarily get to keep the words, but often has a strong pull on how something gets worded. So I encourage anybody that's really interested in these topics to jump in and we can at least start the three Drive documents for them so that there is a place to start.

Steve, I see your hand.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Avri. This is Steve Chan from staff. And so I just wanted to confirm that none of these drafting teams have started their work. But we have created a mailing list for all three of them. They haven't been populated but we can get those populated very quickly.

And so what I can sort of offer is that we can send around a kick-off email, we can also take into account what you just suggested which is to create the Google documents, and then so we can at least create the form for these groups to begin their work and so, you know, they're not required to work in all the same way so maybe they'll discover different ways to get the work done. But in the meantime I thought we could get the kick off email sent and hopefully that would get the work initiated. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much. I gratefully accept your offer to sort of kick off the mailing list and create the Drive documents. Okay, we've got three minutes left. Any comments on that? I see no comment. Any other business at this point? I see none. I see Cheryl is typing, but maybe she's just typing a good-bye message.

And okay, seeing no hands, hearing no voices, it was a pleasure meeting you with all again this evening. After having seen so many of you in Copenhagen, and I thank you and I end the meeting. Thanks a lot. Bye-bye.

END