

**ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call
Monday, 11 September 2017 at 15:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-11sep17-en.mp3>

AC Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p3d894al8cv/>

Attendance of the calls is also posted on the agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/6BkhB>

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

Coordinator: Excuse me. The recording has started.

Michelle Desmyter: Thanks. Thanks so much. Well good morning, afternoon and good evening and welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on the 11th of September 2017.

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

All right, thank you. Hearing no names I would like to remind all participants to 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 will hand the meeting back over to Jeff Neuman.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Michelle. Welcome everyone. It's September 11, 2017 as was said and the agenda is on the right hand side of the Adobe Connect. Start with our normal welcome then do some work tracking.

We'll do a quick update from the chairs on some recent developments then talk about the next steps for the working group. And then we'll spend hopefully the bulk of time talking about the next of our full group discussions, which is going back to the categories or different TLD types and you'll see a link to the document.

Is there any other business that anyone can think of right now and I'll ask again of course after - well towards the end of the meeting? Okay not seeing any which is fine again we can - I'll come back to that later on during the meeting.

And now I'll do a call for any updates to Statements of Interest. Is there anyone that would like to update their Statement of Interest on the phone? Okay I'm not seeing any which is good.

I will now do a work track update and with that I will look to see who is from Work Track 1 that is on the call, and I'm seeing Christa and let's see, Sara on as well and Sarah so who would like to give the update? Thank you Sara.

Sara Bockey: Thanks Jeff. This is Sara Bockey for the record. We are - for Work Track 1 we're going to be finishing up our review of the community responses that we received.

Our next meeting we'll be covering the RFP of registrar - provider accreditation program or potential accreditation program and the feedback that we received from the community on that.

And then in general we're sort of going through and reviewing all the recommendations and feedback that we've received on all the topics, and

starting to compile that into something that we can bring to the work group to review and try to finally - or start to finalize it and get some solid recommendations that we can take back for the full working group so that is where we are.

Then we're going to be more implementations. Some of them are going to be more like a decision tree where we need to get a little more information or just make some decisions, but that is where we are and what you can look forward to.

So if you can join us on our call next week or on the RC program that'd be great. Thanks Jeff.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Sara. Going then to Work Track 2 we have both Mike and Phil on the phones and tell us about your now weekly calls. Thanks Michael.

Michael Flemming: Thanks Jeff. Oh can you hear me well?

((Crosstalk))

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes we can hear...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Flemming: Okay good. All right, thank you very much. So yes Work Track 2 is now on a weekly schedule. Yes. Sorry. But this week we'll be talking about closed generics and because of a conflict in scheduling we will be hosting a call on Wednesday - no I'm sorry, Thursday at 3:00 UTC, a little bit outside of our normal 21:00 UTC Thursday schedule but we hope that we'll be able to get as much participation as possible.

We'll be starting on closed generics this week and we're anticipating about two meetings per topic, so we've got closed generics for the first two weeks here and - sorry, for the next two weeks.

And then after that we'll go to applicant terms and conditions, and then after that I think we'll be jumping into registry/registrars separation as well as nondiscrimination.

And then after that - and we'll probably be just in time for the TLD rollout as well as the - just trying to go from memory here - the public interest and as well as - sorry, defining the public interest as well - not defining the public interest.

Oh the PICs - talking about the PICs -- I'm sorry -- as well as the contractual compliance. We may not be able to get everything done in time for ICANN60 but we are sure going to try.

So we look forward to speaking with everyone this week, and we're going to try to get done as much as possible on the closed generics and hopefully we'll have a compromise on this one soon. Thank you very much. Okay bye-bye.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Michael. Kavouss you have your hand raised. Please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. I think as we're discussing end users (unintelligible) we came across that it is the (unintelligible) they do not have any text relating to government law.

I do not understand whether it is something that was - if it's wanted or is it something that this was not considered? Is it necessary to refer to any government law or is it not necessary?

I go to the grantees and disadvantage of that because that is some of the point that now we've come to some sort of discussing consideration of a possible remedy if there is a need for a remedy.

At least now we're discussing in Working Group 2 or Track 2 this issue. I want to know that - whether they have a mark on this matter or they took it as it was and without any change.

But that is something that we came across that it might have some impact on the applicable laws. Thank you.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Kavouss. This is Jeff Neuman. I'm on that Workstream 2 Jurisdiction Group as well. To be honest that issue has not come up from anyone in Work Track 2 neither in the charter or in the - discussed before this PDP was set up.

Certainly if someone wants to bring it up as an issue it can be discussed by the Work Track 2, but my guess is that it's probably best if discussed and contained within the Accountability Workstream 2 and then for a decision to be taken in that group, and then to be referred to ICANN staff on how best to implement.

But again to be honest it has not come up as an issue from anyone in Work Track 2 on the agreement.

Kavouss Arasteh: Can I have a follow-up comment or question? May I have a follow-up question?

Jeffrey Neuman: Sure.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes.

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: I am not suggesting that we bring it in the Work Track 2 or Work Track 2 and so on. I think that from the viewpoint of the Work Track 2 is it necessary - forget about this Jurisdiction Group.

Is it necessary that this RA and RRA have the government law reference or it is not necessary? Just I want to discuss that but that's all. I'm not bringing something from one group to the other group.

They are independently discussing and at the end of the process that may be something that come back to the appropriate channel, to GNSO or whatever group.

But I'm saying that does the group Work Track 2 see that - is it an (obli) or it is some intentional not addressing, leave it blank, leave it flexible and so on? That is that but if it cannot be raised I didn't want to increase that workload. Thank you.

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes thanks Kavouss. This is Jeff again. What I would propose is that we put that question out on email for Work Track 2 to kick around and talk about to see if this is something that they do want to discuss.

At this point I'm not going to - I think this meeting agenda's pretty packed, but if it seems like we do get interest from the members of Work Track 2 to discuss it further then we can add that as one of the items.

But at this point I would propose just putting it on the Work Track 2 list and to see if it gets any traction.

Kavouss Arasteh: Thank you.

Jeffrey Neuman: Is there any other questions/comments? Okay then let's go to - oh sorry.
Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Sorry. And just in - with relation to that it dawned on me as you and Kavouss were speaking that you're correct. No one has raised this issue. One wonders to what extent however the issue might be relevant in attracting new applicants and applicants who are not already part of the ICANN ecosystem.

And it might be interesting to add that twist to it when it is discussed so just a thought. Thank you.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Alan. So that would be kind of a combination between a Work Track 1 to see if there's any - I'm trying to think of a way to put it. So if there is any impediments trying...

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Jeffrey Neuman: ...based on jurisdiction.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Yes, I mean, it...

Jeffrey Neuman: So let's...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...the fact that you have to use California law or they currently use California law for some things act as a disincentive to some new players. I don't know the answer but it may be an interesting thing to consider as we go forward. Thank you.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Alan and we will also - if I'll just put a note then in the action items then to discuss with the Work Track 1 as this is - kind of fits in with the

attracting - or sorry, with outreach and attracting applications and the financial support program, things like that.

So we'll take that back this week as the co-chairs and the co-leaders and see where if anywhere where we can fit that in. So anything - any other comments on this?

Okay Work Track 3. We have both (Karen) - I think (Karen)'s on AC and oh Robin. Great. Thanks Robin. Please.

Robin Gross: Hi this is Robin. Can you hear me okay?

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes we can.

Robin Gross: Okay terrific. So in Work Track 3 in our last call we finished going through the CC2 responses and some of the issues with respect to the independent process.

And now we're going to be shifting gears a little bit and moving in our next call which is tomorrow, Tuesday, September 12 at 20:00 UTC. Tomorrow we're going to be talking about some other topics.

We're going to be talking about GAC advice, the handling of GAC advice and the GAC early warning systems and if we have time - I'm not sure we're going to have time but if we do have time we'll also start discussions about the string similarity issue and the - whether or not we can have some improvements or prediction and whatnot's sake with respect to string similarities.

So I hope folks can join tomorrow's call especially if you've got some experience going through the program and having some GAC early warning issued or some advice issued, and have some experience that you can bring

to this discussion tomorrow. That'd be terrific so I hope folks will join for that.
Thanks.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Robin. And I think that's important that we as you said have people that have experience and to help us with any kind of lessons learned and how things can be done better, if they can be done better and so on.

So if someone could just post that call, the Work Track 3 call, even if there's someone who's not normally in Work Track 3 that wants to participate. So I'll look for someone from staff to post that call.

I saw a hand raised but I guess there's no longer a hand raised. Okay so let's go on to Work Track 4. We have Rubens please if you're in an area where you can - or Cheryl actually. Both of you are on the call.

Rubens Kuhl: Thank you Jeff. Can you hear me?

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes. Thanks.

Rubens Kuhl: I heard an echo but it's - well not hearing the echo anymore this is Rubens Kuhl for the transcript. At Work Track 4 the most interesting debate we had so far is going right now, which is on registry services.

We currently have some - two straw proposals that were sent to the list and this discussion will continue on the list for the time being. So if anyone has any suggestions on registry services evaluation and even if you don't have the time to join our calls, I suggest you to join our list and discuss that topic so far.

Our next call this week will - to be on Thursday 20:00 UTC I believe is going to discuss financial evaluation. Financial evaluation's a topic that we also foresee to be very controversial so if you want to join the fun please come to our call. Thank you.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Rubens. As you could see the - what Steve Chan has just posted on the list is for Work Track 3, which is the next call on Tuesday and Rubens was talking about Work Track 4, which is on the 14th as Cheryl has pointed out in her intervention.

So any questions about Work Track 4? Okay Rubens I'm assuming - okay great. That's an old hand. Okay we're done with the updates of the work tracks.

There are a couple updates from the full working group. The first one is as you all probably have seen by now our own Avri Doria has been selected or nominated by the Nominating Committee to the ICANN Board starting at the end of the annual meeting, so at the end of the Abu Dhabi meeting and which is great, great for ICANN, great for the community, sad for me in that I'm losing a co-chair.

So with that stay tuned for some announcements of how we're going to plan on - well we can never fill her shoes but certainly to see if there was interest in a - joining the leadership team here as a vice chair.

So we're - stay tuned for that and to how we expect but if you do have any interest, please don't hesitate to reach out to myself or Avri or anyone else in the leadership team to express your interest. Avri yes.

Avri Doria: Thanks. This is Avri. Hopefully I can be heard. I want to thank people for the congratulations and just wanted to assure people that I did intend to remain fully active and - until the end of the meeting and I'm trying to work out all the schedules so that that is indeed the case.

And yes, you know, the decisions of how to, you know, go forward with chairing was a decision that was originally made by the working group when you appointed three of us.

Now we've dwindled down to one so Jeff is going to make a proposal of how he would like to go forward with it, and I do believe that you all as the group that originally appointed me to this co-chair, you know, should sort of jump in and, you know, contribute to that decision.

And also make sure that if any of you do want to get more involved either as a co-chair or perhaps a vice chair, which is a little safer, you know, please let Jeff know. Thanks.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks. Thanks Avri and Anne asks the question, "Did I say vice chair or co-chair?" I actually said both or either one. We're still trying to decide what would probably be best whether - given the fact that we're kind - nearing the portion of our working group on the preliminary report whether it would make sense to train someone up to be a complete co-chair, or whether it would just be easier to get a volunteer that would be able to do a vice chair position.

That's something I guess we're still thinking about and if you have any thoughts on it that's great. I mean, if someone has the time to be a full complete co-chair I can - please reach out to me.

I'll let you know what the time commitment's like and how much work it is but - so it all depends I guess Anne on the type of people that volunteer that want to step up.

Kavouss says, "What about me?" I'm not leaving. I'm still here so you're stuck with me. So right now Avri and I are co-chairs and so Steve was also - Steve for those of you who remember started out as a co-chair and as Avri said we are down to one at this point.

So as Anne says it seems that a person involved here who's been involved all along - that person could be co-chair. Anne yes that's right. I guess let's

just see what type of volunteers we get and what kind of time commitment they can put in.

But we certainly as Jim says we need a replacement either co-chair for workload purposes as there is a lot of work, but again if you are interested let us know.

Okay Anne is typing so while Anne is typing I will go to the next item, which is just about - so we had a - the chairs or I should say Avri and I along with the leaders of each of the work tracks had a call last week.

It was a fairly lengthy call and so thanks to the leaders for the full three hours of that call. And we really discussed kind of our path moving forward and our milestones and timeline.

But seems like someone has their speaker not on mute or their phone not on mute. If you could just please mute your phone that'd be great. So the call this week we talked about milestones and path forward.

What you'll see coming out in the next couple weeks is a plan for reaching those milestones. We still believe we are basically on track to doing a preliminary report/getting that out in Q1 of next year 2018.

So that's why you're seeing a push from some of the work track leaders on getting through all of the topics, and making sure that we discuss everything before we sit down with pen and paper and start writing these sections.

Obviously each of the work tracks will review completely their sections, and then after the sections are drafted we'll go to the full group to make sure that the full group is in line with all of the work tracks before we get that out.

You'll also see or notice that what we've been doing just to kind of give everyone the big picture is we've been going through CC2 comments along

with the - each of the topics in each of the work tracks to incorporate those thoughts into see if there are some common themes or recommendations that can come out of those.

That - this third or fourth walkthrough of each of the issues is really helping us to give us ideas on where we think we can reach consensus within the preliminary report where we know there will not be consensus and may not be a chance of consensus on those issues, and those other areas where we think we could eventually get to some kind of compromise or consensus, but in the preliminary report we may solicit or likely to solicit additional feedback to narrow down those recommendations.

So that's kind of our thinking in moving forward. You should see - and certainly our goal is to have a much more concrete work plan not only out for you all by - in the next couple of weeks but certainly for the entire ICANN community, which brings me to my third point which is that we also had a call.

Avri and I and the ICANN Policy staff had a call with the RPM, the Rights Protection Mechanism PDP Working Group leadership. So basically Kathy Kleinman, Phil Corwin and J. Scott Evans along with their ICANN support policy staff and - to talk about different items including dependencies.

So if you recall the charter of our group, the Subsequent Procedures PDP, calls on us, this working group, to incorporate any of the recommendations from the Rights Protection Mechanism Working Group.

So we're called on to incorporate those findings and to fit them into our recommendations, and to fill in any gaps if there are any gaps left by the recommendations of the Rights Protection Mechanisms Working Group.

For those of you following the RPM Working Group you will notice that the timeframe for the RPM PDP has been extended quite a number of months. In fact as of the time of their last work plan in June or this past June or July, it

had been extended for about seven months further than what it was initially when it was set up when we were supposed to take in their recommendations.

And now they are in the process of making a recommendation to the GNSO Council of doing an additional lengthy data collection exercise, which may or which - well I would say would certainly extend their timeframe out a number of additional months.

So we're looking at if the RPM Group is continuing on its current path they may not have their recommendations until late 2018/early 2019 for us to even consider.

And that being the case, you know, that puts their timeframe well after the delivery of our preliminary report and even after our schedule for a final report.

This is all again still being discussed but it may be that we produce a preliminary report, possibly even a final report without the RPM recommendations and then either reconvene or if we're still a group at that point in time convene again to discuss the - any gaps from the RPM Group.

There was a proposal made during the leadership team call of potentially reducing the scope of Phase 1 of the RPM Group, taking something like the URS, the Uniform Rapid Suspension, and moving that into Phase 2 of the RPM Group to potentially have some input from the Sunrise Trademark Clearing and Trademark Claims sort of within our timeframe but that's still all being discussed.

I know the RPM Group has been discussing that and all I can say at this point is pretty much stay tuned. We have to discuss whether - or I guess the council will need to discuss this as well to figure out how to manage the process.

And there may be some discussions that take place as to whether the next round of new gTLDs could go forward before the RPM Group is finished or with just parts of Phase 1 completed.

So that said there's a lot on the table. I know it's a lot of information. We're still trying to monitor the progress of the RPM Group to see whether it will still be possible for us to incorporate some of their findings within our reports.

But if we continue down our time scale and the path that we set out for ourselves, it may be that we don't get their recommendations until after we have done some of our work.

So if anyone else has any comments on this please, you know, let us know now. Raise your hand or let us know via email. Right now I'm going to turn it over to Avri please.

Avri Doria: Thanks. This is Avri speaking. Okay yes just a few things I wanted to add to that. One of the principles - there was actually two issues. One of the principles of course that we've been operating all along is that, you know, whether the existing policy if we haven't reached consensus to change it, you know, we can go with it until sometime later.

That policy is changed and somehow fits into the ongoing process that we're talking about, so that was one of the things that was brought up in that discussion.

I'm not sure that that was completely favorably listed because of the requirement for the full review of the RPMs before new gTLDs came out. So there's an item of discussion there probably both for this group and for the GNSO.

The other thing we have to consider is the - which we haven't talked about yet but I guess we'll talk about briefly going on is our Work Track 5 and the geo names at the top-level and the amount of time that will take, and whether that will be a bounded discussion that will either be completed or status quo on a certain date or whether that's a topic that will need to be completed before we move on.

So actually knowing between the RPMs and Work Track 5 which is the longest pole in the tent may be, you know, another issue that needs to be discussed.

So I just wanted to basically indicate that there are those two optional elements and possible complexities. And I don't know Jeff whether you wanted to talk about, you know, just a quick update on WT5 or wanted me to give it, however.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Avri. Yes on Work Track 5 we have a - I think we reported on the last call the ccNSO has sent in their nomination of Annebeth Lange who's on this call.

The GNSO - we've gotten a couple of volunteers and are talking to them now to see if - which one of them wants to join us. The GAC has reached out to us to let us know that hopefully by the end of this week they will have nominated their person.

And I don't know if Alan's got any update on the ALAC but we have not gotten an update from the ALAC that I can recall seeing unless I missed it in a couple of weeks. So Alan - okay Alan you got your hand raised and then I'll go to Avri.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. The process is taking longer than we had hoped. We hope - should have a Selection Committee meeting this week and a decision

somewhat short - or shortly afterwards. Things could go awry but I'm hoping still that that is what we'll have...

((Crosstalk))

Jeffrey Neuman: Okay thanks Avri and - oh sorry, thanks Alan. I'll go to Avri now.

Avri Doria: Hi Avri again. Yes just quickly on the GNSO appointment what - the decision that came from the GNSO leadership and I believe the council was that as this was a subgroup operating under GNSO rules, that as opposed to them going through a council process or using their Standing Selection Committee process to do this as we had mentioned, that basically they wanted us to stick with for the GNSO seat standard gTLD practice and operations, which is of chairs putting the call out and then chairs picking someone for the role so that's why we're doing it that way. Thanks.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Avri. Kavouss and if there's anyone else that's got any questions you get into the queue and I'll read some of the comments, so Kavouss please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. As I mentioned in a previous meeting GAC is almost about to finish the internal process. A leadership - the - or GAC leadership have prepared a draft to be sent to you and in that draft there are some conditions accompanied with the participation, and also this condition is under the final review.

It has been commented. I made some comment to that and there was a deadline for the comment, and I hope that after the deadline that will be finalized and will be sent.

So certainly a participate nomination has been made more or less. I leave it to the GAC leadership to announce it formally, but our participation will be accompanied or together with some condition of activities. Thank you.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Kavouss. We'll look forward to getting that hopefully this week and that'd be great. Just to go back to read some of the comments I guess going backwards Jim has asked, "Who from the council has stepped forward as Work Track 5 leader?"

And Jim no one from the council has actually volunteered. There was one person that reached out to the council that has said that they may be interested.

And then since I've had conversations with a couple of other people that have reached out to say they might be interested and to just say - to ask about, you know, the time commitment and what it would entail.

So I'm hoping that I hear back from them this week and then can just send - let the group know who has come forward and volunteered so that we can figure out who would - who could serve in that role.

So I'm trying to see if I missed any of the comments. Anne has - oh on the RPM timeline there was a comment that said, "If our report affects RPMs in any way the RPM would have to deal with that before we could go to the next round."

And so I - yes there may be issues that they need to deal with that we come up with or vice versa. Let's see, anything else? No. Okay so Alan you have a comment. Please.

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you. Kavouss reminded me the ALAC likely will have some conditions also associated with participation. Not that it was surprising (unintelligible) will likely be the ones that are associated with CCWGs, so that is the - we participate but we have to - we have an opportunity to ratify or disagree with the conclusions when they're finished and that kind of thing but nothing particularly surprising. Thank you.

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes thanks Alan. And just to note for the record that the ccNSO has sent a note to the GNSO Council basically saying similar things that they reserve the right - that they're - they nominated Annebeth but reserve the right to give input later on as the ccNSO.

So the GNSO will - I'm assuming the GNSO Council will discuss that during their meeting this week. There is a lot of background noise. If we could get that muted that would be great. Great. Kavouss is next and then Avri. Kavouss please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I just - I'm sorry. It's not a question about Work Track 3. The meeting would be 11th of September or 12th of September. If you determine I cannot participate I will be on airplane.

If it is September 11 then I would attend. This is right after the midnight of our time here so just want to - sorry for this...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: ...side question. Thank you.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Kavouss. Emily is - it looks Emily is going to type that into the chat. Okay it's Tuesday the 12th at 20:00 UTC. Please.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) Yes I wanted to make one comment. I wanted to make sure I was (unintelligible) I wanted to make one comment on...

((Crosstalk))

Jeffrey Neuman: Avri I think you're - Avri you're really quiet. We can't hear you.

Avri Doria: Okay is that any better? Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Jeffrey Neuman: Still sounds really low.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) But anyhow since there is echo - can I be heard now?

Jeffrey Neuman: Avri it's really, really low.

Avri Doria: Well then forget what I was going to say.

Jeffrey Neuman: Okay Avri I heard that barely but if you want to - if you could type it in the chat maybe that would be best, although hopefully we can get your mic up because you're pretty much next on the agenda.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) Thanks (Chris) I'm really, really (unintelligible) Okay.

Jeffrey Neuman: Would it be easier to get a dial out?

Avri Doria: I've already dialed in.

Jeffrey Neuman: Never mind. Okay so while Avri is - still is trying to...

Avri Doria: You guys (unintelligible) so I'll just shout (unintelligible)

Jeffrey Neuman: Well can everyone else - what's everyone - what's it like for everyone else?

Michelle Desmyter: Hi Jeff this is Michelle. I am not able to really hear Avri either.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...and so maybe that'll make me more audible.

((Crosstalk))

Jeffrey Neuman: Avri could you try again?

Avri Doria: I'll dial in (unintelligible)

Jeffrey Neuman: Okay Avri's going to dial in. So while Avri is dialing to - in are there any other questions on timeframes or on the conversations we've had with the RPM group?

(Jonathan) yes we're having Avri call back in so hopefully she will do that and let us know when she's back on. In the meantime why don't we get started with the drafting team discussion?

So if we could do that and bring up the chart on the TLD categories and while they're doing that the - Anne has raised a question. "Did the RPM Group raise anything that we know affects our work?"

Anne they - earlier on the RPM Group had referred a couple of the issues to us including the PIC DRP and the restriction dispute resolution policy, which are being discussed in Work Track 3 as topics, but since then there's been nothing that we've had specifically referred to us from the RPM Group.

So let me see, is Avri back on yet or is she still dialing back in? Okay not yet. So then I will start this subject and then have Avri take over when she joins.

So we're going back to an overall topic that we discussed quite a while ago and it, you know, it keeps coming back in the sense that there are some dependencies on whether we decide to actually go along with having categories or not.

From the CC1 comments -- now this is CC1, not CC2 -- it seemed that most of the groups had favored continuing on with the same categories that were in the initial applicant guide book. Oh, Avri are you back with us?

Avri Doria: Yes, I am.

Jeffrey Neuman: Oh, great. We can hear you. So I'll just finish my part and then hand it over to you.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Jeffrey Neuman: So in CC1 it seemed like we had general agreement -- I'm not going to say consensus because we didn't do any kind of formal call -- but with the concept of keeping the categories that were specified in the applicant guide book -- which included the geographic TLDs, the inter-governmental organizations, communities.

All of that's still an issue for Work Track Three that they're considering. And then also the added category of Brands, which were added at some point -- probably about a year or more -- after the applicant guide book came out with the Specification 13. So it seems like there's general agreement that those categories should be maintained.

Then there were some comments that brought up additional categories of TLDs that could possibly be separated out. And where we left off was trying to discuss the common attributes of each of these categories. And if we did decide to go along with categories what would be the impact on the application process, the evaluation process, contracting, et cetera? And so with that I'm going to turn it over to Avri, and - to continue. Thanks Avri.

Avri Doria: Thanks. And just like to make a point, I'd like to leave some time at the end -- in Any Other Business -- so that I can get the comment that I was going to

make about our working procedures going forward and cross-community working groups at the end so that the group is fully up to speed on that.

But for now what I really wanted to do -- and thank you Jeff for the introduction -- so we've had the introduction that there was - the categories specified in the policy. So where the categories specified in the AGB there was the, you know, there was the - some of those came from the Board, some of those came from the policy.

And then there was the one that was - and then there's the de facto category that was developed and then sort of (moralized) (sic) in Spec 13. And so -- as opposed to asking the general question -- since we're entering a stage in these developments where we really have to start finding what we have consensus for, and what remains as it was.

So at this point -- and kind of the first question I'd like to open up -- is if we accept that that was the set of categories -- however they developed in the last and the round of 2012 -- is the consensus on keeping those? Yes, they need to be changed, they need to be tweaked, they - whatever. But instead of creating a sort of bottom-up theory of categories, we have an existing set.

And so they all need refinement, they're all being spoken of in the Work Tracks at the moment in terms of what to do about Community, what to do about Brands, how to do them. But there has seemed to me -- and I think to Jeff also -- our general consensus at the moment that those existing categories should persist even if they do need to be modified, they perhaps need to be renamed.

And something is that -- for example -- Community and its relationship to Spec 12. And Community, with some of the discussions that are going on there. So that was like the first thing I wanted to open up. Is can we assume that we have consensus on that? Or do we need to go back and sort of say

that no, what existed in the past is not satisfactory and we have consensus on changing it.

So I'd like to open up the topic on that. Yes, Kavouss? I don't hear you Kavouss. Perhaps others...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Excuse me, do you hear me?

Avri Doria: I do now. I didn't before.

Kavouss Arasteh: Did you not hear me? I did just say now.

Avri Doria: Now I hear you.

Kavouss Arasteh: Okay. I am asking are you questioning that whether the existing - whatever category existing? You call them in the past was existing. Is okay, all we have to change it? Or you asking -- once we change -- whether they - something in process needs to not be outlined.

That is, you don't want - you want to have a - what they said that something which goes the arrangement that - the new application would not apply for the old process. You have the new process. What you are asking, you know, the...

Avri Doria: Okay, I...

Kavouss Arasteh: ...what is the question? The two questions...

Avri Doria: Okay...

Kavouss Arasteh: ...make one question in two parts.

Avri Doria: Okay. I apologize for being confusing about it. What we have is -- we have whether de facto or in the AGB -- a number of categories. We're calling them categories now. Do we have a sort of operational consensus at this point to proceed with talking about those as our basic set?

Before -- the next question I'll ask has to do with changes or questions having to do with adding new ones -- but basically do we accept a consensus that we have this basic set? That we move forward with in terms of - for example the Work Tracks. And that's the question.

Let me explain it. The Work Tracks sort of say, well, you know, we don't even know if we're going to have categories. We don't know if we're going to have these basic categories. So how do we talk about changing them if we don't even know that we have them? Now, our basic principle is -- unless there's a consensus to change something or to get rid of something -- it persists as existing policy.

So the question is, do we have agreement to continue forward with these five -- I guess it's five, or maybe it's six if you split Geographic and IGO -- with this set of existing categories? Yes Alan?

Kavouss Arasteh: Until what time?

Alan Greenberg: Sorry, do you want to go to Kavouss first?

Avri Doria: Yes, let me answer Kavouss' since it appeared already. Until we either discuss them in the Work Track teams and come up with changes for them. Until there is another consensus called later on the work that's been done in the Work Track.

But for now, we assume that we have categories and that we have an existing set of categories that will probably continuing forward with in some way or other. Yes, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you. From my participation in the various discussions I think we do have consensus that we will not eliminate the categories we already have. I don't think we have consensus that it is the definitive list. And I don't think we have consensus on the implications of having categories.

And that is specifically what may vary because of the category? You know, is it specific things you have to - rules you have to satisfy? Is - might there be a price difference? Might there be other things. So I don't think we have closure on the implications of the categories. But I sense that we have closure that there will be categories and we will probably not remove ones that we have already de facto created. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And that indeed was the question I was asking. The other two questions about additional ones or how the ones that existed are changed was not included in my consensus assumption. Yes, Kavouss? Do others hear Kavouss?

Alan Greenberg: No.

Avri Doria: Kavouss, we do not hear you.

Jeffrey Neuman: Kavouss says in the chat that he's been disconnected.

Avri Doria: Okay. So we'll come back to that when he gets back in. So - and (Michelle) is trying to help him. Okay. So I'll pause. Is there anyone else that would have sort of - and Alan stated it better than I did. So Anne -- while waiting for Kavouss -- please go ahead with you.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, thanks Avri. It's Anne Aikman-Scalese for the transcript.
And I agree with (Donna). I do support...

Kavouss Arasteh: Do you hear me now? Hello?

Avri Doria: Yes. We let...

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I was disconnected...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Wait...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Okay.

Kavouss Arasteh: Can I talk?

Avri Doria: We had let Anne in the queue while we were waiting for you to come back.

Kavouss Arasteh: Okay, okay. I wait after Anne. Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you.

Kavouss Arasteh: Okay, thank you.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: All right, thank you Avri, thank you Kavouss. I agree with what
(Donna) said in the chat about the existing categories. And also with what
Alan said about existing categories.

I think there's possibility that you could create a new category. The one that
comes to me is applications needing applicant support. Because I think that,

you know, what we saw was that people needing applicant support but it just didn't - I wasn't very successful I don't think in the last round. And I think we need to consider how those might be treated and whether or not another category is needed. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. You're jumping my questions. That was part of future questions I was going to ask as I'm trying to collect information on this call. But thank you. So thanks for that. Kavouss, back to you.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. I support Alan. That until the time that we decide to suppress or to modify categories we'll continue to have categories. This is a...

Avri Doria: And...

Kavouss Arasteh: ...system that we decide anything else. Thank you.

Avri Doria: And the other part of the question, Kavouss -- just to ask specifically and thank you for your response -- is that the existing set is our base set. That we're continuing at this point with a presumption that we have. We don't know exactly what they'll look like. They may be changed, they may be modified. But that that is essentially an existing set that we move forward with.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. My answer also covered that implicitly.

Avri Doria: Okay. Okay, thank you. Forgive me for not understanding the implicit meanings. So thank you for reiterating. So I don't see anybody objecting to that being something we can proceed on. I just want to pause for a second and make sure that that's the case. Okay. Even say a check from (Cheryl), thanks. So okay.

So we'll proceed on that. Now I'm not going to get into the question at the moment of what changes we want to make to them. Those are being

discussed in the various Work Tracks. And once they've had their discussion, but at least they can proceed on sort of a general plenary notion that the existing ones are under review for how they work. But that there's an assumption on their continuation.

Now basically wanted to go - there's the spreadsheet that was talked about earlier. And I can put the -- and I'm sure staff already gave it -- but there's the spreadsheet of different types. And I wanted to look through some of the separate suits inside it to see where we're at on these things in terms of reaching consensus.

So we had basically an attributes matrix. And there they talked about categories of that. Talked about the open, the geographic, the brand, the inter-governmental organizations, community. And that was our original set of six. And so I'd like to ask over time -- I'm not asking for consensus now -- on these attributes. But I'm really asking people to start looking at them.

What I'd like to do at the moment is look at the - we have another seven that are listed here. And I just want to see where we are in terms of starting to see whether we have consensus on proceeding with some of these. But I see Kavouss has his hand up. Please, Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: No, I'm sorry, that was the old hand. I'm sorry.

Avri Doria: Oh, okay. Great. Okay. So we had one that was -- and in fact I believe that today we just added another one because with what Anne said a 14th entry in this, and we'll get to that later -- but can be - well actually I'll let her state it better when we get there but I think she stated another class. But we had listed a validated registry.

So those registries that had restricted registration with qualification criteria that must be verified. And we did have a certain number of those that were handled in various ways during the round of two - 12. So I'd like to ask where

are we at on that one? Do people think that that's a category we should be pursuing?

I'm not asking for consensus on it without a description of how it works and what it is, but I'm looking for a general view of whether this is a separate category that we should be pursuing? And seeing whether we can define it and carve it out. Anybody have a comment on that? Anybody want to speak in its favor? Yes, Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. I have no comment in either way but I'm looking at what is the argument that necessitate to add that category? What are the arguments? Pros and cons. I don't want to go a table and so on. But first of all -- as you've said -- it is difficult at this call we decide on that. But I am not sure but I'm sorry I have not followed this discussion. What is the argument for adding that category?

Avri Doria: Okay.

Kavouss Arasteh: The pros and cons. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay that - okay, thank you for the question. That one came out -- and perhaps I'll use a financial TLD as an example -- and we're asking does it have registration polices that restrict potential registrants as well as usage? You know, likely minimal needs for registrar services. Likely limited registrant base. For example, have to be a registered financial institution in your country.

Then there were - it was an example perhaps given. And we're not even sure of that description. But it was those kinds of registries where you know, because it was something that was regulated -- in many if not most places -- that therefore these would have to pay attention in some sense to that.

And that -- and I'm not arguing for this, I'm trying to repeat the arguments that I've heard, and so please anybody that supports it should speak out in their

own favor -- but it's basically that in - none of the other categories include that kind of restriction. They're not communities in a normal sense. And - because they're regulated industries. But of course regulated industries goes all the way from financial institutions to the people that paint my nails.

So, you know, how far does one want to go in that kind of thing. But that was the issue that came up, that was the issue that was discussed. And basically from some of the I believe GAC comments and things that came out during the 2012 round -- and obviously it was put on this list by some of our previous discussions -- there were people that had strong feelings about some if not all regulated industries. Yes, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I did a pretty exhaustive review of the red - of the strings that were identified by the GAC as the highly regulated ones and looked at the applications and what rules and processes the applicants put on them. And although there were a few that did do verification and validation ahead of time, there were also a significant number - other - number of others where the industry perhaps was not as sensitive.

You know, that you wouldn't die if someone had the wrong credentials. And had lived for a week, for instance, before someone took it down or waited for a complaint. And therefore I suspect when we come to talk about this in detail we may want some gradation. And not just prior verification and validation but other perhaps more nuanced ways of trying to make sure that the registrant is one of the approved community, or is one of the expected thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not quite sure how to say that in a few words, but I think it's important. Because prior validation and verification is really expensive. Other methods are not nearly as onerous. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. From what you say -- and we're not getting into at the moment the "How" of doing it -- but basically from what you're saying -- and please forgive me if I'm jumping to an implication that wasn't there -- but an implication that such a category did make sense.

How it was defined and what we put in that bucket wasn't known at this point. But that as a category at this point working on that as one of our possible categories does indeed make sense. And so Anne, please.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, thank you Avri. This is Anne for the transcript. And I just had wanted to ask a clarification from Alan. I am not sure in the realm of highly regulated strings whether he is making a distinction between category one and category two or of the Safeguard Advice?

Or is he saying -- are you saying Alan -- that even within category One Safeguard Advice from the GAC that there are strings that would not require prior verification of eligibility? And let me just explain it first - I'm asking that question in part you know, also from a just a consumer protection stand point. Okay, sorry. Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you Anne. It's Alan speaking. The answer is there were 60 or so strings identified as Category One and that's all I'm talking about. Of those 60, there were half a dozen perhaps that actually had prior validation verification. But there were a significant number of others that -- in the view of the ALAC when we reviewed them -- they were sensitive.

There were some that we said the GAC was overreaching and they really were not something that was - that met the qualifications. But there were a significant number where we agreed with the GAC but other mechanisms that are less onerous we deemed to be sufficient. You know, some cases for instance verification within a week after registration was something that was probably good enough.

So that - as an example. That's not the only example though. So but yes, the answer's yes. I was only talking about Category One, but nuances within the Category One overall list. Thank you.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Just a quick follow up Alan, if I may. Did you guys - did you write up anything on that? I'm trying to understand. I mean...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Can I...

Alan Greenberg: Sure, I can provide a document if you'd like.

Avri Doria: Right, right, can I...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: That'd be great.

Avri Doria: Right. I think it's a great discussion. I think we're moving a little bit beyond where I wanted to take it at the moment. But that's good. Just if -- those of you looking at the table -- if you look at the Attributes Take Two tab you'll see basically that for all these categories other questions we'll have to answer later but I'm not diving into at the moment -- is, you know, specific requirements, and registration restriction. Limited registered pool. Limited need for services.

So basically all those are broken up. And all of those will be questions that do need to be answered at a particular point. But at this point what I'm really trying to determine -- and this is part to take out the sort of deadlock we've got between what Work Track should be delving into and what maybe isn't a priority and stuff -- is I'm getting the impression no one has spoken yet against.

So I'd really like to ask is there someone that does not think this category should be on our work list? That basically we're not approving them at the moment. We're not saying we have a consensus for doing them and certainly not a consensus for doing them in the following. But we do have a consensus for them being part of the set of categories that we are working on. Yes, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. That raises an interesting question. To a large extent the categories we have right now were -- or at least the ones that were used in the first round -- were self-selected.

Avri Doria: Except for two.

Alan Greenberg: That's correct. It's not clear that self-selection is going to be sufficient here. And it's not clear what other mechanism there will be to identify what a, you know, what a restricted subject registry is. And how the applicant knows ahead of time that that's going to fall upon them. So it's a little bit of a different category but I think -- little of an issue -- but I think we're going to have to tackle that at some point.

Avri Doria: Right.

Alan Greenberg: If they're not necessarily self-selected we may have a panel that's deciding "You are highly regulated therefore, you know, the business model you suggested probably won't work. And I don't know how we're going to handle that, but I think we have to address it. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. So still that would be in the further. So I see no one objecting to that being one of the categories that we're continuing to work on. Is that correct? I'll stop for a second. Okay. Seeing no objection there.

Then the next one we had - okay, I see. Okay. So then looking at Eight, we had the not-for-profit or non-profit GTLDs, the NGOs. Now, that is a category

that is different from the Community Category. Though within the Community discussion that has sometimes come up as a way to define Community.

So I'd like to open the top on whether those are a specific category that we should be exploring at the moment. Do we see it as fitting within the larger Community discussion or what? And remember that this - but when we're talking about a category we're talking about - without being definite at this point about different registration policies or different application policies.

For example, being an NGO is something that is sometimes difficult to verify. In some countries -- like the US -- it's relatively easy if you define it as the 501 C 3, what have you. In other countries, it may be they've been licensed by their government. And in other countries there's no difference between them and any corporation.

So those details would need to be discussed. But is this a category that we should be exploring as we go on as a separate category? And does anybody object to it being on the list as a separate category that needs to be explored specifically? I see no objection to it being on the list and continued as a separate category.

Now the next one -- Nine -- is - we already partly talked about it. We already talked about validated and highly regulated restricted. So I tend to believe that those two are the same. But Sensitive TLDs -- for some definition of Sensitive -- would be a specific issue. And I'm wondering where we stand.

First of all, do people have any objection to my lumping Highly Regulated in with Validated and that being a whole subject that needs to be explored? Is there any objection to that? Yes, (Donna).

(Donna): Thanks Avri, and I apologize for the jackhammer in my - in the background. Can you - do we have a definition around those? Because I think they're - they can be quite different. So I don't know why they're lumped together to

start with. So I think definitions are going to be important here before we can make that decision about whether to include them or not.

And I think -- I'm not sure but -- I assume that the Board or the NGPC had some definition of highly-regulated. And perhaps the GAC did as well, but I think we need a starting point before we lump these two together because I really don't know what - whether there is a difference or whether you're lumping them together because you think they're the same. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. I was lumping - trying to lump and - Validated and Highly Regulated simply because I thought they were similar in some respects. But if they're too different to be put together in a category we can certainly continue and explore. I also thought highly regulated and sensitive might be different categories. Yes, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I can see merging the Validated and Highly Regulated. I'm not sure Sensitive is the same thing. And I'm not sure I know what you mean by Sensitive. Does a religion come under the category of Sensitive for instance? I'm not quite sure what you - what is meant by that word. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay. And that's what I did indicate. Thank you for your comment. What I was saying Sensitive for some definition of sensitive. And indeed nailing down that sensitive definition would be something GAC and I think perhaps even At Large had notions of sensitive. And certainly religion was one of the examples that sometimes fell in that bucket. Yes, Jeff? Don't hear you, Jeff.

Jeffrey Neuman: Sorry. Yes, no, sorry, took me a second to get off mute. I would at this point keep Validated as a separate one. The validated TLDs are not always Highly Regulated. So -- as I put in the chat -- not all VTLDs are highly regulated. I would keep them as separate at this point.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. And go on to (Jaime), please.

(Jamie Baxter): Yes, (Jamie Baxter) for the transcript. I think when it comes to Sensitive, one of the things that should be included is the ability for the applicant to make their case for Sensitive.

I don't know it's going to be as simple as letting the Board or some other group decide what (unintelligible) Sensitive, given some individual circumstances. And so I think part of the process -- should Sensitive be a separate category -- is that the applicant is required to state their case and have that understood.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, Avri, I think highly regulated and sensitive I have no problem. But combine them with the validated or pre-validated. I do think that we could make that combination.

But Highly Regulated -- which is (obviously also) sensitive -- this is something that in GAC we have several cases and we would like to keep it. But whether we associate that with the validated I don't know what is validated. I am not quite sure I understood that correctly. But Highly Regulated and Sensitive I fully understand the sense of that and we have to keep it as a category...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Kavouss Arasteh: ...yes.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Could you explain perhaps why keeping Highly Regulated and Sensitive in the same category works?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, because you cannot separate them. When you say Highly Regulated you have to give some reasons of the highly regulated. Highly Regulated because they are Sensitive. That pharmacy, that (unintelligible), that medicine, that so on so forth.

So it is sort of the description. It is out of the envelope. Sensitivity is part of the reason and argument to be Highly Regulated. Or being in the highly regulated. That is the only thing that I put after this message..

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Okay. (Jaime), I see your - oh no. Yes, I see your hand still up. Would you - or is that from before? Okay. Okay, that - Kavouss you just spoke so I assume that's from before. Jeff, please.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks. Just to answer the question on Validated TLDs -- and I'm not arguing that they should be a category or not -- but for the question of how do you define it. If you go to the site VTLDs - I'm sorry, VTLD singular dot domain they have a description.

It says a VTLD requires verification of eligibility prior to use. And here's just certain standards. (Unintelligible) take back their names and ongoing verification requirements. So they have a description there of what -- again, this is a self-formed group, it's not something that was imposed on them -- but they're self-organized. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. And I guess it's safe to assume that they think they're a separate category. Anne, I saw your hand for a second but it disappeared. Kavouss, is that hand still from before or do you have a new comment?

Kavouss Arasteh: Avri, I'm sorry, I'm not able raise hand and...

Avri Doria: Oh, okay.

Kavouss Arasteh: ...down hand. It is always there. I'm very sorry...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Kavouss Arasteh: ...that is why I have to come in. So, but I have the question. What type of GTLD is a GTLD that is not validated? Why is it just a GTLD is not validated, what does it mean? I don't understand that.

Avri Doria: Okay. For example, I can give you an example from one that I worked with. Dot NGO. Basically they want to validate that anyone that they sell a - or, you know, register a domain name for is a legitimate NGO.

So they have certain pre-qualification -- or some of them even have post-qualification -- but basically pre-(qualification) (sic) to sort of say prove it. Prove you're an NGO. Show me your three oh, you know, your certificate from this government, from that government. Or, you know, attestation by other known NGOs that have already been verified that you are indeed a bona fide NGO. So that's one example where they wanted to basically go for validation.

Now in the same sense -- and this is where my confusion comes with the Highly Regulated -- is for a Highly Regulated the validation mechanisms seem to me one of the ways of dealing with it. But you're right, the issue of why it's done is different than it would be for an NGO. For a validated. Nobody regulates NGOs, so it was a self-regulation by the community there and that's why they went for validation. Okay?

GG Levine: Avri, this is GG Levine, and I apologize that - for not raising my hand. I'm on audio only. I was late to get...

Avri Doria: Okay.

GG Levine: ...into the room.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

GG Levine: But I just wanted to point out that there are Highly Regulated - or strings within highly regulated industries that are not validated. So I think that would be a reason to keep them separate.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. And I've accepted my - the fact that I was conflating things that there's good reasons not to conflate. So thanks. So okay, I've heard no argument for separating highly regulated from sensitive. Yes, Jeff?

Jeffrey Neuman: Oh I was just going to respond to the comment on the chat that said that they didn't understand what the difference was between Validated TLDs and something like Anexus. And just to be more clear, Validated TLDs validate the - who the registrant is and how it's used. Anexus requirement of where it's being used or where the registrant is. So there's the difference.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Yes, Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, just quickly Avri, I know we're running out of time. But again a clarification. I'm trying to remember whether the term Sensitive arose in connection with GAC Category Two advice? Or what exactly, you know, sensitive may mean in terms of the 2012 round. What strings were defined as Sensitive is something that I think we need to take a second look at.

Avri Doria: Okay, yes. Indeed. That's why I've always said sensitive, however it is defined. Or for some definition. That would be assuming that we say there's no objection to this remaining a category. We work on defining that becomes one of the issues. Yes, Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, Avri my question is that do I understand that for the time being the highly regulated and sensitive remain a category? And now the subsequent question is that the validation of the GTLD is a pre-requisite for that Highly Regulated Sensitive? Or it is totally separate chapter or separate items validated GTLDs? I guess I want to know the (variation) of that. Highly regulated...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Right...

Kavouss Arasteh: ...of them. So these - and then validated. Are they same family or same group or there are two different?

Avri Doria: Okay, I think we've got three. If I'm looking at the comments and I'm looking at the discussion, I think we have the Validated. And we were also told that not all Regulated are Validated. So therefore they are separate in that people can decide to do a Validated even without being a regulated industry.

And people that have regulated industries can find another way to work that doesn't include validation. So that defines them as separate. Now we've also had comments in the chat that said Highly Regulated and Sensitive need to be in separate categories because one is a legal standard.

Regulated means there's a legal structure and such - a regulatory structure. Whereas Sensitive is more of a cultural item perhaps, that may have a reflection in regulation but does not necessarily have one. For example, when we're talking about, you know, religious names or profanity or what have you. There may or may not be regulations, there may or may not be law governing it. But if it's not regulated but people still want to say it's Sensitive.

So those would be two separate categories. And I'd like to hear comments on A, the separation of the comments. And B, on whether both of those should be categories that we move forward with. So I have Anne and Kavouss. Are those new hands?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Sorry, Anne.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I think...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Avri...

Avri Doria: Oh right, Kavouss' hand is just permanent. Well no, it's not in the top position anymore. So, but anyway. Okay, Anne's hand went away...

Jeffrey Neuman: Avri, this is Jeff. Avri, time check. Just, it's...

Avri Doria: I call...

Jeffrey Neuman: ...we need to get to any other business.

Avri Doria: Right. Probably - how much time do we want to leave for that? Fifteen or thirty? Or less?

Jeffrey Neuman: Well, we're done, since this is 90 minutes.

Avri Doria: Oh, darn. I was - my last meeting was two hours and I forgot to reset my mental clock. I'm sorry. (Unintelligible) we'll stop here, and...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...I'm so sorry, that was...

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes. And then Avri do you...

Avri Doria: Okay. All I was going to say, my last meeting was two hours and my internal clock just hadn't changed. The issue I wanted to bring up under the Any

Other Business was - has to do with the terms of reference for Work Track Five. It's very important that - to the GNSO.

And this is something that -- in discussions with GNSO Council we sort of guaranteed to put forward -- is that we needed to remain within the scope and within the practices that were PDP working group practices. Now, those are - - in some sense -- different than cross-community working group.

Now, my contention is -- and I'll put this on the table as a statement and we can discuss it on List or elsewhere -- is that most of the conditions -- at least that I've seen so far -- actually do fit within the constraints if we look at them appropriately. For example, in terms of anything that's done in the cross-community working group needs the approval of the full group.

Now all of our separate participants participate in the full group. In the plenary group. And therefore are in a position to indicate agreement with the consensus or not. Beyond that -- with the way the way the procedures are written -- once there is an initial recommendation the SOs and ACs are requested to comment on them. And there are all kinds of rules and provisions about what to do when you get a report -- a response -- from an AC SO that's not in accordance with the recommendation.

So one of the first things that these group of Chairs - Co-Chairs is going to do is sit down and talk about the terms of reference for the group. And my hope on it and my view on it is that we will be able to map the conditions for the most part to ways -- and as we don't use all the guidelines for working groups, we've got a whole bunch of tools that we don't necessarily always use unless we need to -- so that we should be able to basically hopefully satisfy both of those needs.

And I apologize for taking those three minutes. But I thought it was very important to say that, you know, we do have a commitment from the - to the Council -- GNSO Council -- that we will follow PDP procedures and we won't

be -- for example -- voting. But we do have consensus rules, we have comment rules, et cetera. So once we have our five co-leaders we're going to work with them to come up with rules and procedure terms of reference.

Thanks. I turn it back over to you, Jeff. I don't know what you want to do next. And I apologize for my timing error.

Jeffrey Neuman: That's okay. Thanks Avri. I would just say that there's - well, we'll talk more about Work Track Five and the terms of reference during a later meeting. Alan, you have your hand raised. Do you want to add before we close the meeting?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I did ask for an AOB. I'll try to be very brief. I thought this was a really useful meeting. And we've had discussions here that had more depth almost than some of the ones in the sub-teams. Because the attendance in sub-teams is not nearly as wide.

And I really worry that we're going to come up with recommendations out of the sub-teams, maybe even ratify them in the plenary, and then go up for public comment and get comments from people who haven't participated in these discussions at all but dearly care about one of the subjects. And we're going to have to backtrack a fair amount because of that.

And I wonder -- perhaps the group leaders can discuss -- is there some way we can get out messages on a weekly basis or something like that? Not only to members of this group, but to the wider AC SOs. Saying the work group (suching) (sic) is going to be discussing the following topics this week. If you have an interest -- even if you haven't participated before -- this is an opportunity to influence where it's going. And I really...

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes, thanks Alan...

Alan Greenberg: ...think we need to draw in people at some level to make sure that we really do have plans that we can go forward with and not have to back track. Thank you.

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes, Alan, this is Jeff. We do have a newsletter that goes out every month which says the topics that are being discussed during each meeting. We would ask for your help -- and others -- in the leadership of or just participating from certain groups to make sure that word gets out of the content of what's in the newsletters. So that we can, you know, make sure exactly as you said.

People may not be in the group but may have an interest in the subject, can talk about it. So we send that out usually the first week of every month. And it usually goes - it applies for all the meetings that month and maybe even the week or so beyond.

So with that, I want to thank everyone for staying late and for a great meeting -- as Alan said -- and I will talk to you all with the Work Tracks. And we'll meet again in two weeks. Thanks.

END