**ICANN**
**Transcription**
**GNSO New gTLDs Subsequent Rounds Discussion Group**
**Monday 27 April 2015 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO New gTLDs Subsequent Rounds Discussion Group call on the Monday 27 April 2015 at 14:00 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. The audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-27apr15-en.mp3

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Attendees:
Bret Fausett - RySG
Dietmer Lenden – RySG
Avri Doria – NCSG
Philip Sheppard – BRG
Stuart Fuller – RrSG
Christopher Niemi- no soi
Phil Buckingham – Individual
Jon Nevett – RySG
Tijani Ben Jemaa – ALAC
Jeff Neuman-RySG
Liz Williams – RySG
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Sonigitu Ekpe - NCUC
Carlos Raul Gutierrez - GNSO Councilor
Donna Austin – RrSG
Cecilia Smith -    no soi
Jean-François Vanden Eynde – RrSG
Stephanie Duchesneau – RySG
Stéphane van Gelder - BC

Apologies:
Kristina Rosette – RySG
Katim Touray – Individual
Alain Artero – NCUC
Jacob Malthouse - RySG

ICANN staff:
Glen de Saint Gery
Marika Konings
Steve Chan
Lars Hoffmann
Terri Agnew

Coordinator:     Good morning, good afternoon. Please go ahead. This call is now being recorded.

Terri Agnew:     Thank you, (Francesca). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Round Discussion Group on the 27th of April, 2015.

On the call today we have Sonigitu Ekpe, Carlos Raul Gutierrez, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Bret Fausett, Avri Doria, Philip Sheppard, Christopher Niemi, Jeff Neuman, Stuart Fuller, Donna Austin, Dietmar Lenden, Jon Nevett and Alan Greenberg.

I show apologies from Kristina Rosette, Katim Touray and Alain Artero. From staff we have Steve Chan, Lars Hoffmann, Glen de Saint Géry, Marika Konings and myself, Terri Agnew. Also just joining us is Cecilia Smith.

I would like to also remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, Bret.

Bret Fausett:     Thank you, Terri. Well welcome, everybody. Let's - you'll see if you're in the Adobe chat that up to the right there is a agenda. First thing up is roll call, which we've done, updates to Statement of Interest.

I'll lead it off here because I have recently updated by Statement of Interest to indicate that UniRegistry, the company that I work for is an investor in three other TLDs that we don't operate; they are Car, Country and Sucks. So if you

go to the Statement of Interest page you'll see that revised version there under me. Anybody else have an update to a Statement of Interest before we move on?

Well seeing no hands let's move right on to the meat of the agenda which is the documents that we circulated. As you've seen for the past week I think we're getting down to the end here and we have three documents that have been circulated. We've got the draft executive summary, the draft matrix and the draft charter. Those are all out.

I have not - I saw that Avri had some comments that came in overnight. Avri, I did take a look at them. I think that we can accommodate all of those comments in the draft. I know that some of them were in the form of questions but I think I sort of know where to go to respond to those.

Let me just - before we get into comments from the group let me ask generally whether people think that we'll be able to get (unintelligible) in the next two weeks, just to give you an idea of next steps, in my view, and that's Number 3, but we'll come back to it in a minute.

I had hoped that we would be able to get a final set of comments from the members of the group and perhaps from constituency that constituencies that they come from here in the next two weeks so we can get this in a near final form and present it - present it in draft to the GNSO Council for its May meeting as a discussion item, not as an action item for the Council.

Let me just ask whether people think that that's workable, if people will be able to get their final set of comments here in the next two weeks. Any thoughts on that issue?

All right well seeing none let's plan on that. Any comments today that anyone would like to raise about the draft documents that have been circulated? Well seeing no - Jeff, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, this one's on me. I think with the matrix we just need to do a good scrub to just make sure that the - that the matrix comments are more objective as opposed there's some subjective comments in there about, you know, how people thought certain processes went. So again this is as much my delay but one of the things I'm definitely reviewing for is to make sure that it's objective as opposed to, you know, subjective statements of how things went.

Bret Fausett: Good. Yeah, and that - I think so this next two weeks Jeff, Liz and I were going to hold the pen on these documents and collectively work to scrub them, clean them, you know, again editing I think at this point for just the way it reads and for logical coherence, not for substance. So we'll all be making a pass and then trying to unify it here over the next week or so.

Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, thank you. This is Avri speaking. I want to say that as soon as I heard the notion of scrubbing it for the subjective to make sure that everything was objective, I got a very (unintelligible) angst and nervousness because very often what one considers subjective another person statement of how they think they were treated, how they think it went for them, and another person looking at it saying but objectively that's not what I see, it's very difficult.

I think almost all of these statements could indeed be called subjective from some point of view and yet objective from others so I'm very worried about your scrubbing process. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, this is Jeff. If I could just - I understand, Avri, those concerns. I guess as an example, and I don't know if this is in the matrix this way but this would be the type of thing. So there were many comments in the matrix like there was not - there was not enough diversity in applications in this round and therefore that was a failure. That's kind of the statement that's in the matrix.

To turn that statement into a more of a question, because remember we're not - we're not supposed to be determining the outcome, more of a question is, was there enough diversity in the current application round? If not, what are some - are there any steps that could be recommended to take in response.

So it's basically taking the opinion statements out of it and turning it more into questions because our role wasn't to determine whether something was or was not good enough. And obviously we'll send that around for people to review; it's not our goal to change things. So we're going to do our best and hopefully you all will look at it with Avri with the sense that you've been saying to make sure that we're not changing it.

Bret Fausett:     Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria:      Yeah, okay thanks. In this case - and I think you brought up a perfect example. In this case, I would look at your way of putting it as denigrating all those that have very much (unintelligible) of there not being enough diversity. And so for you to then basically change that into a question, now if you want to qualify it by saying so many have stated that there was (unintelligible) diversity or some such as that.

But, you know, to take a unqualifiedly objective statement like there wasn't enough geographic diversity and turn it into a question is indeed the kind of problem I'm talking about. Thanks.

Bret Fausett:     Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg:   Thank you. I'm afraid I agree completely with Avri. And I'm grateful for that example because it's perhaps the best one we could use. You can certainly phrase the thing, "some people felt" but the fact that there wasn't enough - there wasn't in many of our belief, enough diversity is an issue.

We're not asking, you know, we really don't want, you know, someone else's opinion on it because their opinion might be quite different. So I really think that we need to preserve that level of subjectiveness and I have no problem with qualifying it, you know, saying some people. But I suspect that some people is going to apply to almost every statement we make. Thank you.

Bret Fausett:     Jeff, is that a new hand or an old hand?

Jeff Neuman:     It's a new one.

Bret Fausett:     Okay, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman:     I understand that there's a lot of passion behind a number of issues and this is one of those issues. And likewise there are other issues that others and I may be passionate about as well.

But I think if you go back to our original scope, our original - what we were supposed to be doing here it's really to come up with a list of questions that need to be looked at further.

We can have opinions, and that's fine, I'm not saying people can't have opinions. What I'm saying is our goal is to come up with a list of questions, not answers, not how we feel about certain things.

I certainly have strong feelings as to rights protections mechanisms, whether they were strong or weak, you know, and I have opinions about how prescriptive ICANN was in certain things. But, again, I think our goal here is - and I'd love to hear from everybody else - is to present the list of questions which then the groups can look at finding empirical data to support whatever views they have and those views could certainly and should certainly be expressed in those working groups that we set up.

I'm not trying to cut off anyone's opinions here but, Avri, I know you feel passionate about something and maybe Alan agrees, but I'm sure we could find people who feel passionate on the other side of every one of these issues. But - and Bret, correct me if I'm wrong, our mission is to create a list of questions, not to answer them or to express what this group feels about certain issues.

But - and I'm not denigrating it, Avri, this is - I certainly have a lot of things that I'm passionate about on other issues which you may disagree with. I happen to agree with you on this issue, that I don't think there was enough diversity, but I'm trying to get us to put it in a very objective manner so that others can look at data to judge the success or lack of success of it.

Bret Fausett:     Philip, go ahead, and then Alan.

Philip Sheppard:  Bret, thank you very much. Can you all hear me?

Bret Fausett:     Yes.

Philip Sheppard:  Thank you. Yeah, I mean, I think there was a few good sets of points being made here. I mean, one of the comments that Avri made on the executive summary, the subsequent procedures document which is currently saying in Adobe Connect, I think putting in the comments, was that one of the issues that we all saw was that the original PDP was far too general and then we saw a layout of implementation which (unintelligible) I think of Council and those of us who had helped develop the PDP.

I thought it was a very telling and accurate comment. But I think it links back though to the point that Jeff is trying to make which is that we need to be very specific in the work that we are attempting to set here. And I think it's much more work-oriented if you can indeed ask questions to be answered then to make statements however they're supported or however true they may be.

I think the issue of course is that in the questions we make, and this may be the job for all of us but perhaps specifically those of you who are holding the pen, we just confirm that the questions we're making are indeed open questions and not (unintelligible) of course being predetermining a certain point of view.

And I think that should probably be the trick in that open questions that are quite specific will help very much going forward in the work that can be done if we have general statements which may be true I think it makes the - well the (heart) of what goes forward, and we all realize this is complex so that we might (unintelligible). Thank you.

Bret Fausett:     All right, that's very helpful, Philip. Thank you. Alan.

Alan Greenberg:   Yeah, I don't want to belabor the point. I have no trouble taking out things that are viewpoints where they're stated as facts. I do have problems removing a substantive part of it so just replacing it with a question saying, you know, was there enough diversity, sort of implies that's an interesting question that someone raised; it's a theoretical question.

And just like rights protections, there are people who claim that they were really not sufficient. And I think that needs to be preserved in the report we're doing. And I don't really care how it's stated. It doesn't need to be stated as a fact, you know, maybe it's a parenthetical.

But I think it's part of the observations that people have contributed that are really important because there are other things that we're asking theoretical questions we don't even know the answer to and some of them are the result of people feeling that we really blew it in some ways. Thank you.

Bret Fausett:     Thanks, Alan. No, I clearly - as one of the people who's going to try to reconcile this, and of course we're also going to bring it back to the group as

well. I hear the concerns that Avri and Alan have expressed; I hear them quite clearly. I will make sure we're sensitive to that as we go through here.

I don't expect us to do very much editing at all between now and the time that we have a draft that we want to present to the Council. And even then the revisions that we make will come back to the group and you can tell us if we got it wrong. But I understand that the issues need to be preserved and some of the sense of the importance of the issue to the person who raised it, that needs to be preserved as well. So I will certainly take that to heart as we're going through the next version.

Let's see, well any more thoughts on the drafts that have been circulated substantive or process-wise? All right well then let me talk a little bit - oh, Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria:     Yeah, just one question and it wasn't really a matter of fact. In the comments that I put in I was never sure I was putting them in the right place and I only put in a couple. And I probably have more to put in. But I wasn't quite sure that I was putting things at all in the right place so maybe just a little when we get to that just an explanation better. And I'm just being stupid, I realize, but thanks.

Bret Fausett:   Okay, no that's helpful, okay. Well let's talk a little bit about next steps. As we mentioned earlier we've got these drafts that have been circulated this past week. I think they went out midweek last week. That's the - those are the current drafts. Steve, let me ask you quickly, are those available on the wiki if people want a quick place to find them?

Steve Chan:     Thanks, Bret. This is Steve from staff. Yeah, they've been added to the wiki and what I've tried to do is preserve the versioning so you'll see previous versions and then the newest ones. And they should be dated I think like the 27th of April to signify that they're from today. But what I will do I'll just add the link to the wiki in the chat for everyone to find.

Bret Fausett: Oh that's very helpful. Okay, yeah, so there's a one-stop shopping place if you want them, it's in our work space that ICANN has provided. So you can go back and grab them if you need to. So we're going to use the next two weeks to try to get these documents as close as we can to something that represents the work of everyone that we can present to the Council for its May 21 meeting. It will be presented as a discussion item. Jeff, Liz and I will make a presentation to the Council.

We do not yet have a slot on the agenda; I have not seen an agenda. But we've asked for at least 20 minutes, probably no more than 30 minutes, to present the work of the group to date, get the Council familiar with where things are and let them know that we plan to present a motion for the creation of an issue report that will ultimately probably turn into a policy development group at the June meeting in Buenos Aires.

We also have a working session of this discussion group on, Steve, is it Wednesday in Buenos Aires?

Steve Chan: This is Steve. Yeah, it's tentatively scheduled for Wednesday. We haven't finalized the schedule yet but it is at this point tentatively scheduled for 11:00-12:00 I believe on Wednesday of the ICANN meeting.

Bret Fausett: Okay and so that would come in front of the Council's public meeting so that I think that if we - if this works out the way I expect it will that we should use this as an hour-long meeting to present our work and take questions from the larger community from people who did not participate.

So I would expect that we would get a handful of the members or really anyone who would like to participate in the front of the room and then give a very brief presentation of our work, similar to what we'll give to the Council in May, and then basically have an open mic session and invite questions from the larger community about where things are.

So those are really next steps. Any comments or thoughts on that? Well seeing none we will meet again in two weeks, down to the fourth item on our agenda. And that may be one of our final meetings heading into Buenos Aires. Steve, any thoughts on the meeting schedule?

Steve Chan: Sorry, Bret, can you repeat that please?

Bret Fausett: Any thoughts on the meeting schedule? We'll meet in two weeks from today at our regularly scheduled time and then, you know, things go according to plan we may not meet again.

Steve Chan: Yeah, I can see that being - sorry, this is Steve for the transcript. Yeah, I think that could be a possibility and I think that's why it's so important for - just to stress the point you've made that, you know, everyone send in their comments in the next two weeks is really, really important for us to be able to further the work of this group. So just to second that thought.

Yeah and if it turns out we don't need another meeting then we'll go ahead and cancel the rest of the schedule.

Bret Fausett: Okay so we've got them on schedule and if we do indeed wrap up we can cancel. All right well thank you everyone participating in this brief checkup. Let me do a last call for hands on pretty much any other business, anyone have a final thought or word? Seeing no hands and hearing none then let's wrap it up here and I'll see you all on the list and two weeks again here on the teleconference.

Terri, you can go ahead and wrap it up.

Terri Agnew: Thank you very much, Bret. (Francesca), if you can please stop the recordings. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very

much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.


END