

**ICANN  
Transcription  
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP - Sub Group A  
Thursday, 17 January 2019 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: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-sub-pro-sub-group-a-17jan19-en.mp3> [audio.icann.org]

Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p1tk5h5hg2/>

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/rIIWBg>  
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Operator: The recording has started.

Julie: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Subgroup A call held on Thursday, the 17th of January, 2019. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge at this time, could you please let yourself be known now?

All right, hearing no names, I would like to remind all 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. And with this, I will turn it over to Jeff Neuman. Please begin, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Julie, and thank you, everyone. Welcome. So we have an interesting meeting today and we have an agenda that's up on the right-hand screen that is on Adobe. So hopefully everyone is on Adobe and can see that. Before we start the meeting, I just wanted to introduce a few people that are on our call today, and just give a little bit of background.

So you'll see that are several people on the Adobe Connect list that have the word "guest" next to it. And I'm hoping I'm pronouncing the name correctly. But we have Akrita (ph), Austin, Colin, and Iona (ph)? I'm sorry. I probably butchered that and I apologize. But they are technically observers to the group. And normally observers generally don't attend the meetings that any of the working groups have or the subgroups. But in this case, we have some observers and guests that are part of the Work Stream 2 recommendations, so on accountability. Specifically the recommendations I believe for these observers are with respect to human rights and the cross-community effort on working on those issues. And so we were, we, being the leadership of this group, was asked if we could make an exception for these observers to come on and to participate in these calls, or at least listen in. And so neither Cheryl nor I had any issue with

that, and certainly we were always kind of confused by the whole observer designation anyway. And so from our perspective, the more people that want to listen in and participate, the better from our perspective.

So welcome our guests, and I don't know if they have audio -- or I'm sorry they have audio, they can listen. I don't know if they are connected voice-wise, but certainly are connected in the Adobe chat and we'll be looking to see if they have any comments. I know you all are technically observers. But do feel free to type a question into the chat or comments, if you have any. And we'd certainly be delighted to address those comments.

Another thing, just to introduce this group before we really get started, this is Subgroup A, so it's a subgroup of the Subsequent Procedures Working Group policy development process. You'll notice from the attendance list that the subgroup's calls are generally smaller than full working group calls, and that's because this subgroup is assigned to review specific comments that came in on very specific areas of the initial report. And so while this is Subgroup A, there's also Subgroup B and C. This subgroup deals with the comments that came in really on the overarching principles and general recommendations that apply throughout many of the different aspects of the new gTLD program.

Every other Monday we have a full group, working group call. Actually it's Tuesday for some people, depending on the time, because it's a rotating call. But that call is usually attended by the full group and so it usually has a larger attendance list. So welcome to our guests, and thank you, Colin, for typing that into the chat, so just give a little bit more background.

Okay, so with that said, let's go to the regular agenda, which is generally we review the agenda first, ask if there are statements of interest changes, and then we'll get into kind of the heart of the discussion, which is really just reviewing comments from the point at which we left off, and then just any other business. So with that said, I'll ask, are there any comments on the agenda?

Okay, not seeing any, are there any changes to any statements of interest that anyone would like to report on this call? Okay, not seeing any comments or questions or changes; so what we're doing now, just again for our observers, our guests, what we're doing now are reviewing comments that came into our initial report, which comments for that report came in, in the fall. And we are on specifically section 2 -- and these all have long numbers, so bear with us -- but it's 2.2.4.e.2, which as Steve has kindly done, Steve has posted a list to the Google document, which is although you could certainly follow along on this document that's up on Adobe, it's small print and not always very easy. You do have control, so you can scroll through the document.

But if you can or are in a place to actually access that Google document, it's probably easier to read and I would certainly -- as Cheryl has recommended. So we, Jim, have left on line 44, so specifically that is -- sorry, I should be a little bit more specific. So in the Google document, it's line 44. Adobe unfortunately doesn't show the line numbers. There are numbers at the beginning, but those are comment numbers for the specific section. So we are on comment number 8 in section 2.2.4.e.2, which is line 44 on the Google document.

So just as a little bit of a review, this section asks the question -- it talks about categories of new top level domains and really deals with the notion of should we create categories of top level domains. And if so, how should those categories of domains be treated? In the 2012 round, we had some categories that were outlined in the applicant guidebook, including communities and standard applications. We had a contract, a legal agreement for some other types of top level domains, including special provisions that applied to a top level domain that was owned or controlled by a governmental organization. Later on we had a Specification 13 that was created that deals specifically with brands. And then in the guidebook also there was a designation of geographic top level domains, which had some specific provisions related to how those applications would be accepted.

So we left off on the Registry Stakeholder Group comments. So that's line 44, comment number 8, which really refers back to another section, which is 2.2.4.c.1, which is specifically line number 13 in the Google document. Which the registry position really says that they support the existing brand category, so adding that one, but that there is not support within the Registry Stakeholder Group for actually creating additional categories of top level domains.

And then the next comment on that section is from the International Trademark Association, which again refers back to a previous comment that they submitted, which is on specifically line number -- just scrolling backwards, because there was a lot of comments on that very section -- which was line 21 of the Google document. So they support the creation of a brand top level domain. They do not see merit in a geographic top level domain being a separate category. They talk a little bit about in that section which we've already reviewed that they think geographic TLDs are really just standard TLDs, but may have certain kind of pre-qualifications, so that once they meet the consent or non-objection requirement, really in every other way they're not really, at least in the trademark association's minds, any different than any other standard top level domain. And so that would finish out the comments on that section, 2.2.4.e.2.

What I should actually mentioned while we have some hands being raised, is to give a little bit more background that our role here is really to review the comments and make sure we understand what comments came in. And then ultimately we're going to summarize all of the comments to the full group, to give a recommendation to the full group, to see what, if any, changes are needed to the initial recommendations we made in the initial report, and to just inform the group, the full group, on new ideas or other topics that may have some support within the community.

So let me go to Kathy, because Kathy's got her hand raised. Please?

Kathy: Thank you. Can you hear me?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I hear you. If you can get a little bit closer to the mic, that would be better.

Kathy: Okay. I also have one of those wonderful winter colds, so nice deep voice. Sorry about that, guys. It's a procedural question. When I'm looking at something like

2.2.4 tab and B44 (ph), the registry comment, and it says see 2.2.4.c.1 above. That's hard. It's hard to jump around like that. I was wondering, A, whether the comment could just be copied over and say, this was what was posted in 2.2.4.c.1 or alternatively if the cell of the registry comment for 2.2.4.c.1 could be put into B44 to make it much easier to find it. Thanks, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks, Kathy. We were -- either of those are possible. I think our goal was to try to keep the document short. At the end of the day, we're going to be sending summaries to the full working group, and then obviously attaching these charts to it. So let me take your proposal and let's review it with ICANN staff. I think we certainly could do either of those. That's not an issue. I think it was just to try to not make the document too onerous. But let's see what that would do, and we'll discuss it in our leadership meeting and come back to you.

Kathy: Jeff, if I might follow up?

Jeff Neuman: Yep, please?

Kathy: We're doing this in Rights Protection Mechanisms. The easiest thing would just be to put the field in, the F23 or whatever it is, or a different tab. The easiest one would just be to put the field, and then people can just reference it quickly. And we're doing a lot of that right now in Rights Protection Mechanisms. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Kathy. I wish this had the technology to just like put the link in where you can click on it and go jump up to that section. But absent that technology, I think so long as the comment is not huge, I don't think that's an issue. And in this case, the comment is not that big. So let's take back your suggestion and I will ask Steve and Julie to help out if we can do that for the next round of calls.

In the meantime, we're going to jump now to the 2.2.4.e.3. This is line 46 in the Google document. And I have not been keeping tabs on where it is on the Adobe document, so if someone could kind of help out in just pointing, if people are only on the Adobe document, I think that starts on page 9, if I'm not mistaken. So for this question, so the question here is, if you have recommended additional categories of top level domains, what would be eligibility requirements for those new categories and how would those be enforced? What would be the ramifications for a top level domain that qualified for this new category? If they would have failed to meet those -- or to continue to meet those qualifications, how do you deal with that? Who deals with that? How is that dealt with?

This is an interesting one, because most of the comments that came in did not really -- if you look back at the previous question -- didn't really support adding new categories, other than a .brand, and other than the ones that currently do exist in the guidebook. So you basically have the first three comments at least that agree with the notion that at least for Spec 13, for brands, the existing requirements should remain in place that's in Spec 13. And they agree with the notion that if you fail to meet the Spec 13 requirements, then it would just revert back to the regular registry agreement, as if the Spec 13 did not exist.

So the comments from FairWinds basically says that just do what we had in the Spec 13. Comment from -- I'll probably pronounce this wrong too -- Lamaret (ph) says keep the same categories as you have, the designated five ones for government -- (inaudible) as the registry, geographic, brand, community, standard; and that no changes are needed. And the ALAC doesn't see a need for or any benefits to establishing new categories.

On line 50 you have -- these are some new ideas or some suggestions. So you have for the NABP, the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, and I don't believe this is a first time this comment appears. So we may just be reviewing what's already been reported or in here. But the NABP would like to make the point that verify that there are these categories, they believe, of verified top level domains, which are ones that require verification of eligibility prior to use that they would like to make sure that those top level domains are allowed to keep the same standards and have the autonomy as a registry to take back those names and have ongoing verification. And therefore they believe that if there is a verified top level domain that it should be included as a specification in the registry agreement. Failure to meet those qualifications could result up into termination of the registry agreement.

Where this comes into place, and I'm trying to remember which subgroup is dealing with this. I want to say it is C, which deals with objections. But this is relevant, because if I remember correctly, the NABP made a comment that said that if there are any applications for top level domains that are -- I forgot the word that they used -- but essentially substantially similar to the ones that they have, that those new top level domains if they're allowed, should be required to have the same or similar verification or eligibility requirements to prevent consumer confusion, and that would be in the form that they would have the right to object, so an existing operator would have the right to object.

So if that category was created, this would be what NABP would recommend, if the verified top level domain doesn't continue to meet their requirements. So we're not going to talk about the objection. That's for Subgroup C. But I just wanted to give the comment a little bit of context as to why they are talking about a verified top level domain.

The Business Constituency talks about or says that eligibility requirements should be stricter and allow for validation that the application does adhere to the requirements of that specific category. So the Business Constituency, at least the way I interpret it, is saying that if we do have this other category of validated top level domain or domains with eligibility requirements, that they should be stricter and allow for validation that the application does adhere to the requirements of that category.

And then the International Trademark Association is a new comment as well. In reading this and just knowing just from personal experience, I think this is an interesting comment from the International Trademark Association where they're saying that if we do allow brands during contention resolution or objections, if we do allow them to change strings, again this kind of relies on what Subgroup C is dealing with. But if there are brands that change their string because of contention resolution and that is something we as a group think is acceptable,

then they should be allowed to have Spec 13 treatment if they have their trademark plus a keyword. Right now Specification 13 only applies to exact matches. So let's say an example that we did have that was talked about previously, we had SAS, S-A-S Airlines apply for .sas. And we had SAS, the analytics company, apply for .sas. The two groups, if we had asked them and if this was allowed, they have said that they may have opted to or would have rather both been given top level domains, and one possibly for sasanalytics, the other for sasairlines. But ultimately that wasn't allowed. So they had to work things out amongst themselves.

But in that case, what SAS would be saying is both of them that they should be able to Spec 13 treatment for something like sasairlines or sasanalytics, even though the term "analytics" or "airlines" don't appear in their trademarks as an exact match. So I think that's the suggestion from the International Trademark Association. Let me go to Kathy, who's got her hand raised. Please?

Kathy, I don't know if you're still on mute?

Kathy: Can you hear me now, Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Now I can hear you. Thanks.

Kathy: Okay. Great. So I actually have a question winding back to something that you had talked about earlier, but I just wanted to mention as going to the changing of the string discussion that there's great objection to that. That is a new idea that was not allowed, as you mentioned, in the first round. And there is great objection. So that's by no means a done deal.

What I wanted to ask you about and then -- I'll ask a question and then make a statement and then get off. Is going back to the field which on my spreadsheet is B50, with the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, and the idea of this verified TLD. So this is being taken care of under objections. The idea of a verified TLD, if I understand correctly, is one that would require a certain verification of eligibility as NABP tells us. What objection? It's not a community objection. It's not an IP objection. It's not a string objection. So I was wondering what objection.

And then the second question is, we're seeing lots and lots of new ideas here, in part because this section of the initial report, 2.2.4, different TLD types, was so broad. It kind of said, give us ideas. And so we're getting lots of new ideas. So I just wanted to check that it's the intent of the leadership that this goes out for another -- not in final report -- because no one's had a chance to comment on these new ideas, except those presenting them. But that this goes out in a second or third or fourth, or whatever round it is, of initial report from Subsequent Procedures to test the waters and see how people feel about these new ideas that are being put out there; that it's not just the working group, that the working group puts it out to the community. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks, Kathy. So I know Cheryl has got her hand raised. So actually Cheryl, do you want to respond to that one, and then I can jump in? Is that why your hand is raised? Cheryl, are you there?

Julie: It looks like Cheryl's line has disconnected.

Jeff Neuman: Oops, okay. Well, I'll try to give an answer and then when Cheryl comes back on, we'll turn it over to Cheryl. So Kathy, I think, so let me answer your question in a couple different parts. So a number of these comments are kind of dependencies, like if something -- if the group decides one thing, then this comment would potentially apply. So in the case of the pharmacy one, again, I'm kind of doing this by memory. But I believe that NABP had suggested that there should be a new type of objection for verified or validated top level domains, again this is not a done deal. It's not accepted by the group. But what they're asking for, and this is again more of a topic for Subgroup C, is that like they have .pharmacy. So if there was something approved like .pharmaceuticals, so they're not saying that they outright object to something like that being established. What they're saying is that for .pharmacy they have very strict requirements that you have to meet certain medical pharmaceutical standards in order to get one of those domains, and it's very, very strict, because they want to ensure that anyone that buys any prescription medications off of their sites, they can get that users can be assured of the safety of those medicines.

Their argument, from what I understand, is that if someone were to have .pharmaceuticals, but then do it as an open top level domain, they're worried that consumers are going to believe that this new .pharmaceuticals will be just as strict and tight as the existing one, when the new one may not be doing any of those verifications. And so they're making an argument, a safety type argument so that they should have the right to object in a new type of objection. So it doesn't exist yet. But again, this is something that -- I don't want to get to the substance of that, because that's not really what we're kind of talking about. That's not agreed to. That's just what -- so if that is established, then that would be in theory a new category, and that's why they've put their comments in here.

As far as the new ideas, I think we're going to discuss the new ideas with the full working group, and if the ideas do have legs, meaning that there is some support within the working group to really consider those new ideas, and the working group believes that we should then consider them much more seriously, then those new ideas, yes I think will have to go out for some form of comments, because they have not yet been considered by the community.

Martin puts down in comments that -- well Justine has put in there about linking back and forth the comments. And then Martin puts in a comment that ties in with the INTA idea too. If there's an objection contention that can be resolved by amending the string, then this should be considered. Right, so that's -- thank you, Martin. This is another kind of conditional thing that the idea of amending the string, as Kathy says, has not been approved yet and is still being discussed. But if it is approved, then INTA is making this recommendation.

So one of the things that we're doing in the background is to do a chart of dependencies. So if the full working group does or agrees to one set of ideas, what impact is that going to have and what other comments relate to those impacts? And so this would be one of those. So as Kathy said the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group has objected to the notion of changing strings,

so I can't tell you here whether that is something that's going to be accepted by the group. But this is kind of one of those if it is, then this comment would apply.

And then the registries, I believe, so hopefully that helps, Kathy and Martin. The registries really just again refer back to their old comments about just going with the existing categories and with also adding .brand. So it's really just -- it doesn't really add anything new to this question. And finally on the different categories -- sorry, different TLD types, there was an open question that just said, is there anything else you want to add that we didn't address.

Actually, before I do that, sorry, Cheryl, your hand is raised. Did you want to get back in the queue?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Very briefly, Jeff, is you don't mind, before we go onto Mr. Wilkinson's comment. And you've covered off what I wanted to react to quite well, Jeff. But just to reiterate to Kathy and anyone else, of course including our guests who are concerned; this is why we're not dealing with the details here. We're not reacting to the quality in any form or sense of debate to these ideas or comments at all. Our role is much more looking at the ease of understanding, the correctness of how we've categorized, whether it is support or not support, divergence from a proposed question, or in these cases as Kathy pointed out, a whole lot of new ideas.

The test requirement to get carriage to make it into the following reporting as a recommendation or a consideration, hopefully we'll have more recommendations than considerations for communities to react to. But it is possible that we may end up, when we look at our dependencies, that the full working group ends up with an either/or. And we may in fact have something in our final report that is asking the community, do you prefer this over that. But we'll try and minimize those wherever possible.

So it's going to be up to the ability of the full working group to come to consensus, to a sufficient level of agreement, not full consensus. That's not required. It's nice if it happens, but it's not required. But a sufficiently high level of agreement, as opposed to divergence on a matter for it to become a recommendation. And this is where Jeff and I are going to not go down the rabbit hole of disagreement, but philosophically we do have some differences in the following statement. And Avery (ph) and I have long held that if we can't make a recommendation for a change, then the previous information, guidance and rulings in the applicant guidebook and the previous round will stay as she is writ. So what we hope is that the motivation there will be for if something is unconscionable, disagreeable, or desperately needs change out of our last experience, that we can come up with a recommendation or suggestion for improvement or codify something that can work more effectively that was observed during implementation or review of implementation, and not leave poor things in place. But we believe the fallback position is, if you can't agree on a change, then it doesn't change. But that is the job of the full work group.

Jeff believes, and I'm paraphrasing him here, that some changes may need to be put through with unconscionable or clearly negative experiences, even if we can't reach the high level of consensus. Though I don't think I've done him justice.



We'll argue that one out on the full working group if we need to. But just to be really clear, it's got to get sufficient carriage, sufficient support, to get it going beyond the next drafting. Thank you. I'm sorry. I just get fairly keen to make sure that everyone realizes what the subgroups are doing. This is what will be happening in the full working group. Thanks, Jeff, back to you.

Jeff Neuman:

Yeah. Thanks, Cheryl. I think you've done a good summary. I think in just listening to you, maybe it is kind of worth having that discussion with the full group so that they know that even the leadership is not always of one mind on everything, and maybe it is good to have that discussion on the status quo at one of the future full group calls. I think that actually might be beneficial, even though to balance that with Cheryl and I and the whole leadership team from an administration viewpoint are very much in line on everything that we do. But that doesn't mean that we're not individuals that have differing opinions on different topics. And they may be an interesting thing to cover, though I don't want to ever give the impression that just because we may disagree on a substantive issue that we're not organized or on the same page on running this group. So let's balance that and see what happens as we move forward.

So the last comment on this section is from Christopher Wilkinson. It's an additional comment and I think it's in line with some of his other comments where he certainly indicated in other sections that he does not believe that there should be generic top level domains in the future, truly generic ones, open ones; and that it's his belief that we should have only categories moving forward, and that they should each come with their own criteria.

So this is basically just in line with comments from other sections. I don't think -- I'm not sure we need to -- unless anyone has got any questions on his comments, I'm not sure we need to spend too much time on it. Because I know we spent some time on it in a previous tab on probably 2.2.1 or 2.1.1, wherever that was in there. Yeah.

Okay, I'm not seeing any comments, so I think it's time to move on to the next tab, which is 2.2.5, application submission limits. So this topic, if everyone remembers correctly, this topic deals with the question -- basically two questions that were addressed in the initial report, which were, should there be any limits on the number of applications overall in a particular round that can be submitted? So should you say that we're going to accept up to 5,000 applications and then that's it overall? And the second question is, okay, let's say whether we have that overall limit or not, should we limit the number of applications by any individual entity or any person that's affiliated with different entities? So should there be those types of limits?

In the initial report, we came out with a recommendation that was pretty much supported, though we didn't do consensus calls, from my recollection there seemed to be a good amount of support for the notion of not having limits, either based on the overall number of applications or based on number of applications by any individual entity, et cetera, because of the practicalities of how difficult it would be to enforce that type of restriction and that just didn't seem to the group something that we felt was feasible. So we put this into the report.

So 2.2.5.c.1 said, although some members of the group supported the notion of putting limits in place, ultimately the working group concluded that there were no effective, fair, and/or feasible mechanisms to enforce those limits. And therefore we concluded that no limits should be imposed either on the number of applications in total or the number of applications from any particular entity. So with that recommendation, we pretty much had agreement by down the line, with the exception of Christopher Wilkinson had some concerns expressed by the public interest community organization, which we'll go into in a minute.

So the groups that agreed with this recommendation, the ALAC, the Brand Registry Group, the Business Constituency, XYZ which is a registry, Registrar Stakeholder Group, Neustar, FairWinds Partners, the Registry Stakeholder Group, Lamaret (ph), and Validais (ph). I'm not sure -- maybe Kathy, you can help me. I'm not sure if there was a comment on this from the NCSG in particular that may have been in another section we didn't move here. But we don't see anything from the Non-Commercials. But essentially as you can see, whether it's registries, the ALAC business, registrars; there seems to be general support that it was not feasible to limit the number of applications by a single entity, or limit the number of applications in total.

Christopher Wilkinson though did want to make sure that the existing players would not necessarily be able to apply for hundreds of new top level domains, that we should ensure that there is diversity in the application process, that new applicants have the option of engaging with what's called the RST which is a registry service provider, so a technical backend provider that's independent of the preexisting registries. And the work track should have considered some form of cap. I will say that I think the work track did consider that, and I think we just went round and round, as the working group, in trying to come up with some way that we could do that that was fair, that made sense, and we just couldn't.

Now the Public Interest Community, which submitted comments as well, and I think Kathy may have been a part of that as well. So maybe if I'm saying anything incorrect, maybe you can correct me. But the belief there, and we copied this comment in total from another section. So the real pertinent part I think is in part B here. So this is line 15 in the section, which says that applications by a single company, partnership, or venture must be limited. So I would put this as divergent, not really a concern. So let's change that to red if we can.

The incumbents in this community who have the time, resources, and interest to submit thousands of new gTLD applications, so that would be not fair to the rest of the world that's learning about this. Strict limits on the number of applications per company and in cooperation with other companies is both fair and allows for adequate oversight and public review. Their recommendation is that no more than two dozen applications for each company, including its parent, subsidiaries, and affiliates. So that's the comment from public interest community. Kathy, please? You're in the queue.

Kathy:

Thanks, Jeff. I agree that this should be red, this is divergent. These were comments written largely by Mitch Stoltz of the Electronic Frontier Foundation and signed onto by public interest groups, as well as public interest law clinics, I

think around the world, but I'd have to go back and see. There's kind of a core group of people that submitted these.

What I'm going to do is go back. I did check the -- so if that could be red, I really think this is divergent. So first a technical question, and then a placement question; the technical question is, is there a limit? Is there a limit to the number of gTLDs we can put into the root? You can Cheryl would be more familiar with anything that SSAC (ph) or the technical experts have given us. So what's the limit and what if all of that is applied for in the next round? So if the limit is 20,000 and we get 20,000; or the limit is 200,000 and we get 200,000 applications in the next round; what happens then?

And then the second thing is the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, I did check for comments, did not respond on this particular point. But they responded on other points, and I'd like your permission to insert it here, when I've plowed through it, that there's a great worry that the knowledge and the ability to apply for new gTLDs is limited in places around the world, including the global south, indigenous people, et cetera. So that even the next round may not be one in which -- the next round may be one in which we again see Western European and North American companies coming forward to apply in great numbers, and the rest of world not.

And so we've expressed that concern again and again, and I think it would apply here to the limit. So what I'll do is go (ph) through and send that to you and Cheryl and Steve and staff for consideration. Okay, back to you. So technical question, what's the limit in the root? And then again, what happens is that happens in the next round? Thanks.

Jeff Neuman:

Yeah, thanks, Kathy. So on the -- I'll do the latter question first or comment, so yes, please, if you see any items in the Non-Commercials that relate to this, please do send to us, and we'll put it in the chart, absolutely. On the first question, which is what are the limits; so this has been subject to a couple different comment periods. I think it was initially in the -- it might have initially been in the comment period a year or two ago, and then we did send specific questions to both the SSAC, the RSAC, the Office of the Chief Technology Officer of ICANN, and to GDD to ask them a very similar question about the limits that were in 2012, which were on delegations, not the number of applications. So there could have been 10,000 applications, but there was a limit of delegating no more than a thousand per year or per 12-month period.

So we did ask those questions to those groups. Those groups did come back with comments. Those comments were reviewed, and put into the initial report. I can't recall off the top of my head what section that is in. Maybe someone, Steve or someone else, can put down what section it's in the initial report. But there is a discussion on that. And then those comments are being reviewed by Subgroup B -- yes, B. Because I think it's the one that Rubens is leading. So that's in that Subgroup right now. Long story short, no one has said that there is a limit on the number of applications, it's more a limit of how many delegations can be done within a year. And then there's not, I would say, not agreement on a specific number or even a specific formula, but just some general guidance from the SSAC and from others, combined with some prerequisites that they'd like to see

in place for monitoring purposes. So that is a topic that Subgroup B is -- that they're talking about.

And as Jim says, it's the rate of change to the root. So what they came back with -- was it the SSAC or the RSAC, the root zone servers came back and actually said, we think that it's not a static limit that we think the limit of delegations could actually increase every month or so, based on the previous month. And so it's kind of this sliding scale formula that they recommended.

So Kathy is saying, can we put a note in the spreadsheet here that another section is looking at the-- so I think yes, we can put a note in here. But let me just clarify in the report that I think it's just limits on the number of delegations, not the number of applications that can be submitted. So if someone can correct me if I'm not mistaken. So no other group is talking or has brought up the issue of number.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You're not mistaken.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Cheryl, please, yeah?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, and basically I'm just typing it in. Remember, I was Work Track 4 as well. This is what came out of Work Track 4's (inaudible). A huge number, you know, 20,000 is going to take less time to introduce in a safe, stable, and reasonable rate of change than 200,000. So it's one of those, if it happens, it happens, as S-H-1-T does sometimes. It's a bandwidth issue and it's a -- for want of a better word -- conservative approach. If stability is fine with this amount, then there is an equation to apply to increase, providing there is physically enough time to do it to this amount in the following month. So it's like having a huge tax problem. If it's a problem you've got, then to some extent it's a function of success. So we shall see. Crystal balls are the other thing. We could all gaze into crystal balls. But that tends to end up with perspective views, not actual prediction. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks, Cheryl. It's also worth pointing out, that's why I'll just get (ph) to Kathy and I'll read some of the comments here that from Jim, there is a limit on the number of applications ICANN or the third-party contractors can process. And also so bandwidth is an issue, and the ability to roll back things if there are problems. So I just want to also notice that I covered the SSAC and RSAC responses. GDD, when they responded, so ICANN Org responded. And the response that they gave was pretty much that look, they don't think that there is any limit on the number that they can process. They can always ramp up to process the applications. So they did not express any concerns when we asked them that question. And we could certainly maybe, Steve, maybe putting that in here as well in this matrix. I know it's in a previous matrix that we used for the draft of the initial report. But it seemed that GDD, their response was, hey, you guys decide and we'll make sure we meet the demand.

Now obviously they're not going to commit to if they initially think that they can do a certain number of applications in a few-month period, of course if they get more applications than that, it's going to take them longer. But they're not on the record as saying that there's any limit on the number of applications that can be submitted.

So Kathy, your hand was raised. It is raised, okay good. Please, Kathy?

Kathy: Okay, I'm on mute. Really interesting discussion, thanks for putting the flag in here to wherever the discussion of technical is, both operational bandwidth, how to process the applications; but also any kind of technical limit and is it possible that if there are 200,000 applications in the next round that's if we blown the root, we're done. So that would be very interesting. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yep, thanks, Kathy. Okay, let me just make sure we covered all of these. Oh, one thing I did want to note as well is on the public interest community comments, if we can go back, there is a suggestion in there that says they recommend ICANN allow no more than two dozen applications for each company. I'm assuming that they would mean individual in there. But I'd like to know how they came up with that number. Was that just kind of -- is there some kind of science behind that number? How did they get to that, or is that just kind of let's throw it out there and see what people think? So if we could send that comment to the -- put it as an action item. If we can just sent that, I just want to know where that number came from.

There are people that are typing. Kathy is asking, what number? So if you look at line 15 in the Google document in the part B, which is now a divergence in the red, in limit applications. In the last sentence that's read, it says, we recommend ICANN allow now more than two dozen applications. So that's the number I'm referring to. And I guess, yes, the two dozen should probably be blue, I guess, as well. But it is red. So now that makes it purple? So if we could just ask the question on that one.

Kathy: I'd be happy to ask that.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Well, we'll send -- do you want to do that, Kathy, or do you want us to send something?

Kathy: Sure, go ahead, if you want to send something to Mitch Stoltz, I think that would be good (inaudible).

Jeff Neuman: To Mitch? Okay. So we'll do that and I'll cc you, Kathy, as well.

Kathy: Terrific. Thanks, and that's a good question.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. All right, I think since we're running up the time, I think we -- this is probably a good place to break, and the next time we will talk about accreditation programs for registry service providers. Those are backend providers. Just a reminder, there is a full working group call on Monday. I'm just going to my calendar -- if someone's got that off the top of there. There's a full group call on Monday at -- and probably someone's going to post it before I find it. So that would be the 21st. I can't find it on my calendar, so maybe it's actually on the 22nd. Let me double-check. Because if it's an early morning for, 03:00, it might be on Tuesday. So let just double-check.

Okay, yes. It is a full working group call on the 22nd. Sorry, so that would be on Tuesday. There is also a Subgroup A call as put down there at 15:00 UTC on Thursday the 31st. So we are skipping a week. We're skipping a week because it happens to be the GNSO strategic retreat, the council, sorry -- the Council's strategic retreat. So we are skipping Subgroup A next week, but we are having a full group call on the Monday, because that's before the strategic council session. So hopefully we'll send out another reminder on that, so we'll talk to everyone on the full group call on the 22nd. There's also a Subgroup B or C call -- C call I think that's later on today. If I'm not mistaken that is at 20:00 UTC.

Okay, that's it. Everyone else has their time back. We can stop the recording. Thanks, everyone.