ICANN
Transcription
GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group
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-subsequent-04mar19-en.mp3 [audio.icann.org]
Adobe Connect recording: https://participate.icann.org/p9teovovd5a/
Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page:
https://community.icann.org/x/SYs2Bg
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Operator:	Recording has started.
Julie Bisland:	Great. Thank you. Well, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on Monday, the 4th of March, 2019.
	In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge at this time, could you please let yourself be known now?
	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 background noise.
	With this, I'll turn it back over to Jeff Neuman. You can begin, Jeff.
Jeff Neuman:	Thanks, Julie. This is Jeff Neuman. Welcome to the call. Just out the outset just want to say that this call is going to only be 60 minutes, or end by the top of the hour, as opposed to our normal 90 minutes, because the Council, the GNSO Council, has a special call that they need to do. And so, we can't really overlap. So, with that said, we're going to finish just at the top of the next hour so that people can get to that other call if they need to.
	The agenda for this call is on the top right-hand side of Adobe Connect, as normal. We're basically going to spend the bulk of our time on Number 5, which is starting the next section of the Supplemental Initial Report. The role of public comment, I believe is where we left off.

But before that, we'll do our normal updates to statements of interest. We'll talk a little bit about the next steps for the Sub Group comments and then a little bit about ICANN, which I know everyone is – a lot of people are leaving in the next day or two or three. So, we'll spend a little bit of time talking about our meetings on Saturday and on the following Wednesday.

With that said, any other business that anybody wants to cover?

Jim Prendergast: Hey, Jeff. It's Jim Prendergast. I apologize, but Adobe is kind of screwed up and I'm trying to get it to work, but I can't raise my hand.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Go ahead.

Jim Prendergast: Could we get an update from you and Cheryl? I believe during the last GNSO call you gave a presentation to the GNSO Council. So, could we get an update from you on how that went? And could you tell us where the slides are posted? Or could you circulate them to the list if they're not posted anywhere?

Jeff Neuman: Sure. Yes, we can – why don't I do that after we – just let me do a call for any other agenda items and any updates for statements of interest, and then I'll get to that. Any updates for statements of interest?

Okay. Not seeing any, let me just cover what Jim just talked about. I think it's easier before we get into the review of the comments. So, last week – I think it was last week now; it might have even been a week and a half ago – I gave an update to the GNSO Council. It was after a long discussion on the EPDP, which had a motion that ended up being deferred. So, I think most of the wind was out of everybody's sails by that point in the call.

But we just went over the expected timeline, which we talked about the work plan on our last full group call. And so, you should have access to that work plan document. And then we also prepared – so, we prepared a slide that showed that work plan plus an alternate work plan which showed a potential public comment period – showed the impact of a potential public comment period if we were to choose to do another one prior to the finalization of a final report and recommendations. So, I will ask Steve if he could either send that to the group or to post it. It's probably on the GNSO Council list somewhere, but maybe there's a better link to that presentation.

I don't think we really had too much input. I think most people were exhausted by the previous discussion. So, there really weren't too many questions. I think by that point most people were tired. But I may – I don't know if Steve can think of any kind of questions that we had, that we got. I think Keith may have asked a question as the chair. But I'm sorry. I was not prepared. So, I'm not – I cannot quite remember. But I think it was probably about the timeline. Maybe Steve or someone can remind me. If not, I'll send an email to the list once I look at that transcript.

There's a question from Anne. "What's the impact in terms of timeline for a second public comment period?" So, basically, just to sum it up – and I think, hopefully, Steve will find a link to those slides – but essentially, it added about five or six months to the ultimate time schedule. So, instead of finishing – our work plan had us finishing in July. The alternate work plan with the public comment would like to be done before the end of the year; so, in December, before we break for the end-of-the-year holidays. So, that's the impact.

Okay. With that said, again, hopefully Steve will find a link or someone will find a link and we'll post that as soon as we get it. It was really done just to update the Council as to where we were, because our time that we have to meet with the Council in Kobe is fairly brief. So, this enabled us to give a much more in-depth update than what we'll be able to do in Kobe.

Okay. Moving out to – hopefully, ICANN – Julie, hopefully you see Anne's note to dial out to her. So, if we can do that, great.

So, the next step for Sub Group comment analysis. So, just to report that Sub Groups C and Sub Group A are both completed with their analysis of the public comments. Sub Group B is making good strides towards completing. If we were going for the next week or two, they would probably complete. But because we have Kobe, it won't complete until the end of – towards the end of the month. But otherwise, everyone's making really good progress.

So, just to recap, the role of the Sub Groups were to see – make sure we understood the comments that were submitted; if we had questions, to submit those questions to those that made comments. And right now, ICANN – Steve and Julie – are very hard at work trying to, along with the leadership team, summarize those discussions so that when we get to the full Working Group discussion on these items there's a good, reliable summary of where are the comments for any particular issue so that we don't have to review all the comments again. When talking about it, we can just say, "Well, look, the comments from these stakeholders were 'this'; comments from other stakeholders were 'that.' Here's the questions we're left with." And help us to try to get to a substantive consensus on those positions.

So, there is – Steve, I don't – good. Okay. Steve posted the slides – sorry – from the last agenda item, on that link that's in Adobe. But Steve, can we also – do you want to just take a minute to just go over those summaries that are being prepared? And this will also lead into the discussion on ICANN 64, because we're going to spend a couple of sessions going through those on some of the topics. So, Steve, please, if I can turn it over to you?

Steve Chan: Sure thing. Thanks, Jeff. This is Steve Chan, from staff.

Briefly, so the idea and the effort that staff has initially started but will undertake in earnest is to try to summarize the Sub Group discussions, as Jeff noted. And the goal is really to try to turn those Sub Group discussions into something more concise and digestible by the full Working Group, something to help avoid the full Working Group from having to go through every single comment again, as the Sub Group has done. So, really, the summaries are intended to facilitate a discussion and make sure that they are able to be held at the full Working Group level in a constructive manner.

So, the summaries, they attempt to try to at a high level look at the level of support for recommendations. And the intention isn't to foreclose any additional discussions or make, I guess, try to decide an outcome or assess consensus level which is, of course, the role of the co-chairs, but really just to try to pull out and identify what that level of support is for either preliminary recommendations or options. The other idea and emphasis is to try to highlight new information within the comments, and it's also to identify themes where several commenters might have identified the same element that should be brought to the full Working Group.

The other thing that we're doing is we're leaving these summaries within the Public Comment Review Tool. And while that might not be the most reader-friendly place to leave them, the idea is to make sure that to the extent any member wants to see the full comment, it's to make sure that that context is available and in the same place so that it's all very, hopefully, convenient for the Working Group members to review.

I will post a link shortly. There's what we're calling a proof of concept. We haven't gotten much further than this at this point. We just want to make sure that this format is going to be usable and helpful to the Working Group. But what you'll see is a link to one of the Public Comment Review Tools. It's for Sub Group C. And the topic is accountability mechanisms, and it is in Column F. And I'll include all the information in the AC room.

Hopefully this is helpful. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Steve. This is Jeff again. So, I think you'll notice that there is – sorry. I'm just trying to – I got logged out of Google for some reason. So, I'm trying to get into that sheet. So, if you look at Sub Group – there's the link. So, Steve has – if you look at Tab 2.8.2, Column F, you'll see what this summary looks like. And again, it's just been started. We're working on how that's going to look. But again, it's to try to call out the patterns, if any, and to call out the questions that exist or that still remain in order for us to provide a little bit more detail or to see if we can come to consensus on some of these items.

So, you'll see that there's a couple of items that we saw for this particular item, the accountability mechanisms, where we noticed that there was support, in general, for a number of different things. Now we need to kind of flesh those out. It's not saying that there's unanimous support for those items. But in general, if you were to look at the comments, those were the patterns.

And as Steve said, we're not ignoring any of the comments that came in, but what we're hoping for is for those that may have had some concerns, whether there's anything we can do with those items now knowing that, let's say, there's some support for a limited appeals process to people, both substantive and procedural. Yes, there were some comments in there that had some concerns about that. So, are there any – is there anything we can do with those that have concerns to mitigate those concerns such that they could support those items? And that's what we'll be doing over the next several months on each of these topics.

I want to kind of merge this topic with the next one, the planning for ICANN, simply because there will be – and maybe Steve can put up the outline. And I'm going to – before going over the Work Track 5 stuff, which is on top because they're the first sessions, there's – if you look at Session 2, full group Working Group Session 2, at the bottom, you'll see "Topics Worthy of Closure Based on Public Comment Input So Far." And there are a couple of items that we are going to do, just to work through at these sessions to try to close them out. So, we'll have the summary for those items and the questions and talk about those during the Kobe second session on Saturday.

So, essentially, what we noticed, especially doing, like, Sub Group A, towards the end of Sub Group A there were a number of topics on systems and communications where there was mostly agreement on the recommendations that we had. So, we may start with those easy ones, simply because they will be easy to close out. It's not saying we won't need more detail on some of those recommendations or that we won't make recommendations calling for more details from an implementation team; it's just we think that because of

the initial recommendations we have in the initial report, along with the public comments, that it seemed like the community was on board with some of those recommendations.

I know I'm speaking kind of generalities, but it will become much more clear on Saturday when we start going through those items. They include items like we want to make sure that all terms and conditions are finalized for the applications prior to applications being submitted. Right? Not a very controversial one. But if we could close out some of these and get them towards final recommendation status, that will provide good test cases for the more complicated issues that will come up, where we may or may not be able to get consensus.

So, looking at the chat, let me make sure – I've got to go back here, because now there's some more comments. Let's see. So, Kavouss says, "When would the date for public comment be?" Kavouss, if you click on the link that Steve put up there from the slides from the GNSO Council, there's both a timeline if there is a public comment – if there's no public comment, as well as if there is. And so, that should help you figure out when, if we did a public comment, when it would be.

Let's see. Rubens says, "Summaries intend to reflect, in my opinion, what either has likely to end up being adopted or causing change in the report, and that might even come from a single comment or from a single person." That may be true, Rubens.

"When will we see the full...?" – Jim says, "When will we see the full list of items that will be discussed during these sessions so we can go prep?" That's a good question. Steve and I, we did talk – our leadership team did talk about a couple of those items. So, Steve, is that at least a list of those items and where they can look? I think we can agree to get that out by tomorrow since I think we're just reaffirming the ones that we discussed the other day.

Susan says, "Will you circulate – have you circulated this doc currently in the window re: Kobe sessions?" So, Susan, we'll have a working – this is still kind of a working draft. I know that we have to add the specific subjects for Working Group Session 2 and 3, which we'll do shortly. And then perhaps – I know that some members of Work Track 5 leadership team were still playing around with those topics, but I think they're pretty close to final. So, we'll have that up shortly, as far as the list of subjects.

Okay. Going back and talking about ICANN, the first session – so, let me just take one large step back. Our meetings, everyone should have the ICANN agenda. Work Track 5 will be the morning of Saturday. That would be March – I can't get my days straight. March 10? Or 9? Sorry, March 9. Saturday, March 9. And then someone will let me know if I have that date wrong, because I just lost my calendar. But yes, Saturday is the 9th. Great. Yes.

So, those first two sessions are on Work Track 5, and you'll see the topics there. They're really talking about going through some of the public comments that – so, there's some continuation as to what they've been doing the last couple of weeks. And then looking specifically at the second session, which again still is in the morning – so, it's really both in the morning, separated by a coffee break – they'll talk about substantive issues: three characters, intended use, things like that, translations, and the next steps for Work Track 5.

Then there will be a...

Kavouss Arasteh: Hi, Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Kavouss Arasteh: Sorry. The Saturday morning, there is an EPDP meeting and that is important. So, it is no way that we avoid such overlapping? Otherwise, without blaming anybody, we will not be able to attend this important Work Track 5. So, that is the question. There should have been some sort of coordination if possible to avoid any overlapping. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Kavouss.

                     Rubens just posted something that says that he thinks the Saturday morning EPDP session was canceled. I don't know about that.

                     But yes, I understand, Kavouss, and I would love to avoid conflict, but it seems like that's not always avoidable because of issues of the day that seem to take a lot of time. Berry is saying the EPDP session starts at 11:00. So, there will be some overlap. I apologize for that, but that's – we kind of have to work with what we have. And of course the EPDP, as Berry said, will continue throughout the day. So, it will impact the full Working Group sessions, which are – the two sessions are in the afternoon, of Saturday, as well.

Kavouss Arasteh: Do we mean that in the first part of the morning, there is no EPDP? Because I have not received anything about cancellation. But if the first part of the morning is canceled, I would be very happy to come to Work Track 5. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Kavouss. I only know what I'm reading on the chat. And Berry has said that the EPDP session starts at 11:00. Work Track 5 starts at 9:00 a.m., if I'm not mistaken. So, we'll have a couple of hours of Work Track 5 without that conflict.

                     Okay. Before I go to the full Working Group, Martin, do you want to add anything to what I said? I probably should have called on you earlier.

Martin Sutton: Hi, Jeff. Thank you. It's Martin. I just thought it would be worthwhile just to sort of clarify some of the progress for those that aren't members of Work Track 5. So, we had approximately 50 comments submitted for Work Track 5's initial (inaudible). They were a mix of individuals, companies, associations, supporting organizations, and advisory committees and governments. So, we had a really good mix of responses to that part of the initial report. So, it's taken us a while to plow through those comments.

                     We're very much in the stage that you articulated that the three Sub Groups have been through so far. And we've had two meetings recently, which has gone through the general comments that were provided, and we've also gone through the preliminary recommendations comments. So, that's why when you look at the Work Track 5 sessions outlined for ICANN 64, we want to focus in on mainly the preliminary recommendations that we've talked through, and staff have gone through and prepared sort of a summary of the comments for each of the preliminary recommendations, which helps us identify those that have got the most convergence and those with the least convergence. And where we see the least convergence items, we're picking those out for more substantive discussions during ICANN 64. So, those ones that we've highlighted here are the three-character codes, intended use, and translations. Translations wasn't included in any of the preliminary recommendations. So, we think that's a very useful one to cover on the Saturday.

So, I just thought I'd give a bit of background and substance to why we're choosing those particular topics. Thanks, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Martin. I appreciate that. And please come along to Work Track 5. I know Saturday is the first day and the first sessions, but I think highly worth it and very important to make progress on those issues.

Just looking at the chat, let's see. "Could we also get any slides that will be used ahead of time so the group is not required to react on the fly?" Jim, we will make our best effort to do that. I think it's – we will try to do that. We'll certainly get the list of topics and certainly get the areas of comment forms so that you can look at those as we go into it.

On the full Working Group sessions that are in the afternoon, there's two sessions that will be on Saturday and then a third session that will be on Wednesday afternoon. For the first session, we're going to go talk about – and I think we talked about this on our last full group call, although I have so many meetings I'm not 100% sure of that. But we're going to go into the notion of closure and how that relates to a round and the impacts that it has on such things as the start of another – of a subsequent round after that, refunds, evaluations, the reservation of strings, things like that. I think what we're going to – the hope is to have kind of a diagram that shows all the things that may be impacted by this concept of round closure. And then the Board had brought this up in one of their letters, in their comments to the initial report. So, this is a good subject that we can go over at that meeting.

And then the second one, which has a lot of open areas or open questions that would be good to have some substantive conversations is on the notion of an appeals mechanism. This is differentiated from accountability mechanisms. So, we're not talking about ombudsman or independent review – sorry, reconsideration or independent review; but more the thought of an appeals process for certain decisions that are made through the new gTLD process. And we were just looking at that section, actually, and it did seem like there was support for some kind of appeals mechanism outside of the accountability mechanisms that currently exist in the bylaws.

Sorry. Did someone else have a question?

Thanks, Anne. By "reservation of strings," – Anne asks, "What is meant by 'reservations of strings'?" I think I was – Anne, as you say, it was my shorthand, probably not the precise terms. But if there are applications pending for a specific string, we need to discuss the notion of whether we – if we do start a subsequent round prior to the completion of applications for a particular string, do we take that string and say nobody can apply for it in the next round? What do we do with it, essentially, is the question. So, yes, I did basically say a shorthand when it obviously is much more nuanced, as you're pointing out.

Okay. The second – so, the two items that we have for those, for that first session, are the closure and appeals mechanisms. And then as we talked about a little bit earlier, for the next two sessions – one on Saturday and then one on Wednesday – we're going to pick out subjects like systems, communication that we can hopefully close out, because it did seem like when we went through those comments, at least in Sub Group A, it really seemed like the comments were for the most part all in agreement, with maybe one or two ideas added on to it, but very little in the way of pushback to those recommendations. So, we'll not only look at the way that we've summarized the comments, but also look to

see if we can finalize some of those recommendations, at least to a point where we can start drafting a final report section on that.

Looking back at the comments, "Did we get advice from Legal on statuses, as requested, with respect to those strings?" That's a question from Anne. We – I don't believe – I'll let Steve answer, but I don't believe we've gotten any comment on Legal, other than the statuses of those strings that we passed around. While there may be one or two updates from that chart a couple of weeks ago, I don't believe we're going to get any other response from Legal, other than that's where these stand right now.

But Steve, if you have anything further on that request?

Steve Chan: Sure. Thanks, Jeff. This is Steve Chan, from staff. So, that question on the pending applications was directed at the Operations staff that supports the new gTLD program. They were the ones that produced that initial report that was then supplemented with some additional information from Jeff. The intentions on your support staff for this PDP is that we will update some of the statuses where it was sort of ambiguous about where or why it was still pending. I think we have some additional information that will help show why some of those are still not complete, for whatever reason. So, I think the idea is to make sure that's available for the session and it will support the topic of the round closures, in particular.

So, I guess, just to be clear, that question for us at least it made sense to us, the Operations support team, to give us a status of pending applications. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Steve. Just to read the comment from – Christopher Wilkinson says, "In the case of geographical names, I would expect the reservation of strings at the second level to be the most critical issue." Rubens responds, "When reservations in this Working Group without any other qualifier, it usually means at the top level." Yes. Thanks, Rubens. That's true. ut there were discussions on second-level exclusions, as well.

So, yes, when I was talking about reservations just before, it was at the top level. We're not talking about second-level reservations at this point, although that was in, I want to say, Sub Group B? Or C? But I'm not 100% sure. I can't remember which one had the – actually, it might have been C, now that we think about it.

Anne says, "As mentioned at the prior meeting, do we need to ask Legal about the status? In addition, it is not in our...of those strings and it's not in our charter." So, yes. So, I think I'm not sure – I know, Steve, you and I discussed this. I don't think Legal was going to provide us with anything, other than what we already have from the Operations. So, I don't think at this point there is a Legal position.

But I do know that the recommendations as we have been discussing in this group and in the Sub Group seemed to have some support that if there were pending – if there was something still pending on a particular string before the start of a next round that we would put those strings aside and not allow applications for that string in that next subsequent round. So, we'll get more on that when we talk about the closure issue on Saturday.

And Anne is just saying, "Have we asked Legal?" So, let me go to Steve, and then I'll go to Christopher.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Jeff. This is Steve, from staff, again. Just to try to directly respond to what Anne is mentioning, so the intention in looking at the list of pending applications for this Working Group is most definitely not to try to resolve their statuses or try to develop policy in any way to facilitate the resolution of those strings. It's purely instructive and, in this case, to try to identify what closure means for the future rounds.

So, I just want to be clear that we as a Working Group are definitely not looking at the pending applications for the purpose of trying to resolve them in the 2012 round. That is, as you say, not within our remit and is not the intention. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Steve. Christopher, please?

Christopher Wilkinson: Hi. Good evening. Christopher Wilkinson, for the record. (inaudible) there's an echo. Staff, I'm not speaking on (inaudible).

Julie Hedlund: Christopher, do you have your laptop microphone or speaker turned up?

Unidentified Participant: The voice is very much (inaudible).

Christopher Wilkinson: (inaudible) continue. I'll try to solve this problem and come back.

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead, Jeff. Christopher is going – we're going to work together and see if we can find out what's going on.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thank you. Okay. So, let's go back to then – sorry, some other comments. "I had made some what Jeff said, just stated it's definitely policy as to 2012 applicants." Okay.

I think that we can probably go on to the supplemental report. Why don't we do that? Why don't we go to the supplemental report so we can move on with the role of public comments?

Okay. Where we left off was that on the 2.3.c.1 – so, it's Line 8 in the Google doc. And so, the link to the Google doc is at the top right-hand side of the screen. And maybe someone else can post it in the chat. What we're talking about now is that – is the role of public comment and in the public comment period and how it's used in different parts of the evaluation process. Thanks, Steve. It's Tab 2.3.

So, the first, 2.3.c.1, says that we had some implementation guidance under consideration, saying that the Working Group believes that the mechanism for public comment and the system could be further optimized. We say that the system used to collect application comments "should better ensure that the email and name used for an account are verified in some manner and that the system used to collect application comments should support a filtering and/or sorting mechanism to better review a high volume of comments. The system should also allow for the inclusion of attachments."

A lot of this actually is a – was also – if this seems like déjà-vu to people in Sub Group A, Sub Group A talked about systems, in general, and some of these same comments were repeated from that, although those dealt with, in general, application systems as opposed to the public comment systems that were set up.

So, not a surprise to see that everyone, other than ICANN Org – oh, even ICANN Org – everyone that commented supported this, including the BRG, the ALAC, IPC, the Registry Stakeholder Group, and BC, Registrar Stakeholder Group. ICANN supports it

but has one – but has a concern. But just to go back into a little bit more detail in the comment, this really seemed to focus on making sure that all of the support – the comments mostly – not mostly – the comments supported the notion of capturing this additional information about the commenter to make sure that we weren't getting frivolous comments or that things could be verified and not getting spam on these lists.

In addition, as the BRG states, that it would also – better systems would allow applicants to review and prioritize the comments, predetermine categories and responses, could help prevent – could help the evaluation panels and, over all, better systems could prevent duplicate comments. Of course the other stakeholder group constituencies seem to support that line of thinking.

But I do want to note the concern expressed by ICANN Org, similar to what we talked about in Sub Group A on the system. ICANN Org notes these types of – while it supports the notion of having better public comment systems and searchability and all those things and adding attachments, they – this could make the system more complex. And then with respect to attachments, that attachments will not necessarily be searchable. So, even though – even if you could search on the comments that didn't have attachments, making attachments searchable is a lot more difficult and give many more things for evaluation objection panels to review. And all of that would impact, in ICANN's view, timelines and costs. So, ICANN is not saying don't do it; it's just saying this may have the impact of higher costs and more complexity, hence more delay.

Okay. There seems to be a discussion on geo names in the comments. "In general, when we say a question is out of scope, we must say when and where the question is in scope. When a geo name is delegated, there will be a demand for reservation and regulated delegation of second-level names." And Anne is saying, "As to geo names, Jeff's assertion is particularly problematic since there will be new policies." So, I'm not sure what that is, but I will follow up after – I'm not sure I asserted a policy, but if I did I'll go back and correct the record.

Any questions on Recommendation 2.3.c.1?

Okay. 2.3.c.2: ICANN should be more explicit in the Guidebook on how the comments are going to be used, how they're taken into account by evaluators, panels, and to the extent different types of comments will or will not impact scoring. I'm sorry. I missed one. And that applicants – if they are going to affect scoring, that applicants have an opportunity to respond.

As you can imagine, this recommendation seems pretty straightforward. It had support from dotgay, from ALAC, from IPC, from ICANN Org, though there are some notes in ICANN Org about just trying to clarify a couple of the items that we have in there.

It sounds like someone else has their mic open. Let me just finish this, and I'll call on whoever it is that wants to be called on. Two areas of concerns were expressed by the BRG and the Registries, and they center around just giving some more information and definition in terms of the type of comments and how they would be interpreted by the evaluators and the impact on scoring. That's what they need in order to fully assess the impact of our proposals. And I think the BRG and Registry Stakeholder Group comments are similar in that respect.

Okay. Questions or comments on 2.3.c.2?

Okay. Jamie, please?

Jamie Baxter: Jamie Baxter, for the record. I would just like to add that I believe that letters of opposition should also be grouped as public comment, because they don't fit nicely into any other place in the process. And there's some (inaudible) raised in our responses later on addressing letters of opposition. In most cases, it only affects the community applicants. I don't believe I've seen any letters of opposition to standard applicants. But I think it's a very important issue that has to be addressed in this PDP discussion.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Jamie. I think we have more of that down below, some rows ahead. I think we'll get to that. And I know we discussed that with respect to community or communities in Sub Group – geez, is it B or C? It's one of those two. It might be C, I think.

Okay. So, the next – we're on Line 28 on the Google doc, and this is talking about the cutoff of application comments. And we noted that while there was a cutoff in the Guidebook for applications to be considered by evaluators, that the cutoff for Community Priority Evaluation was not – went on a lot longer, as Jamie has brought up, on a number of occasions. And that longer period was because of the – was due to the timing of the Community Priority Evaluation. And so, we had asked questions specifically about whether that was appropriate or whether we should – whether it was fair to continue having comment periods that extend – for CPE that extend beyond the date of the initial evaluation.

And so, we've got some comments in. This one has a range of comments: some that agreed, some that disagreed, or some divergence. So, the ALAC agrees that there should be a longer comment period for initial evaluation – I'm sorry, there should be a longer comment period for CPE than for initial evaluation. But also thinks it's sensible to limit the comment period for CPE to run parallel to the initial evaluation comment period. The ALAC also states that they are supportive of the idea of limiting comment period, again to run parallel to the initial evaluation comment period.

IPC states that they think all the comment periods should run concurrently and for the same amount of time and only extended where there is a change to an application, which we will talk about in the next tab, 2.4; not today, but probably the next time. And they say that it's only – it is reasonable to extend if there's some sort of change that impacts the application.

Dotgay LLC fully supports comments on all applications but must be fair, and they believe, as Jamie said, it should be a consistent length, an equal length of time for public comments that open and conclude at the same time. And here's where Jamie talks about and dotgay talk about they believe that "letters of opposition should be considered a form of public comment and should adhere to the same submission deadlines." If you recall in CPE you were required to demonstrate support for your community application if you applied for a community-based application. And then they say that, "If community opposition exists against a community application and the opposition does not intend to participate in the community objection, then it should be required that the expressed opposition be registered during the public comment period in the form of a letter of opposition." So, that is in line with what Jamie just said.

The BRG registry, Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, and the BC do not support extended comment periods for community applications. More specifically, the BRG and the Registries believe that there should be the same level of – I'm sorry, they believe that

it shouldn't be changed from what it was in the current Guidebook – that exists currently in the Guidebook.

The NCSG finds that the CPE is a useful evaluation mechanism and does not support the idea of shortening its period. So, they would not be supporting the notion of extending or for differential time periods – I'm sorry, would not be in support of having the same time periods or running concurrently.

The BC states a larger comment period for community applications makes sense to them and allows for the communities that are impacted to become aware of it and to file a response.

I think we're losing some people. So, it may make sense to just draw a line here. But let me comment on what Anne says. "Jeff is saying no new applications for strings applied for in 2012. This is problematic." So, Anne, if I said that, I did not mean that. I didn't intend to mean that. What I was talking about was the start of the next round and when we would start another round and what could be an option. But it was not – it was meant as an illustrative point, not as a policy statement or a finding of consensus. So, it was meant to illustrate a point of why we may need to define what it means to have a closure to a round and what may rely on it. And I said reservation of strings, and you asked me to be more precise. And I said that reservation of strings, that's one of the things we needed to talk about as to whether someone could apply in a subsequent round for something that was not finalized or completed in the prior round. So, that's not meant to state how – a definitive position, but meant to illustrate that that's why we need to define closure and talk about these issues.

All right. Christopher, your hand is up. Is there anything you want to add?

Christopher Wilkinson: Yes, Jeff. This is Christopher Wilkinson again. We have more echo. Two points. First, I think that the terms if they involve comments should be longer because we're getting into fields where it will not be individual comments; entities, organizations, even governments. We need to have the time to analyze the proposals and to corroborate internally their comments. So, I really think that we need to be able to lengthen the time available for comments, if necessary.

Secondly, I understand that there is something called Community Priority Evaluation. If that is the case, the more I think about it we actually need a Geographical Names Priority Evaluation approach. You cannot subsume the geographical names and block into the general pool of generic top-level domains.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Christopher. We'll refer that comment to Work Track 5. We're counting on that Work Track to provide us with a recommendation. And so, that would be within their – that group's purview as to whether (inaudible) that is set up. So, we'll refer that over to Work Track 5.

Okay. Anybody else have any comments or questions before I – before we close this and then meet again in Kobe?

All right. Not seeing any – there's still some discussion on 2012 issues. So, that's interesting and we'll keep record of it of course, but let's close the meeting for now. And see everyone in Kobe. Safe travels, everyone.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Jeff and everyone else. This meeting is adjourned. You can disconnect your lines. Have a good rest of your day.