

**ICANN Transcription  
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WG  
Monday 13 June 2016 at 1300 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WG call on the Monday 13 June 2016 at 13:00 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-13jun16-en.mp3>

Michelle DeSmyter: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on the 13th of June, 2016, at 1300 UTC.

In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants, attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. So if you're only on the audio bridge today could you please let yourself be known now? All right, thank you. And I'd also like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And also keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

I would like to turn the call over to Steve Coates at this time.

Steve Coates: Thank you. This is Steve Coates. I'll quickly go through our proposed agenda for today. I think it's slightly abbreviated given that we leave for Helsinki next week. Proposed agenda Number 1, review agenda; Number 2, roll call, statements of interest. If there's any updates to your employment or – please

update your statement of interest. Number 3, review of action items; Number 4, planning for ICANN 56 Helsinki, including our working draft agenda and any other business. Can you guys hear me okay?

Klaus I hear you're – I see your hand is raised.

Klaus Stoll: Yes, I would like to update my statement of interest.

Steve Coates: Excellent, thank you.

Klaus Stoll: Okay, my – I've changed today my statement of interest on the ICANN pages. I'm no longer the General Manager of the Global Knowledge Partnership Foundation; I am now self-employed. Also, there is no financial or contractual arrangement between ICANN. I also would like, in the interest of transparency, declare that I'm the sole member of the Brokers Group LLC registered in Virginia and Germany. Thank you very much.

Steve Coates: Excellent. I think we can move to Agenda Item 3, review action items. Steve, is that you?

Steve Chan: Sure, thanks Steve. This is Steve Chan from staff. Let me go ahead and put this up – or put the action items on the AC room. And there's not actually a whole lot new to cover. But the updates that it wanted to share are Item 12, which was to go out initially to the SOs and ACs on the overarching issues. This item is now complete. The CC-1 letter, those are – or letters – those were sent on Friday. Actually Item 22 as well, which was related to the drafting team to develop CC-1.

Hopefully – Susan, you can hear me a little better now? A little. Let me go ahead and keep going then. I'll just quickly repeat what I said. Item 12 and 22, which were related to CC-1, those are both complete as of Friday. Those were all sent out and I believe that's actually the only thing that I wanted to provide an update on.

So actually back to you, Steve. Thanks.

Steve Coates: Thanks. I think we can move to Agenda Item 4, planning for ICANN 56.  
Steve, did you have a doc for that? It's attached, thank you. I'll pass it back over to you, Steve.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Steve. I'll actually pass that to Jeff.

Steve Coates: Oh, Jeff. Apologies.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, it took me a second to get off mute. Can you guys hear me okay?

Steve Coates: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Great. All right so we have several sessions in Helsinki. There are – there's one session that's intended for the cross community or for, you know, for everyone to attend, all stakeholder groups, all supporting organizations, all advisory committees. And then there are face to face meetings of the PDP working group itself.

So first we'll go over the description that we have of the cross community session and then we'll go over the face to face ones. And this is still kind of in progress, it's still in the planning stages. And so if you have any comments please raise your hand and we'll cover it. And, you know, this is kind of just the thinking that the co-chairs had along with ICANN staff and really one of the goals of this cross community session is to encourage discussion. So it's not really meant to be a panel discussion, it's not meant to be for the co-chairs to talk about in a great detail; it's really to encourage both the working group to talk and also those that aren't in the working group but that come to the session.

So what you see up on the screen, which was also sent out you see an overview of the session and who should attend and why. It's also important to note that the – we're going to share some time during this cross community working group session with both the Cross Community Working Group on Use of Country and Territory Names. We'll give a few minutes for them to do a summary of the status of that group and its proposed plans moving forward.

And then a little bit of time with the Competition and Consumer Choice and Consumer Trust to give an update of its work, but not engage in long conversations with those. I think each one of those groups have – well at least the CCT Review Team has its own session at the Helsinki meeting so they may just give an update and give a preview of what's going to be covered at their session.

So with that the other thing is that we were given a list of subjects, which we believe were from the ALAC and the GAC and others as to what topics they wanted to cover during the session. And so you'll see I think, scrolling down, yes there you go, you'll see those topics, called Topics of Broad Community Interest. So that would include things like promoting applications from underserved regions and developing countries that you see under Number – sorry, it's Page 2 D.

They also wanted to discuss community applications, geographic names and other names of public interest at the second level and safeguards, PICs and a question that we just added, which I'd like to get feedback on to see if you all think this would be a good topic to discuss during this cross community session, which is how can the implementation work or can implementation work proceed in parallel with policy development.

And the example there would be so let's say Track 1 of this group starts meeting and decides, yes, having an accreditation process for backend registry operators from a policy perspective sounds like something good to have. And so we make that recommendation or we look like we're heading to

make that recommendation then in parallel starting some of the implementation work on creating what criteria would go into selecting or accrediting backend providers, that could be something that could proceed in theory in parallel to us finishing the PDP so that doesn't just happen that we do the complete PDP and then start implementation work at that point.

So that's just an example. I'm not presupposing an outcome of the policy process but giving an example of some implementation work that can be done in parallel to policy work. So with that I see there's two hands so let me go over to Alan and then to Carlos. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I see on Item B you have a time of 10 minutes, on the others you don't. I'm happy to speak on H or we could have someone from the GAC, we can decide among ourselves but some guidance as to how much time you want to focus on it, you know, for that particular item I don't think it'll take more than two or three minutes, but that's – we're looking at a pretty packed session so I think we need to identify who the speakers will be and what kind of time we're giving them each.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Alan. I think that would – that's another purpose of today's call is to see who can kind of introduce the topic and get discussions going. So I think I'm glad to have volunteers and we've put in the notes that Alan – so really it's to stimulate discussion so, Alan, if you could, you know, introduce that subject on H and then really see what kind of discussion we get from the crowd on that.

I think we'll have – we have a total of an hour and a half for the entire session, and so the bulk of the session, I believe, will be spent, or at least half the session will be spent on these broad topics of interest. So thanks for volunteering for that.

Carlos.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes, this is Carlos for the record. Thank you very much, Jeff. I just want to make a small clarification. We do have a full session on the use of country and territory names because this is a ccNSO/GNSO working group. It's to be exactly after our session on Wednesday at 15 hours. And we are planning to make it as a forum because we have some important issues to discuss. So we hope a lot of people come to the meeting.

On the other hand, we are not planning to have a specific session on the CCT review; we have only those 10 minutes assigned that you have shown. Thank you very much.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thank you, Carlos, for clarifying that. That would be – okay, I don't know why I thought there was a session for the CCT Review Team but that's great. So, yes, so that will be – that part will be question and answer from the CCT Review Team will give an update as to – on the face to face and the progress they're making and then take a few minutes for questions. But then the rest of the time will be spent on these other topics.

Some of these other topics were introduced by – or wanted to be discussed – there are topics, selected, I should say, by GAC representatives and we reached out to the GAC to see if they could – if they wanted to volunteer anyone to introduce the topics and for a number of reasons they did not want to appoint anyone to introduce these topics.

So what will happen, if – on some of these like one example is other names that the – other names of public interest at the second level, things like that we'll introduce and say that we've received this and if anyone wants to speak on it during that cross community forum we'll let them speak. We'll probably have – we'll probably conduct it kind of like a public forum where we'll initially limit people to a minute or two, depending on how big the queues get, in order to get some feedback on that.

Is there any other topics or is there any – is there anybody else that would want to volunteer to potentially start one of these subjects to discuss and introduce it? I know we have Alan for the safeguards, and thanks.

All right not seeing anyone initially volunteer, we'll send around a note via email to see if anybody would want to lead any of these discussions. So we'll then talk about during this cross community forum that the next steps are obviously we have the face to face meetings in Helsinki, we'll talk about the agenda for the Helsinki, which we'll actually go into in a couple minutes here. And then say that everyone is welcome to attend and participate in those working group sessions.

So it's going to be like a normal working group from – like these normal working group sessions but others are free to come and attend and participate if they want to. Does anybody have any questions on the cross community sessions? Steve Chan, go ahead.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Jeff. This is Steve Chan from staff. And hopefully you can hear me okay. I just wanted to make a comment that the thought to run this meeting sort of like the public forum for the topics of broad interest is really to try to make the session as interactive as possible. And so that was our suggested was to do that. And we certainly welcome any suggestions on how to make the session even more interactive.

So I just wanted to point out the rationale for why we designed the session this – or proposed to design it this way. And just also point out that we're welcome – suggestions to make it more so or do it in a better way.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks, Steve. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you. I'm afraid I missed the first part of what Steve said, that we're going to be running it like the regular public forum or not like the regular public forum ?

Jeff Neuman: Like the public forum, in other words, we'll have people build up queues – so you'll introduce the topic, let's say for PICs and safeguards, and then hopefully people will come up to the mic and give their thoughts on it. We'll have a time limit, I guess, so that we just really get the comments and, yes, so like the public forum.

Alan Greenberg: Okay then if I may have a follow on? It's Alan speaking. The criticism of that has been unless you can really constrain the topic when people queue up they already have their two minutes planned so you don't get reactions to the previous people's comments, you simply get what they were planning to say when they entered the queue 10, 15 minutes ago. So I think we need to have some level of consideration if we're really trying to have some interaction that may not be the best way to do it. Thank you. I'm not sure I have a better way but just a thought.

Jeff Neuman: So, Alan, when you introduce the subject if you could point out some – maybe some questions that people could come up and address at the mic and, you know, whoever is leading the minute or so just starting that topic whatever the other topics are we'll ask the same. So, you know, if you could kind of think of these questions in advance and then we'll do the same for the other topics.

Alan Greenberg: We can try.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, all we can do is try. This is a new format. And, you know, otherwise, you know, if time really runs and nobody is saying anything we could always go back to the overall questions that we submitted out for CC-1 but, I mean, our goal is really to address these topics of broad community interest that we were given. So I'm hoping that because we were given these topics there are people that have been thinking about these and that could address them, I'm hoping. Anyway.



Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: All right thanks, Alan. So any other questions on the – Susan, good okay.

Susan Payne: Yes, can you hear me? I hope you can.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Susan Payne: Just a question about F. I'm reading that as being intending to cover second level names rather than top level, which presumably would have fallen into the session A from the cross community working group update. Assuming that's correct, I'm – I'd quite like to volunteer for Section F.

Jeff Neuman: Okay great. I think that's – that is the right assumption. We were given that, I believe it was from the GAC, without much explanation so I think that would be great if you could lead that session and see if people will come forward and address it, especially those that wanted this issue on the table. Thanks, Susan.

So we have someone for F – we have Susan for F, we have Alan for H. It would be great – I could easily do J because I can talk about what we talked about at the GDD summit and kind of reintroduce that. So it would be great if we could find people for D and E and we'll put that on the list unless anyone wants to volunteer here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Jeff, Cheryl here.

Jeff Neuman: Hi, Cheryl. Go on.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I popped in chat, I'm happy to fill wherever, sorry, with anything that you need me to. But I'm obviously, you know, I'm part of the Geo Names group and go back to the original study group on that so you could pop me in there if you want and I can fill in with anything as desired. And there's also useful if

some of us have very brief interventions or (unintelligible) we can keep conversations going for any of the other topics of course.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Cheryl, were you involved in the – I mean, I know Avri was involved but were you also...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes I was.

Jeff Neuman: So promoting applications...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Use me as required depending on what talents you get, just fit me in where you need me.

Jeff Neuman: All right, Cheryl, I think if you were to do D, so promoting applications from underserved regions, developing countries.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Happy to do it.

Jeff Neuman: That would be great. Sorry, the notes say C, it's actually D or it may be the new C. I don't know, whatever – what's D on the current form, I'm just watching that the notes are going back and forth. Cool, so that would mean we would need just someone for the community application, and if someone wants to volunteer here that would be great, if not we can just do that over the list.

Okay, any other – thanks, Cheryl, Susan and Alan. Is there any other questions or comments on the cross community forum? Okay, I'm just reading the – oh, Alan, yes.

Alan Greenberg: Just on community applications, we have a number of people who have – who submitted community applications or were associated with those who were refused and I think any of them could probably be button-holed to talk on the generic subject without talking about their specific example. So, you know, Avri is clearly one example but there are others around who are likely going to be at the meeting and participating. So it shouldn't be hard to find someone who can talk with passion about that one.

Jeff Neuman: I'm sure. So, Alan, if you could – can you, you know, reach out to some of them and see if someone will volunteer to take it on, but with the caveat that you said that we're introducing it in kind of an objective way without trying to – then they can raise their comments about the process as part of the discussion but when they introduce it it should be in an objective manner.

Alan Greenberg: I'll give it a go and report back.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Thanks, Alan. Paul is saying, "Can we add other topics to the list? I don't want to disrupt the flow but I think a streamlined dotBrand process should be included for example." I think we should have time. I'm checking with Steve Chan, but I think introducing that as a separate subject would not be an issue timing wise.

Steve Chan, do you have any thoughts about adding Paul's subject to the list since we did cross out a few?

Steve Chan: Thanks, Jeff. This is Steve Chan. So I guess if we assumed each of these topics might take 10 minutes or so then we have five topics, 50 – so I think we're right around 75 minutes or so at this point or 80 minutes maybe, it seems like we could add that. Although I would possibly note that I'm not sure how broad of a topic that is given the interest from across the community. I would just add that. I'm not saying one way or the other I just would perhaps put that forward as a concern.

But timewise I think we should be able to accommodate that and – although perhaps we would have that as the last item, so if there's something that does fall off perhaps that would be it, the one that would fall off. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks. And why don't we do that then. We'll add kind of like an if time if time allows we'll do that one. And I think that's kind of a subject that's well – I'm sure people will address it in the CC-1 comments since that's part of categorization. I'm sure that that may also get into some of the proposed face to face sessions that we have anyway.

So if we scroll down then kind of transitioning to our face to face meetings and we actually have two sessions, two face to face sessions, I believe it totals three hours or two hours and 45 minutes I think is – if I'm correct. Let's see that's – yes, so we have two different sessions split by a break. And we wanted to do, for the first session, was to discuss the overarching subjects, again and any feedback that we've received up until that point.

So as you know, we sent out – and as Steve reported earlier, we sent out the letters this past week or last week, if we could come, you know, maybe just get a sense of our stakeholder groups, our advisory committees, even though the comments aren't due until July if we could get some sort of sense from our groups as to what their views are, even if it's like in an outline form, then we could have a good discussion on that in our first face to face session.

And then the second face to face session will be used to talk about our work plan going forward and more specifically breaking down into the work tracks, talking about coming up with the – well the procedures for the work tracks including potential rapporteurs of these work tracks as we kind of talked about very early on in those whole process. So talking about creating mailing lists and electing leadership, discussion of which topics are of which work tracks and to make sure that we all kind of agree that, yes, these are the subjects that we think should be in each of these work tracks and making sure that there's as little overlap as possible and where there is overlap or

potential overlap that we make sure we have processes in place to ensure communication between the work track so we're not duplicating efforts. So that's really kind of the goal for the two face to face sessions. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry to dominate so much of the conversation. Based on the contracted schedule in Helsinki there's going to be some real difficulties at least for a few of us, and I'd like to make a request, which I understand is going to be hard to meet. A number of us who are heavily interested in this topic are actually in Helsinki for other meetings, and therefore we simply can't carve out all of the GNSO meetings that are of heavy interest in simply saying we're skipping the others. In my case I'm running a lot of the others.

So to the extent that we can publish detailed schedules ahead of time so people can zip in between from one meeting to another, or if necessary put in something in writing ahead of time, and at the same time try not to make locked-in decisions at the face to face, that would be useful.

You know, I know I will not be able to be there for the full two sessions for the gTLD and to the extent that my needs can be accommodated as well as I'm sure, and I'm not the only one, that would be useful. thank you.

Jeff Neuman: So I think – thanks, Alan. I think the goal is so that once we solidify on these subjects and everyone's kind of in agreement then we will put these out in writing specifically try to put timeframes associated with these but obviously we'll have to, you know, kind of go with the flow as to how things happen so if some discussions take longer or shorter, you know, they are what they are. Yeah, I hear what you're saying, Alan. It's kind of a new format for all of us.

It's supposed to be – what policy of Meeting B was supposed to be was to be just a policy development meeting and somehow it got turned into every group has to have their own meetings as well and unfortunately there are conflicting sessions. So we will avoid definitive decision making in the face to face meetings just like we do in the regular meetings where decisions have to

be taken on at least two separate occasions. So hopefully that will help. And we'll do what we can to post timelines and things like that.

Any other questions or comments on sessions in Helsinki? Is everyone comfortable with the way that we're planning on doing this? Paul McGrady says, "Steve C, will the public be invited to comment during the face to face?" Yes. So, yes, this meeting is open to everyone, working group or not a working group, so to the extent there are comments that are relevant to the discussions that are taking place, absolutely, we'll take comments from – happily take comments from anyone.

I'm just looking at some other things on the chat. It looks like we've covered most of them. Okay, I think that completes – Steve Chan, do you have anything else to add to this before we go back to the regular schedule – agenda?

Steve Chan: I don't think, Jeff, thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Steve Coates, do you want to take it back over?

Steve Coates: Okay. I think that's it for the agenda. Does anyone have any other business? We have one more meeting, I believe, before Helsinki. I don't have my calendar.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, we have – this is Jeff Neuman sorry. We have one more scheduled, if we're still looking at whether we need it or not. We're going to talk with the co-chairs this week to see whether we have enough for a session next week but we'll put it on the schedule but please look out, we may – if everything is set with Helsinki and there's no comments that we have to go through we may not keep that meeting. So we'll – just please be on the lookout. It will be on the schedule. We'll send out calendar invites for it but we may end up cancelling if we don't have that much to talk about.

Steve Coates: Thanks, Jeff. And just – I think I've mentioned this before – this is Steve Coates – that unfortunately I will not be in any of the sessions in Helsinki as I'll be tied up with the Nominating Committee. So my apologies for that. Seeing no other requests for any other business I think we can adjourn.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Thanks, everyone.

Jeff Neuman: You can stop the recordings.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you the meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop the recordings. Thank you. Everyone have a great day.

END