

**ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP - Sub Group A
Thursday, 3 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-03jan18-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p5mej2tqplm/>

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/l4lWBg>

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

Operator: Your recording has started.

Julie: Great. Thank you. Well, good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure PDP Subgroup A call held on Thursday, the 3rd 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, would you please let yourself be known now?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Hi. It's Anne Aikman-Scalese. For some reason, I'm not getting into Adobe. But I am on the phone.

Julie: Okay, great. Thank you, noted. All right, and hearing no other names, just want to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I'll turn it back over to Jeff Neuman. You can begin, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you, Julie. Hello, everyone. Welcome. Happy New Year. And I hope everyone is well-rested and is ready to begin kind of the home stretch for this group. We have lots to accomplish in the first half of the year. And hopefully we can meet our schedule. So with that said, our agenda is, as always, on the top right-hand side of Adobe Connect. And for those of you not in Adobe, although I see that Anne has now successfully made it into Adobe, we will basically start where we left off in reviewing the comments, and then we'll talk a little about -- well, we'll start off with applications assessment rounds, and then if we have time, go on to the different TLD types. And with that, I will see if there's any comments on the agenda.

Okay, not seeing any, and I will then ask if there's any updates to statements of interest in this New Year. Okay, not seeing anything in the chat, not seeing any hands raised or anyone speaking up, I will assume that everyone's statements of interest is updated accordingly. If not, please do update via the email list.

One thing I do want to note as we go through these comments, is that the ALAC has through Justine -- and thank you very much, Justine -- has responded to a number of questions that have come up, not just with Subgroup A, but with I think all of the subgroups. They sent that to the list probably about 24-36 hours ago. And we will cover those starting with the section that we're in, which is applications assessed in rounds. And then time permitting, if we get through this section, we will kind of go backwards a little bit to just cover their comments from previous sections and then go on to 2.2.4.

For those other groups that have gotten questions or requests for clarification, please if you can, get those requests or responses to us. That would be great. Then we can then incorporate those into our discussions and ultimately into the summaries that will go to the full working group, when we have some more substantive discussions on these topics.

So just to remind everyone where we are, because it has been a couple of weeks since we last talked, we are in the section -- and I know this is going, I'm actually reversing some of item 2 and 3 on the agenda, because I'd like to actually -- sorry not 2 and 3. 2b, I'm doing first, and then the rest of 2a.

So this section is dealing with whether or how we do the next application windows, whether it's first-come/first-served, whether it's rounds or whatnot. And so going back to just one of the ALAC's clarifications, we had asked them, there were some questions on their statement. And to just go to line 4, if you are on the Google Sheets, and the link is in the agenda section of the Adobe Connect. Or it's line -- I guess it would be 1, the number 1, on the Adobe room.

So basically what the ALAC has come back with is just a clarification that they were asked to clarify the two paragraphs on the concept of rounds. And they just want to make sure that really section 2.2.3 covers the bulk of their response. But it says essentially that the ALAC places a greater priority on the aspects of applications assessment over submission. So in this respect, the ALAC believes that applications, regardless of whether they are submitted or received year round or first-come/first-served, must be batched in order to allow not only for fair competition in string selection, but to facilitate manageable review procedures by various stakeholders from initial evaluation to public comment, GAC advice, GAC early warning, objections, et cetera; and resolution procedures for contention sets of community priority evaluation.

They are strongly against doing first-come/first-served immediately, and there are still -- they believe that there are still aspects of the program that need to be improved and that need to be addressed between one or more rounds. And they support the approach that's discussed later on, which we'll actually skip to right now, where we left off.

So where we left off, now jumping down to -- and everyone should have control over your Adobe Connect -- is 2.2.3.d.4, which is on Adobe it's page -- well, it's really small to read. Let's see. On Adobe that would be page -- sorry, there we go -- starting at the bottom of page 5. If you're on the Google doc, it would be line 36.

So just to refresh again everyone's recollection, this section basically provided different options of how we could go forward with assessing applications. And each -- if you remember the first option was going straight into a first-come/first-served. There was another option that basically talked about conducting one or more rounds, et cetera. So where we're leaving off here is on the option that is -- actually, let me take a step back.

So what it seems like, actually no. I'm sorry. I'll do a summary in a second, after we review this. But this latest option is whether we conduct one additional round, followed by the permanent opening up of a first-come/first-served process for new gTLD applications. I'll note for the record that this option really just had support or agreement from Google in the comments, and pretty much across the board, everyone else seemed to -- at least that commented on the specific sections -- not support the concept of only doing one additional round, followed by first-come/first-served.

So Google has said that in order to deal with the pent-up demand, they believe that at least one, quote, "round" is needed before you can then do a first-come/first-served. But they do believe that it is possible to go to a first-come/first-served after you do one round. Keep that in mind when we talk about the next option, or one of the next options that talks about, doing two or three rounds followed by first-come/first-served. I think ultimately Google envisioned us going to a first-come/first-served process at some point. And they would support doing it after one round.

The rest of the comments there is, including the Brand Registry Group, the International Trademark Association, Registry Stakeholder Group and ALAC do not support having just one round and then going to first-come/first-served; not all for the same reason. Some of those groups do not ever want to see a first-come/first-served process, as we'll see later on down in the comments. And others are the comments that don't agree with one round followed by first-come/first-served, may agree further down with doing several or a couple of rounds, followed by first-come/first-served. So they're not opposed to first-come/first-served in general.

So the Brand Registry Group thinks it's a little ambitious for us to just do one round followed by first-come/first-served, given what happened in 2012. The International Trademark Association, I think if I remember correctly, did not support first-come/first-served at all. And so this option would not be one that they support. And the Registry Stakeholder Group does feel like eventually it could go to a first-come/first-served process, but does believe that there needs to be at least one round, if not more. And the ALAC, as we just read from the overall comments and as we'll see when it comes down to choosing an option down below, they do not support the notion of first-come/first-served, at least at the beginning or pretty much they don't envision a first-come/first-served at all.

So those are the comments on that section. Any questions about the comments that came in? Okay, so jumping to the next option, which does have some more support than the first option of just doing one round. This one is an option to do two or three additional rounds, separated by a predictable period to do some major course corrections, and followed thereafter by a first-come/first-served. This one obviously since Google had supported doing the one round above, followed by first-come/first-served, I think although their comment is not in this section, I think it's safe to assume that they would support this option, if the first option wasn't selected. But this one also has the support of the Brand Registry Group that thinks it's a more reasonable and progressive approach. The International Trademark Association does not in general support the notion of first-come/first-served, but does believe that this does have more merit than the first option, which was just doing one round followed by first-come/first-served. But they do believe that this would put -- this would still create a burden on ICANN governments and brand owners to monitor new gTLD applications, if we go to a first-com/first-served at all.

So registry -- I'm sorry, it's the ALAC. The ALAC again -- I'm looking at their overall comments -- supports the notion of rounds and does not generally support first-come/first-served. The Registry Stakeholder Group, if you look at 2.2.3.d.1, which would be line -- going back up to it at this point. I think it's line 19 in the Google document. Sorry, I don't know what that is at the moment in the Adobe Connect. But if you're in Google, it's line 19. It does talk about doing one or two further application rounds, followed by a first-come/first-served is one of the viewpoints. And the other viewpoint is that the -- well, the other one is similar to the one that Google had expressed, with doing one round followed by first-come/first-served. So the registries ultimately do envision going at some point to a first-come/first-served process.

Okay, I'm jumping back. Sorry, I know we're jumping back and forth. But some of the comments have just referrals to previous sections. So I want to make sure we cover them all. And let me just make sure that we've got -- yes. So those are the comments on doing two or three application rounds separated by predictable periods, followed by a first-come/first-served. So again, I think this one has some more support than the first option. But still there are a number of groups that do oppose going to first-come/first-served, which actually leads us to 2.2.3.d.6, which is immediately going to first-come/first-served. And I think we can say unanimously from the comments that came in that there is no support for going immediately into a first-come/first-served, albeit for several different reasons.

The BRG, the Brand Registry Group, and the Registry Stakeholder Group believe because of the pent-up demand that we certainly can't start out with a first-come/first-served. And I guess I'd put Google in this category too, even though their comment was not put into this section. We can safely say that there's no group that supports immediately going to a first-come/first-served, again, because some groups oppose first-come/first-served completely, and others believe that it would be too ambitious to start with that, because of the pent-up demand.

Any questions on that? I don't think we need to jump through specifics. Because I think it's been covered previously. But all of this ultimately leads to start the question as saying, of all the methods, the models that were discussed; which model do you believe should be employed? Or if there are other ones that you could suggest, this question left that open as well. So again, to just do kind of the summary. I don't think anyone had selected going straight into first-come/first-served. So that option I think we can pretty much at this point put on the back burner. Again, it will be the full group that ultimately makes the decision. But none of the comments that we had gotten in support going immediately to first-come/first-served.

There is one comment from Google that supports going -- actually I could say maybe halfway the registries as well, but not the BRG, do support or could support doing one round, followed by first-come/first-served. I would classify there being a little bit more support, adding the BRG and the registries doing two or three rounds, followed by first-come/first-served. But as we'll go through these comments individually, you'll see that I think the most supported option would probably be staying with rounds, at least for the foreseeable future. But let's go through these comments and see if there's any clarifications or questions.

So I'm on line 53, which is page 7 of the Adobe Connect document. So the ALAC again, if you look at their overall comment, does not believe that -- although it says here in column E that they don't believe first-come/first-served should be used in the next round, and that they don't take a position. I think, with the clarification that they offered, that I'm just reading the clarification again and maybe Justine, you might want to just jump in. But I guess the ALAC does say that they certainly don't want to go into first-come/first-served immediately. But they may support the notion of doing a few rounds followed by first-come/first-served. Justine is typing, just want to make sure I got that correct, as we go back and review.

So if they were to choose one of the ultimately going to first-come/first-served, it seems like they would support 2.2.3.d.5. But let me just see what Justine is typing. Okay, so Justine is clarifying. So no to immediate first-come/first-served. Have a few rounds, likely the best option, which would be 2.2.3.d.5.

The XYZ registry had submitted some comments and they would say that the next introduction should be in the form of a round, and then they are not in favor of doing a couple of rounds before opening it up to first-come/first-served. I think they are more in line with the Google comment, I think, which is going from the one round to first-come/first-served. Let me double-check and look at the numbers to see if I've got that right. So they say, no to d.4, which is actually I'm a little bit confused now, with the XYZ comment. We may need to get some clarification on that. Because they say that they're opposed. They say that they agree with the next introduction being in the form of a round, but then they recommend against d.4, 5 and 6; although d.4 does say one round followed by first-come/first-served. So I'm not sure. I think we might need to ask a clarifying question there.

Steve Chan is typing. Because that, at least for me, is a little bit confusing. If anyone else is not confused, okay. Steve is saying that they're against first-

come/first-served overall. I guess that would make sense as to why they were, got you. Okay. That would -- that does make sense. Okay, so and Anne is doing a checkmark or I think that's a checkmark against first-come/first-served completely. Okay, thanks. That helps clarify it. So I guess so then we put XYZ in the category of doing rounds in perpetuity.

The Trademark Association, actually the Trademark Association does believe again that we should be doing predictable rounds, as opposed to any kind of first-come/first-served. Brand Registry Group does support the notion of predictable rounds, the rounds can overlap, but also above did note that they would support a few rounds followed by a first-come/first-served at some point in the future.

The Business Constituency is -- oh, sorry. Just going back to the chat. Anne says, that's how she read the XYZ one as well. So don't ever open up the first-come/first-served is the XYZ's view. So it's not similar to Google. So I stand corrected. And XYZ is more in favor of similar to what the Business Constituency seems to be saying, which is just doing rounds with some sort of short period of review scheduled in between.

It looks like the Registry Stakeholder Group again, going back, it seems mostly aligned with d.3, which is the option of doing -- going back to d.3 -- is doing everything in rounds, as long as there's a predictable process. Although I will note that there were some registries -- there was not a unified viewpoint, if I remember correctly. Some registries did support the notion of several rounds, followed by the first-come/first-served. So I want to make sure that that's accurately reflected.

The Public Interest Community, which was a group formed by a -- I believe it was a number of Non-commercial stakeholder group or constituency. Some were members, I don't think necessarily all of them. But they seem to be non-commercial organizations. They seem to support option 3, basically that first-come/first-served should never happen. And that would only benefit, in their view, the biggest players. And they believe that predictable rounds would help those that need to monitor the program. So the language in green, which says new gTLDs could be opened up in rounds and applications must be limited. Future rounds, we agree that there must be specific times when applications can be submitted, when the acceptance window closes, and when the process for review by the public begins. And then on the notion of -- they want to make sure that when considering the introduction or assessing in rounds that attention is paid to the community of watchers, which include not just the applicants, but also the public as well, so that they could comment on the applications.

And then on the notion of limits, they believe that applications by a single company, partnership or venture must be limited. So this actually is not a question that we asked here, but was I think addressed in community comment number 1. And I'm trying to see if that was a separate area here. The group had, for those of you just to remind, this working group had concluded that there was not support for limiting applications by a single company, partnership or venture. But the Public Interest Community is submitting a comment saying that they do believe that there should be limits. They believe that there are incumbents in the community that have the time, resources, and interest to submit thousands of

new gTLD applications. And they believe that that's not fair to the rest of the world still learning about the process, or to the community which needs to comment on them. So they believe that strict limits should be placed on the number applications per company. So I will note that that is a concern really to 2.2.5. And I think that's what Steve and Justine are saying. So if we can make sure, actually probably move that comment to that section if it's not already there and actually propose taking that out of here, because it's probably confusing this area. So let's -- we'll make sure we cover that again in 2.2.5.

Okay, and then the comments from the -- oops, I went too far down, sorry. We have comments from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, which is similar to the Public Interest Community, believes that it should be in the forms of rounds. That it's against first-come/first-served at all, and then there is that notion of not on a rolling or ongoing basis, which we had a lengthy discussion about on the last call, as to what that meant. I think we clarified that that really meant that what they did not want was two rounds open at the same time. Now remember the term "open" is one that still needs to be defined. And that is a subject, if you recall from the last meeting that we had, that is a subject that we're going to be taking up with the full group, which is what does it mean to close a round, and how do we determine that a round should be closed, not affecting the 2012 round, because we are operating on a go-forward basis, but for the future. The topic that the full group will take up starting on the next call will be how do we, quote, "close" a round or deem a round to no longer be open.

Jumping then to the comment from the registrars, it seems like again, they would support the notion of certainly not doing an immediate jump to first-come/first-served. They would support going forward with at least one additional round. But they would support the notion of a first-come/first-served if there is a robust model that can be defined. So they still have a preference for the notion of rounds, but would be open, it seems, to talk about a first-come/first-served if it were robust and fair, though that's not defined in the registrar comments.

So I want to just stop there and see if there are any questions. Steve is saying, instead of moving it -- moving the NCSG comments, it would be to just copy it. Well, Steve, I was actually just referring to part B, which talks about the limit of applications, keeping the part A -- well, I guess there's nothing labeled A. My proposal was taking the concerns and putting them more into 2.2.5. Because I don't think that's a concern of whether -- I think that's an overall concern in general, whether you do it in rounds, or first-come/first-served, if ultimately that's the way it ended up.

I think that that was my suggestion is moving part B to the different section. Because I think it's -- I'm not sure that it's related to whether it's rounds or first-come/first-served. I think it's more related to just limits, in general.

Okay, Steve is typing. So again, I think if I'm just going back while people are thinking, it seems to me to be again, no support for immediately going to first-come/first-served. There is one entity, perhaps two comments that support potentially going from one round to a first-come/first-served. There is some more support from additional groups in doing two or three rounds, followed by first-come/first-served. But overwhelmingly, it seems that there is more support for the

notion of not doing first-come/first-served at all, but just doing a continuous predictable series of rounds. But again, that's just kind of an overall summary. Of course, the full group will get all of the comments and the full summaries.

Michael and Steve are typing. And while they're doing that, we're going to jump to line 62 in the Google document. Oh, Steve Chan said, left the comment in there, but removed the concern coloring. Okay, copied the entire comment into 2.2.5 application submission limits, and removed it as a concern. Okay, thanks, Steve. That makes sense.

Michael is saying we could describe it as some support for x rounds and first-come/first-serve, and those who are against completely first-come/first-served, if we were going to sum it up in a sentence. I think that's right.

Okay, so then the question was asked for the model that was selected, are there any mechanisms that we could employ to mitigate any of the downsides? And a new idea submitted by the registrars was that ICANN clearly defined the number and frequency of application rounds prior to a continuous process. So registries believe it's essential for ICANN to clearly define the number and frequency of application rounds prior to the implementation of this continuous first-come/first-served process in order to avoid any uncertainty around that process and the eventual rollout of a continuous process.

So again, the way I've interpreted this comment and Donna and others from the registries, is that if we do -- ultimately go to a first-come/first-served, they would like ICANN to say definitively we're going to do x number of rounds, three rounds, four rounds, five; whatever that is, and then go into the first-come/first-served. So that everyone knows, the community knows that there is a certain number of rounds followed by first-come/first-served. So again, that's if ultimately there is going to be a continuous first-come/first-served that ICANN should specific up front the number of rounds, and that may help also the rest of the community accept the notion of going to a first-come/first-served potentially.

And Donna is typing and Justine. Okay, sorry Donna. Donna was not involved with these comments, but the interpretation makes sense. Okay. And then it seems like the International Trademark Association again talks about the benefits for brands in doing continuous rounds. But they do say, if applicants know that they have three opportunities to apply, there should be less of a bottleneck of pending applications. And so when the first round -- so in other words, I think this comment is basically saying that if they know there's going to be predictable periods of rounds, let's say one round will start in 2021, the next round 2022, et cetera. If those are set in stone, it may not force brands that aren't ready to apply or other applicants that aren't ready to apply, to go in the first one, because they're afraid that another one may never happen. They may then say, well, there's a predictable date for the next round. I can wait until round 2022 starts. So I think that's INTA's comment, basically saying that you may not have as much of a rush in the next round if there is certainty that there will be a certain number of additional rounds. And that it would also provide the opportunity for applicants to familiarize themselves with the requirements and benefits of obtaining a new gTLD.

Justine says just to note in advance, RySG line 11 seem to say they do not support placing limits on applications. Thanks, Justine. I think that's right. I think where we get to that application submission limits, I don't think there were -- well, at least in the working group discussions, there was certainly not support for those limits. But let's wait until we get to 2.2.5 to talk about that.

Any questions on the mitigation, 2.2.3.e.2? Not seeing any, if we go to line 65, is there a way that we can assess demand to know whether we should be doing a round or first-come/first-served? I think that across the board most people felt like that would be a difficult thing to do. But to go through the comments specifically, the BC, the Business Constituency, doubts that many companies would want to announce their intention before the application window opens. The registrars seem to agree with that notion, by while they would support the notion of trying to assess demand, they don't think it would produce -- an expression of interest process would produce meaningful results, because of confidentiality of data and to avoid what they're calling front running, which would be those that would look to see who's expressed an interest in a specific and applying, and then perhaps in order to create contention, especially if we allow private resolutions or auctions or things, there's a concern that they may use that data to then submit an application.

The International Trademark Association is opposed to expressions of interest, because of confidentiality concerns, like the BC and registrars have indicated. And they believe that if we look at the last round, the most recent round, you can assume that there would be a similar number in future rounds, and introducing a set of two or three further rounds set in stone could help provide adequate data as to the demand on a going-forward basis.

The At-Large believes that expressions of interest only yields useful insight for well-educated markets. So that could be a good way to assess demand for new gTLDs in the future. But it also could help promote greater awareness in regions where awareness was low in 2012. So they do believe that there could be some usefulness in doing an expression of interest process. But they also then suggest a simpler form of market surveys could be used at ICANN road shows and other outreach event efforts. So that could help gauge demand for new gTLDs in the next rounds. They could incorporate questions targeted at establishing on the one hand awareness of the key aspects of the program, and on the other basic expectations of potential applicants.

Justine is typing. If anyone wants to raise their hand, I'm happy to yield the floor. A lot of people are typing. Okay, while typing is going on, I will check back in a second. We'll go to the next comment, which was the registries. And the registries seem to be opposed to any kind of notion of expressions of interest. The goal should be ultimately to do a continuous process and therefore expressions of interest would not, I guess, be in furtherance of that concept of doing a continuous process.

So Justine is just summarizing ALAC, saying that instead of using resources for expressions of interest, a process that could be better would be used for outreach and as part of outreach, doing some sort of simpler market survey approach. Okay, that made sense.

Anne is typing. So while is Anne is -- oh, as an aside, ICANN needs a workshop webinar on how to prepare an application. This needs to be well in advance of a window opening. So Anne, at some point, we will be talking about the communication period, I believe, which would be, I think, 2.4.2. So make sure you remember to inject that comment for when we are talking about section 2.4, which is within the subgroup. So that's a little bit later on.

Okay, line 71, I think this is the last question in this section, which was kind of an opening for some new ideas. And so it basically says if we were to have a process where a certain date was announced for the next subsequent procedure, what would be the threshold for the community to override that certain date? Okay, so this goes to the notion, going back a few weeks, of we said that -- and it seemed like there was some level of support for doing something like this. That if you're going to have predictable rounds, let's say we announce two or three rounds, that if we do -- we can either do it one of two ways. We could do it in terms of saying it will be a date certain. So you could say that we'll have the next round start in 2021 and then the next round after that be January 2022. I'm just making this up. Please don't comment on the example. But that if we were to set those in stone, those dates, what would be some factors that we'd want to consider where ICANN or the community would say, well wait a minute? We may have too many applications here to say that we can definitely start the next round on that date that we said in 2022. So let's take a step back and override that decision to start in 2022 and so this was kind of what we were trying to get at in the question. And so a number of responses came to this, the first one being the Business Constituency that basically said that really this is a question of ICANN's ability to scale. And so it's really looking to ICANN responses to this question. So we'll kind of put that comment on hold, till we get to, I believe -- well, actually not in this section. But there were responses by ICANN to their ability to scale. And I believe they said that they would have that ability.

The At-Large finds in principle the idea of overriding an announced date to be undesirable. However, in the event that ICANN has not been able to account for the unexpected, then if at all and only on an as-needed basis thresholds triggering an override would be limited to where the actual number of applications exceeded the expected number for a round, which would then negatively impact on the resources assigned based on the expected number, so the availability of ICANN staff resources, evaluation panels, et cetera. Or if the anticipated number of new gTLD delegations -- not applications, but delegations -- exceeded the number which the SSAC considers as the tipping point to maintaining stability, security, and resiliency of the DNS and root zone system. So in those two circumstances, the At-Large could see some sort of override for ICANN Org. Though in general, they believe there should not be an override.

The registries proposed a new model. Actually this is more, I think, Neustar. It's defined as the registries though, unless I'm not reading this correctly, unless I'm skipping here. Can someone just verify? It's got registries in there. But I think it's just Neustar.

Okay, Donna is confirming. It's just Neustar. All right, so if we can just change that to Neustar. I'm not saying the registries wouldn't support it. But this was

submitted by the registries, where they would do three phases, an initial application window in three phases. They would essentially for the benefits they described in the comment, I'm just skipping to the blue area. Their suggestion is that you do brand TLDs in phase one, and then there's certain time periods for -- sorry -- certain -- let me go back. Phase one would be brand TLDs with a certain application window. Then the next application window would be for geographic TLDs would be phase two. And then phase three would be generic and community TLDs. And they believe that doing something like that with a phased approach would deal with pent-up demand. And then they believe we could go straight to a first-come/first-served. I'm sorry, not first-come/first-served, an open round, commencing on October 1st -- well, in their dates that they had put in there, if we were to use those dates.

So essentially it's -- putting aside the dates in there, it would be a several month period to do -- a few months to do a phase one, followed by a few months' break, followed by a few months to do phase two, followed by another few months' break, followed by a phase three. And can I just ask the question of, and Donna's saying it's illustrative. Donna, when you say open round, do you mean rounds specifically or are you saying first-come/first-served. I just want to double-check.

Donna Austin:

Yeah, hi, Jeff. It's Donna Austin from Neustar. So what we're essentially saying here is that there would be one round that would have three phases in it. So you'd split it by brand, geo, generic and community. So essentially that's -- we look at this as that's one round. And the evaluation of those three phases may actually meld in some way. So it doesn't -- so one phase doesn't kind of toll the next phase. It's just that ICANN would receive those applications for those specific categories during that period of time, but then depending on how the evaluation goes, it could be that some move ahead of the others. So that's what we mean by that round. That's why we've used the term "phases", but we consider that to be just one round. When we refer to the open round that would commence on the 1st of October, there wouldn't be any recognition of whether it's a brand, geo, generic or community. It would simply be an open round for any type of application, and then probably subsequent to that would be -- I have to admit it's been a while since I've read through this myself. But subsequent to that, you would have potentially first-come/first-serve. So we're not talking -- the open round in this instance is not first-come/first-served. The open round is another application period, where anybody could apply, and there's no -- it doesn't go to type of TLD process. Does that make sense, Jeff?

Jeff Neuman:

Yes. Thanks, Donna. So essentially just to summarize, it would be a phased -- the first application windows would be a phased round. The second would be an open round, and then after that it could go to first-come/first-served, if I were to summarize it?

Donna Austin:

Correct.

Jeff Neuman:

Great. So thank you for helping to clarify that. And you know, it's an interesting idea. Anne has a comment in there, saying that it makes a lot of sense. This would be something that if some of you can -- I know that the substance of this proposal will be discussed in the full group. But in order to give your group's -- you know, we have representatives here from a lot of different groups. It would

be interesting if you guys could take that back to your larger groups and just say to them, Neustar has submitted this proposal. What are our thoughts on it? This would be good to prepare for that full group discussion on the substance of this proposal. This is something new that hasn't been proposed before, and just going back informally to your own groups to see if there are thoughts on it would help all of us greatly, when we do get to that full group discussion on this.

Donna, your hand is raised. Is that old hand or a new one?

Donna Austin: Yeah, thanks, Jeff. It's a new hand. Donna Austin from Neustar, so just a little bit of context, I suppose, is that what we were trying to do here was think of this from a holistic perspective. So I know that Neustar did not address a number of the questions that we've been working our way through as part of this analysis. But we're trying to think of it from a more holistic perspective and what could work that would meet other objectives of the work that we're doing in this working group. So that's why we've come up with this idea, rather than simply addressing the questions that were in -- the other questions that were identified throughout our public comment process. And that's why we've gone to quite a bit of trouble to provide a rationale as well, so just to provide that context as to why we didn't address each of the individual questions. Thanks, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Donna. Appreciate that, and yes, please do when you discuss this with your groups, do look at the rationale as well and take back what Donna has said from this transcript. We'll note that Katrin from the Geo TLD group does say as an FYI, there was a lively debate with Neustar in Barcelona about this with the Geo TLD group. And the Geo TLD group does not support the proposal, opposes proposal. Perhaps not on this call to put you on the spot type thing, but certainly when we get to discussing this proposal, discussing this proposal with the full group, if you could maybe submit some comments in writing or just a summary of that debate that would be very helpful for others in this group, as well as the full group, to help all of us kind of think about this new proposal.

Anne is also going to -- thank you, Anne, for sending it to the IPC list. And so of course, please send it around to your groups, get some comments on it. And even if there is opposition to certain elements, perhaps there's elements that we could take from that proposal that may work, or not. I mean again, this is not really -- the point is not to in this call to talk about really the main substance of it, but just to see if we can get some groups thinking a little bit early on this new proposal.

And then the last comment in this section is line 75, and it is from -- this one is from the registries, which again says that there should not be any kind of override. I think this goes back to the override question. And so that's the date set for subsequent rounds should not be dependent on number of applications received or expected. So registries do not support any kind of override.

Okay, we got through this section, applications assessed in rounds. Before we go, I do want to just take a minute to go a little bit backwards, just to have people look at the -- and we don't have to cover it specifically on a call. But do look at Justine's or sorry, the At-Large's responses to questions that were asked of the At-Large. I think there was some good comments in there, especially all of them

good, sorry. But there were comments in, I noticed in -- oh, I just missed it. I know, I forgot what sections they're in. But there are a bunch of them, I think in predictability, if I remember correctly, yeah, 2.2.2. There is some predictability. There were some requests for clarification. And if you could just take a look at those and see if those do clarify in your minds what we had asked of the At-Large.

Then of course we covered the 2.2.3 applications assessment round at the beginning of this call. So great. I think that's it. I think we made it through these items. Is there any other business we should cover? Donna says to Katrin's point, there was some flexibility that could be built into the proposal. So that just goes back to helping to get a summary of the discussion in the Geo TLD group in Barcelona on that Neustar proposal.

Great. Well, I think we are ending on time. We do have a call, I believe -- when's the next call? If someone could type that in, I'm trying to remember if we're on a - - yes. Thursday, January 10th, at 20:00 UTC for 60 minutes. Thank you, everyone. We'll take up the differentiation of TLD types -- some people call it categories -- on the next call. Thanks, everyone.

Julie:

Thanks, Jeff. And thank you, everyone, for joining. You can disconnect your lines. Today's meeting is adjourned. Have a good rest of your day.