

**Transcription ICANN61 San Juan
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures
Saturday, 10 March 2018 at 13:30 AST**

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

Michelle Desmyter: Okay. Well, if we're still okay to recording and they'll give me a thumbs up in a minute, we'll then move to Work Tract 3. So sit poised and ready to go ladies. Waiting for a thumbs up for a new section of recording. Thumbs up - good to go. Work Tract 3 - over to you. Who's leading? Karen? Robin? Karen, go ahead.

Karen Day: Hi everyone this is Karen Day for the record. For Work Tract 3, we in our Work Tract have had five topics on our agenda. (New detailed) Applicant Freedom of Expression. You'll see we, at this point in our preliminary report, are going to offer no preliminary outcomes or questions for the community.

The next topic that we have been working on is String Similarity Evaluation. We do have preliminary outcomes and proposals as well as questions on – for community comment coming in the preliminary report.

The same for objections -- we have both recommendations and questions for the community. Those first three topics you can read more about if you'll go to the link that was provided along with the meeting agenda today add to the full fly-deck for the PDP meeting this morning and you'll see more in depth on those three topics, where we are and what you will probably see coming in the preliminary report.

What we're going to look at today are the last two topics on our subject list here – accountability mechanisms and community applications. Both of

these we have some preliminary recommendations we're going to put in our report and we have some questions and options that we want the communities to weigh in on during the comment period.

So, with that, we're going to start today's discussion with community applications. And, go forth with that and if we have time for our next slot then we will move to accountability mechanisms. But let's move to just community applications for as which Robin is going to lead us through. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thanks, Karen. This is Robin Gross for the record. We've spent a lot of time in Work Tract 3 talking about the community application process in the last round and what went wrong and what went right and how can we make improvements, and that sort of thing. And one of the things that really came out of this discussion was that there was a need to define what we mean by community applications. There didn't seem to be, and frankly doesn't still seem to be, a sort of shared understanding about what should be considered a community TLD.

We've got a whole lot of different ideas about it should be, you know, only non-commercial or it should be only for brands or it should be only for the cultural things. And so there's a lot of different ideas that have gone around about how we should define community. So there's not agreement on that but there is agreement on the need for a definition.

So that's something that we want to really focus on in the next, in the next little bit here. This process is trying to get the community here to really kind of focus on what it is that – what is the overarching public interest goal that we're trying to further by creating this concept of community applications and how do we get there. What are the kinds of protections that we need to build into the process in order to achieve that.

Okay, so we've got the right Slide up there. So some of our preliminary recommendations/implementation guidance is we need to see more of a

increase of the transparency and predictability in the application process compared to what we had in the last round.

We need to have a shorter time period in which evalu – applications are evaluated and we need to have – this is really important – procedures that are developed before the application process opens. So applicants know what the expectations are and how to meet those.

We also would like to see more opportunity for dialogue and clarifying questions in the community process evaluation to see PE process. And things like less restrictive word counts for communities to engage in clarifying and providing the information that is required on their applications.

Okay, next slide. So that, oh I'm sorry, please.

Jim Prendergast: Sorry, Robin - Jim Prendergast. Could you just go back? I had a question or a comment on the third bullet point, I believe. Could we just go back a slide? So on the point evaluation procedures – should be developed before the application process opens, it's my understanding that we had that last round but that they changed after the application window opens.

So you may want to consider adding some language there that says, "Once they're set, they're set and they're not changed unless it gets kicked back to the community." Or something like that.

Robin Gross: Yes, I think that's an important clarification that, you know, we may have thought we had the process set but then things did get changed in some time – in some time (unintelligible) considerably changed from what we had started with so I think that point is very well taken.

Did anyone else have any comments on that? Or any of those points on that slide?

Okay, then let's go on to Slide 19 there. So the questions for community input and this is the part where we really want feedback from you guys. We really need this kind of feedback in order to complete this work.

So how would you define community for the purposes of community-based applications in the new gTLD program? What are the kind of attributed that are appropriate for a community TLD. Let me just stop there and see if we can get some comments or discussions on that. Anybody have any suggestions how we should define community? Should it just be a group of groups and that's good enough? Or does it need have some kind of demonstrable public interest objective or some other type of criteria that we need to see in order for an applicant to be given the kind of privileges or preferential treatment that one gets when they're designated as a community.

Okay, I'm sorry; I can't see down there but please go ahead.

Woman 1: Thanks, (unintelligible), and sorry I don't know the answer to his question but it might be helpful in terms of his question, but what's the current definition of community? Is there one?

Robin Gross: I don't think there's really a shared one. There is one that's in the applicant guidebook but it is very vague and open to a number of different interpretations so in the last round we saw people saying, "Well they were designated as a community but they shouldn't have been designated as a community."

Other people said, "Well they should have been designated a community, but they weren't." And so there really isn't anything that's concrete or substantive that could really help us to define. It's pretty vague and pretty open and basically just a group of groups.

Yes, I see hands here.

Volker Greimann: Volker Greimann. I think the question shouldn't be what is community or what isn't – well it should be a question but not the first question that we should ask ourself.

The first question that we should ask ourselves is, "What do we actually want to achieve by having a community grouping?" Apparently we are trying to make it easier for certain groups to obtain a TLD where there might be competition for other interests that does not formally represent that group.

But why? We need to define why we want to have a certain process that would make it easier for certain groups to get a TLD. And unless we define this why -- very definite -- we will have a very hard time to define what is a community and what isn't.

Robin Gross: No. I think you're absolutely right that we need to start from this. What is it we're trying to achieve here and then build our definition based upon that. So that's really the kind of input that I'm hoping to get from folks today and I saw we had Stéphane and then I think I saw a hand over here. And then one is at the mike. Okay.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Robin. Stéphane Van Gelder, and the risk obviously of having an open meeting like this is that you get people like me coming in that haven't followed the work and say, "You should be doing it this way." But that will serve you right for not having a closed meeting.

But one of the things that strikes me is obvious and it – I'm sure it's been considered – there's this was the only category in the original African Guidebook and you've discussed categories in another forum as part of this working group and much as Volker was saying the first approach should be defining exactly what we want.

I think you can add to that – do we want categories in general as an initial step before you start to define the categories. This is one, there may be others. You've discussed brands and GOs or whatever.

But I think you have to get to that point of understanding whether you want categories or just a kind of header a genius group of applications and once you've done that then you can start to define what the categories are and to answer questions like the one that Volker's just asked. Thanks.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, Michael Flemming for the record. Building on what Volker has said, what Stéphane has said, I think that we did this at the last ICANN meeting as well. We tried to get into what the community was and there really was no end to it.

But maybe building on a question of why – should we more or less be looking at, you know, a community can be almost anything. So rather than that, what types of communities should have priority? And in that sense, we're not going to limit what the definition of community is. But within the group of communities, what types of communities, you know, would need priority I think would be best to address in that aspect.

Robin Gross: Yes, thanks, I'm really glad you brought that up because that is something that the working group has considered is different types of communities. And this is something that came from our discussion with the GAC in the last - at ICANN 61, where, you know, (Thomas) had a number of ideas about, you know, maybe we'd have different categories of communities.

Some are social, some are language-based, some are, you know, a big long list of categories of TLDs and building on that another suggestion was that maybe we need different rights and different privileges associated with the different types of communities. Such that's it not just this sort of one-size fits all if you get designated a community, you get the TLD and that's sort of the end of it but rather, what are the needs of this community in this particular

process. And how can we address those needs because, you know, frankly the need for a language communities probably going to be different than the needs for a brand community. That type of thing.

So I'm really glad you brought that up because that is something, kind of a direction that we're heading in in terms of initial recommendations is considering the different types of communities and what kinds of privileges do we want to attach to that.

So if others have some thoughts and some suggestions on how we can tailor that, I would really encourage you to respond.

So I see we've got the mike and then Volker and then here and then here. Okay.

Man 1: Thank you, this is (unintelligible) from (unintelligible). So, for you (unintelligible) on the ICANN (unintelligible) a community TLD is defined as a TLD that is operated for the benefit of a clearly delineated community. However you clearly define that? And that you have to be prepared to substantiate if (unintelligible) as of definitive of the community, names and their vocation.

But I didn't have time to look up the Applicant Guidebook but I think I remember that one of the proof of a clearly delineation could be a membership. I also recall a requirement that is, organizations should be established before the release of the first Applicant Guidebook so you couldn't trade a new one just to (unintelligible).

But our experience is from this discussion we have followed (unintelligible) serviced over two years now and what happened in with, pardon my being frank, but mess of CPE. The community definition simply doesn't work. We cannot find one universal definition of that so I would repeat myself, sorry, but I think we should skip it all together and instead have non-for-profit TLDs.

That was (unintelligible) and you would have the public interest instead. That is my suggestion.

Robin Gross: Thank you. Yes, please the corner here.

Liz Williams: Yes, Liz Williams. I'm going to have a Stéphane moment, which is to go back a little – I'm working on the Geographic Names in Work Tract 5 and have been progress on that but I just think it's worthwhile thinking about some first principals of why do we still need a community TLD definition? I don't have a vision one way or the other. But I think it's unwise for us to presume as we move forward with the new round of TLDs that we still wish to carry along legacy issues that we've had in the past.

And this is not the first time we've done it in 2004 of course we had a sponsored TLD round, and the sponsored TLD round gave us some criteria and some identifications of community, but it wasn't defined at that point at the time.

So I just want to be sure that we're not continuing with something that may well have run its course. So just to question – not a statement, one way or the other and it is okay to say, "We don't need that anymore." It's okay to move forward. It's okay to do something different and we have generic agreements and we have generic terms and conditions, if we have generic terms of technical service provision, is it in an interest in a global internet definition to continue with something that perhaps has run its course, but again just a question.

The second thing is what value does a community TLD really give the users of that community – of that TLD that supposedly represent a community and does it create more trouble than it's worth.

I think we have to do a risk assessment around what kinds of things cause trouble for innovation and competition and consumer choice and trust. I think we can, again, set a first principal of questions which, of course, you may well have answered in this set of recommendations that you're handling.

Thirdly, in terms of evaluation, what did the notion of the community TLD cause in terms of positive and negative applicants and I think (unintelligible) pretty much (unintelligible) caused a lot of problems. And those are – and now it's just under CPE provision that there was grave disagreement in many, many elements of the way in which community TLDs were evaluated.

And then finally, the compliance question after application, after evaluation and then in terms of implementation, what kind of compliance burden or otherwise a positive frame does a community TLD notification give to the way in which we test and evaluate whether someone is complying with the terms and conditions of the community TLD contract.

So there's quite a long list of – I'm sure that you've discussed this but I just think it's worthwhile. When we get into the point of thinking about recommendations for policy, that we make sure we've exhausted it all and it is okay to change our mind. It is okay to say, "On the balance of probability we think that maybe we could innovate and move forward in our policy-making."

By perhaps asking the question about whether it's time to move on or away from these really specific labels for the kinds of TLDs that you want in the next round.

Robin Gross: Thanks, Liz. Let me start with your first question which is do we still need communities is this something that we still want to go forward with. This is something that we've discussed in the working group and we've asked a number of times and the response that we got back was, "Yes", in some form we do want this.

But if folks disagree with this, now is the time to say so that maybe if communities aren't the right approach if it's an idea that's run its course, you know, let us know now because we have discussed this in the working group and folks have said, "Yes", some version of this should go forward but maybe others weren't there that day we discussed it.

So if you've got a different opinion, I do hope it will be brought forward today or in the coming weeks. And (Jeff), did you want to add something to that?

(Jeff): God my voice, sorry about that. Yes, just to add to that I think, you know, we have to start at the point of existing policy does talk about community TLDs and a preference for community TLDs. And there hasn't been an outcry from the community to get rid of that completely, in fact, this is the first time I've heard that – a comment saying that we should just get rid of them.

I would caution – there have been comments that have said, "We question whether they should get priority but not just a question of just should we have them at all."

The other thing I would also caution you made a statement of, you know, again, these are in the form of questions so it was that, you know, the applicants. It was a lot of trouble for applicants. I would just caution just as kind of a personal comment that unhappiness with the CPE process does not equate to unhappiness with communities.

There are a lot of communities that didn't have challengers. And if they didn't have a challenger they got approved. They're still operating as communities. They could be very beneficial for their individual communities. We don't know, we haven't heard that they're not.

So I think it's - we need to very careful to equate an applicant's unhappiness with the CPE process or the fact that communities get priority with the notion

of unhappiness of communities as a whole. I think there's a lot of communities out there that have TLDs that are – that could probably demonstrate that they're serving their communities.

So we just need to be careful with that. So that's all it's the only point I wanted to make. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thank you. Okay, we've got Annebeth and then Volker and (Enoli) and (Greg) at the – wow lots of hands I'm not going to be able to keep track of all this. Okay.

Annebeth Lange: Okay, it's Annebeth Lange. I'm really thinking back a little on what's been the purpose of having a community. And for me I think back when we had the sponsored like the museums (unintelligible), those things that were meant to cover a community at that time in a way. So and I (felt back) with the second level remained but we had under-over (unintelligible) that it's certain generic words that can serve a lot of people better if it's taken by a community that work together instead of one .actor using it for a special purpose.

And that's words like culture, could be health, that kind of things that – and we had them words in the last round that serve, in my opinion, and many more people, many more communities as you're all groups of people in a better way than they just one .actor should have it.

So I agree that we should think thoroughly do we need it and why we need it but if we need it, we should do it in a proper way and make the group clearer than it has to be.

As they said today, "What is it a prime group?" And what should the conditions be to be able to be treated as a community. But I personally, I would not go away from it I think it has served its purpose. Thank you.

Volker Greimann Yes, just to (unintelligible) speaking one night here based on a real-world example of a TLD that is run by one of our companies, at this time we only have two options. Either the community runs the TLD and (unintelligible) themselves through a (unintelligible) operator or if they are technically very clever then they do it themselves all together or they don't have any influence at all.

Well we've done for our gTLD as uTLD.(Saarland) which is a small state in Germany is that we have invited the community of (Valance) which is the government's media press, all kinds of economic interests to form a council that advises the Registry Operator which is a commercial operator on policies, procedures, changes – anything that might impact that community.

And that might be also a model for how a community might have the influence over a TLD that they have an interest in. So to say if you have (unintelligible) music, anybody could apply for it but if there's a community, they would have to be in some form or shape tied into the management, the operation of the – not the day-to-day operation – but the policy development and the direction that TLD can develop. Not in a way that would curtail the ability to sell the TLD all together but have the influence there, have a say in how the TLD is run.

So that, for example, if there's an operation that really wants to run it would be able to overpower any community applicant and the community could say, "Okay, we are forfeiting our community application but we want an influence, we want a say in whatever you do with the TLD." That might be an idea to incorporate the idea of having a community influence, having the community have a say in their TLD without having them to run – having them to run it directly. It might even serve their interests better because it takes away a certain operational aspect that (unintelligible) really want to deal with but have to because they have – otherwise they would have no say in whatsoever in that TLD.

Robin Gross: Okay, in the queue I've got (Emily) and then Greg and then (Alan) and who, who else wants to get it in? Okay.

Kurt Pritz: Kurt.

Robin Gross: Kurt, okay. (Emily), please go ahead.

(Emily): Thanks we have two comments from remote participants. First, from Phil Buckingham. Should we say that the community would always be a non-for-profit application and an auction in a multiple bid situation would not happen if the CPE failed?

The second comment is from Jamie Baxter. It seems to me that perhaps by design community TLDs currently offer priority to those who are likely to be presumed, the presumed, or community-chosen operators of the TLD which not only aligns with avoiding the showdown between community interests in others, but it also works towards the goal of building consumer trust.

Robin Gross: Thanks and in response to the first question of what have we considered only having communities be not-for-profit, it is something that we've talked about and it is something that the group hasn't really gotten behind. It's I think more the approach would be to have specific not-for-profit types of communities and then, you know, to have, again we're talking about the different types of communities as opposed to making sure all communities must be non-for-profit and there was some discussion of well should it be their purpose or should it be the applicant's legal status that needs to be non-profit?

And there really didn't seem to be agreement on that. So I think it would, again, narrow down to a particular type of community TLD. Okay, Greg please.

Gregory Shatan: Thanks, Greg Shatan for the record. As I've listened to this I'm becoming more skeptical about the idea of continuing with the communities. It seems

that without preferences and without the priority there's not a real point to having communities unless it's just to have some different aspects to the application. Just like with Dot-Brands that are, you know, a little bit more tailored. And not ask questions that are irrelevant to that type.

But that's – the main focus really is the priority because without the priorities you can call yourself a community and nobody cares. You know, unless we made every community application pass a Community Priority Evaluation even if there was not contention.

So I'm wondering if there have been any success stories in the – among the communities based on the fact that they elected to apply as a community. And I'm not sure whether that would happen except if there was a CPE and a contention, and the community won.

So it seems like there's some things I might have thought were communities that were in contention and lost that's, you know, opinions obviously can differ on those.

So it's kind of a question of what are we really protecting if we don't really have – if we don't have the preferences then we're not really protecting anything. And if we do have the preferences we need to see whether it worked.

The last time around I don't really have my head wrapped around it I think there were a total of maybe 75 community applications which was less than 5% of the total. I don't know how many of those were tested and how those ultimately worked out. A number of them seemed to be involved gaming and defensive applications and, you know, didn't really appear to be communities anyway.

So, to me it seems like the burden of this outweighs the benefit which is not to say the communities shouldn't have gTLDs-- quite the opposite. Just the

question is, “Why do we need to kind of hive them off and give them a special preference.” And if there is a reason, how do we focus it so that only those that fit within that reason for the preference, make it there.

And we tried that the last time around I think with the CPE and I don’t, again, were there successes where they came through the CPE and our successful communities and it was good for them that this all happened. We’re focused on a couple of late Stage 1s that are messy but, you know, what was good about the community set up the last time that we would want to keep it.
Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thanks, okay I’ve got Alan next.

Michelle Desmyter: Sorry, I’m just needing to (unintelligible) I’m very concerned about the time management and the queue. We do have to wrap this section up in, literally, (unintelligible) a number of minutes.

What I might suggest is we may gain in some of the other sections so, for example, if you would like to just put a pin in your thoughts now and we make the other comeback to Robert and Karen later on. I think that would be the best way and please, also, if (unintelligible) type your question and we will take note and respond and deal with that as well.

Sorry, I just wanted to help you there.

Robin Gross: Thanks, I appreciate that. And then we’ll close (unintelligible) Alan over here, Kurt and then Gg. And I do apologize that we’re running out of time after that. Thanks. (Alan)?

(Alan): Thank you very much, a statement and then two questions. I strongly support the CP – to the community applications and the CPE. I think it’s one of the few places that can perhaps arguably but more the few places that we

can see that ICANN was looking at the public interest in establishing this program.

And we can have lots of debates on whether community applications are really important to the public interest. I personally believe they are.

And clearly on the CPE we were so worried about gaming that we, to a large extent, made sure no one can pass it. And somehow I think we have to modify it but I believe both of them should be maintained.

I have two questions, though. One is, if we had had multiple community applications pass the CPE, what was the process for selecting them? Do they go to an auction or is this some other process?

And the second question is when, and it's a historic one, when we were (unintelligible) but this – if we hadn't had the CPE, would we have had community applications at all? Or was it linked, you know, as a single thing? I'm just curious. I suspect since we rejected the concept of categories we probably wouldn't have had community applications for the CPE. But I'm not – I don't remember. Thank you.

Robin Gross: I think when we created community and I'm not really sure my memory's accurate on this so please correct if I'm wrong, but I think it was in resp – it was as an objection. Somebody saying that you could create the – an objection to a TLD because you could say, "Well, we're a community and we really represent these people." Is that right?

(Alan): (Unintelligible) I think was a separate issue.

Robin Gross: Okay. Yes, right here.

Man 2: (Unintelligible) about (unintelligible) process versus are there forms entities actually he's suggesting that (unintelligible) profits are going to be separated.

I'm not sure it's a good idea because currently Gs, some Geos, some non-for-profits, you have communities – it could be everything. So I'm not sure it should be separated because it's one of the forums.

For example, for some Geos its municipal entities sometimes it's not-for-profits. It could be like the highest (unintelligible) performing under the concept with the government. So it's might be not the best idea to spread on the (unintelligible) on the forum of yet. How it was created.

Robin Gross: Thank you. Kurt and then Gg.

Kurt Pritz: I think I want to make two points. One is I want to build on what Liz said is and that is the primary finding of the 2003/2004 sponsor-gram was really that (unintelligible) based on categories and categories themselves were a bad, you know, a bad idea in that they're difficult to create a smooth running operation for evaluating them.

And to build a little bit on what Annebeth said but to take advantage of it is that we have talked about defining community very carefully in 2003/2004 and then again in 2012 and we still don't have a good definition for it. The GNSO probably took up more time debating what a community was than any other topic turned their debate in the 2012 round.

But having said that, there's a really legitimate purpose for identifying community and that is to protect them. So I think the overriding concern was, you know, and I'll give you that we all have an example in our minds of what a community is -- what a clear community is. So being an American, you know, I can tell you that I think dot.Navajo would be an example of a community and we don't want that label to be misappropriated. So there's one example.

So I think we need to create a definition of community not so much to grant them special rights as an operator but to protect their name from being

misappropriated and for that we really have the Community Objection Process and that is a way for communities to protect themselves. So having the objection process and the CPE to me is sort of a belt and suspenders situation.

So to me – so to me I think Liz is probably right that we could abandon CPE and community as a designation and the new gTLD program but protect communities by maintaining the objection process which requires us to define community in some way. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Thank you. And Gg, you have the last word on this subject.

Gertrude “Gg” Levine: Thank you, Robin. Gg Levine for the record and I – it seems to me that when you have a TLD that represents a broad swath of users or of constituents that that would take precedence over an entity – a single entity that’s applying for a TLD. So kind of to echo what (Alan) and Annebeth were saying, it does provide an advantage for users and therefore, is perhaps deserving of priority evaluation. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Thank you. I’ll turn it back over to Cheryl and (Jeff).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, thanks, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record and do we need to break for recording or are we okay, we’re all good? We can continue on? Excellent, so we’re working backwards so I believe the next number would be Number 2. Number 2, okay so we’ve got both (unintelligible). Is it you Michael?

Michael Flemming: (Unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh it is then.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, Cheryl. My name is Michael Flemming I am co-chair of Working Tract 2 earlier. My co-chair is (Sophia Fen) who was not in the room

but she is here with us now. We are both 12 hours from the opposite side of the world, in Asia, so we are very happy to be here in Puerto Rico with all – with many of you.

So we are discussing Work Tract 2 the legal regulations area, this is a very, very fun and exciting area of discussion. We have about 12 topics, 10 of which we have made exceptional work on. Two of these topics are more or less dependencies in some ways on other PDPs but we are leaving most of that work up to them and if there are recommendations or items that we need to consider once the majority of that work is finished or at some point reaches a point where we are able to see if we need to make some deliberations on, we will go back to those items.

But as you can see in front of you, the majority of the work that we have made progress on are reserved names, the base registry agreement, registrant protections, contractual compliance, vertical integration, TLD roll-out, the global public interest, as well as, the applicant terms and conditions.

Where we still need to time to come up with proper recommendations is closed generics. But I really think that in the year and a half, I think, that we've been discussing we have come a long way and today we would like to seek further feedback on, hopefully, two at least – two of these topics. And we'll be looking at – well we have three prepared of course, but two I think will – time will allow for. We don't want to go over Work Tract 1 now do we?

Course, so today we'll be looking at closed generics and then the vertical integration – I kind of I think switching the order a little bit. But if we could go to the closed generics slide please? Thank you, so, let me shift my own slide (unintelligible).

Thank you for your patience. So closed generics to keep this very quick, it basically talks about the exclusive use of a generic string for one – for registry. There are a lot of pro – there's a lot of feedback for the pros and the

cons in this. We have invited experts to discuss the innovation for allowing this in the future. And we've also invited experts to discuss the alleged harms for why this is not allowed now.

So originally in the 2012 round, this was resulted in a ICANN board decision that they would not allow it for the current time. And it was deferred to PDP to discuss further so that we (unintelligible) path for the future.

So where are we at now? Well after eight or nine meetings I believe on this topic, we have not come to one single path forward but where we have seen signs of a neutral area, if you will, is if the closed generic was for the public interest, we could possibly see a path forward.

So noting that, we have proposed five potential ways to move forward this – with this one being the very extreme not allowing closed generics all the way to the other side of being so flexible that they are allowed without restriction.

But these Options 2 and 3 and 4 I think are rather straight forward in the sense that Option 2 will allow closed generics with public interest applications so this would entail that an applicant would need to clearly demonstrate that in their application why the closed – what public interest the closed generic serves and you could see that this may have some implications to have that, the registry would – the applicant would need to disclose ideas about the business model or what the registry would serve.

In many ways we think question 18 might fulfill this but at the same time this is what this option would entail. And of course we would also look to have for an objections procedure process for closed generics that would very much resemble or be modeled on the current community objections that is in place.

And then the third option is closed generics with code of conduct so rather than disclosing details in the application, this would require that applicants would need to follow a self-annual code of conduct to say that they are

compliant with that. And, sorry, do self-audits and also the same time make sure that we have the objections process in place.

And then Option 4 is an option where it basically has both 2 and 3, they would need to reveal details in the application as well as following the self-audits. You can kind of see this in a – well, you could look at this in a Spec 13 type of a situation but that's a different story. It's something that is in their contract as well as following along the lines of self-audit.

So what we would really like to do now is open the floor for ideas and or comments in regards to these proposed path forward and better ways that we could perhaps word them in the initial comment – in the initial report and we hope to have more feedback after this. So after the initial report - so we can come back to this and develop or recommendations for the final report.

So I will open up the floor now. Jim?

Jim Prendergast: Thanks Michael, Jim Prendergast. So I know we have members of the GAC who participate at the (unintelligible) level. I'm not sure if we have them in this work tract, I'm a member but I don't think we do. The reason I'm asking that is because the genesis of the prohibition on closed generics in the previous round was from GAC advice.

So have there been any attempt to socialize what's on this screen with the GAC to see if any of these resonate with them since they are the source of the prohibition on closed generics.

Michael Flemming: At the current time we have not been able to engage directly with the GAC on this. (Jeff), you have your hand raised.

(Jeff): Yes, I just for the record I think there were multiple sources of reasons why I think there were a lot of letters and public comments that were submitted so I'm not sure it was only attributable to like GAC advice but certainly there was

GAC advice from this. But no, there's not specific feedback on this issue but we will (unintelligible) obviously in the initial report.

Jim Prendergast: This is Jim again. Yes, I'm sure you'll get that feedback. Both from the GAC and all those parties that you mentioned.

Michael Flemming: Thank you. We have a question from Volker. Oh sorry, (Alan), I'm sorry. Okay, just Maxim then...

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba. Short question, can I talk now about reserved names or is it off menu?

Michael Flemming: We were hoping to keep these more topic gen, sorry, topic specific on closed generics at the current time. If there are no further comments in regards to closed generics then I sure would be happy to accept comments in regards to reserved names.

But I, please, Jannik you have a venue that you had – sorry, you have feedback in regards to this topic?

Jannik Skou: Yes, Jannik Skou. I can review that I am pro-closed generic. Because there was so many words around and I think that free competition subsided. But if we go forward with this model which I also find sympathetic for many reasons, I simply cannot think of any scenario where last couple Asian as a build brand will not have all these criteria. And I cannot think of – not many – I can think of only very few scenarios (unintelligible) on the community application criteria that any organizations would even be entitled to file such an objection.

Remember you have to yourself then – let's say you start PIG – if you are bacon producer, you want the PIG, P-I-G, so then you have to have to be a community for a worldwide recognized community for PIG, PIGs – I don't know if all pigs worldwide have such an organization. They must be active

and they have membership, they have leaderships. I don't see – I don't know in Denmark we have 25 million pigs but they're not organized as such.

To illustrate that they will – I don't see any scenario in which you can say any community objection will ever prevent but I don't think any organization, let's say to the book. Who can say that they have the (unintelligible) community it goes back to that discussion and we have a right – if they have done that (unintelligible) I don't see it.

So if we go with this, I think you have to realize you just allow closed generics which to me is fine, I just wanted to raise that issue. Thank you.

Michael Flemming: Thank you. So I would like to respond very briefly but I want to make sure that we have in mind that there are distinct categories being proposed out of the working groups work. Specifically, Brand Specification 13 is one category, closed generics is another one. Now there are other ways of describing this exemption to what the public registry model whereas the registry would be exclusive.

However, if we're going to specifically talk about closed generics and these – this proposed ideas that if it is for the public interest, there are multiple ways that you can address potential models for that. And we're not restricting this. We're not saying how that needs to be for the public interest we – and we're not saying that what these closed generics cannot do.

We are merely stating here that if the closed generic was for the public interest and we're not getting into what the public interest is because that – we've already tried to do that and that we've not been successful. I don't think anyone will be successful in that, I mean. But in that mindset, this leaves it up to the applicant to be very innovative with that and to interpret that freely, I believe.

Yes, and I – you, if you would like to respond quickly but then I have Jim in the...

Jannik Skou: Just to (unintelligible) so you think that the – it will be very hard to apply for closed generic because you have to prove that it is serving a public interest? Is that the point?

Michael Flemming: You don't have – I wouldn't say – prove is a very big word in that sense but if the closed generic is for the public interest, this is where we've seen common ground in between the alleged harms as well as those for innovation with closed generics.

Instead of just cutting it off completely, if we were to – if it was for closed generics because I think we come back to this all the time, but (Jeff) always had the best example for, I can't think of the exact TLD was that you used. But I think (Jeff), if you could merely describe what example you had I think that would give the best idea for Jannik.

(Jeff): I remember it was signed and we're in a good place for it, it was dot.disaster. And so let's say the Red Cross wanted dot.disaster and they wanted that because every single disaster they could know that they could have a specific name set up so Puerto Rico dot.disaster or whatever the name of it is. That would be in essence or could be a closed generic. One could make the argument (unintelligible) you know what? If anybody's going to have dot.disaster -- that's much more in the public interest.

That would be an example and I just want to remind everyone that GAC advice was not that there should be no closed generics. GAC advice was that any closed generic – in different words – basically any closed generic that is approved, must be in the public interest, or should be in the public interest. That was the advice.

So it's not remembered that way by a lot of the community but that is what they said. Now the board interpreted that because it's very difficult. In fact, they did ask if you recall, they asked each of the applicants that had closed generic applications to submit how it's in the public interest to proceed. And lots of entities replied – I don't what ICANN ever did with those. It never evaluated them, it didn't even discuss those; they could be in some trash compactor somewhere.

But DOT was initially intent but the board, I guess, found it easier just to say, "You know what? We're not going to do it this last – in 2012." And they explicitly told us, or what became us, to consider this issue.

Michael Flemming: All right thank you, I'm going to turn over to Jim and then we probably need to move on to our next topic. Oh sorry, I'm sorry (Alan)? And then we'll move on to (Alan) and then we'll move on to our next topic.

Jim Prendergast: Sure, Jim Prendergast. (Jeff)? You actually just sparked something in my head with those responses, would it be possible to find out from ICANN what they did with those responses because that's going to feed into this next round especially if you're asking people to demonstrate that they're complying with the public interest.

Michael Flemming: So we could and we should ask that?

Woman 2: They're posted for public comment for thirty days once they were submitted. I don't recall there were much comments submitted but they were posted for public comments.

Michael Flemming: Right.

Woman 2: That's what we gave.

Jim Prendergast: They were posted for public comment but we still don't know what ICANN eventually did with them.

Michael Flemming: Well, well nothing I mean.

Jim Prendergast: Well did they consider them, did they – how did they analyze them? I don't know. The other thing though, you know, this is Pandora's Box and I'm going to bust it wide open -- definition of public interest. You, Michael, correctly said we struggled with this. Nobody really wants to touch it in this community. If that's the case if we can't define it then I am a little wary of including it in a – as a litmus test for applicants to comply with if we don't know what they have to comply with if it's like what, you know, what is the public interest and how are you going to meet it. If we can't give them a definition of what that is then I'm not sure how you evaluate those.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, Jim for the comments. I think that this is similar to the discussion we just had in communities a moment ago. The more we talk about this I think the more we'll be able to develop directions and perhaps criteria in some way for applicants to have guidance on this.

We're not going to be able to – we don't want to restrict and we don't want to prevent I think. If without preventing what we – sorry, without knowing exactly what it is we need to prevent because at this point with the base that we've had, there is no end to it, to what could be in alleged harm or reason for why allowing closed generics.

So in that sense, let's deal with what we know what we have and what, perhaps, has been filed in the past and community objections and we'll try to develop a path forward with that.

But I have a comment from (Alan) and then I'm going to – sorry, and then there's still a few comments to read out of here and we're going to see if we can move onto other topic.

Jim Prendergast: Thank you very much. One of the previous interveners implied that closed generics were the same as communities. That you have to have a community of pigs or whatever, and that's very much not the case.

I think (Jeff)'s example of Dot-Disaster is a great example because it demonstrates we can use a generic word and the owner does not benefit it from it specifically at the expense of other organizations. And I think that essent – I don't think we can define public interest, but we can define ways of recognizing it.

And, you know, ICANN is not going to be in the business of evaluating but we have a long established process of panels to make judgments and we started this whole thing to enhance consumer choice and it's not clear that this whole process has really done that in the great extent. But an opportunity for innovation is one of the places that we can have win-wins, and I think this is one of the places that it could have it if we do it properly. Thank you.

Michael Flemming: Thank you and I'm just going to briefly read over Kathy Kleiman's comments and the chat and I'm sorry, we have to close this in regards to...

Jannik Skou: (Unintelligible) and my point with the pictures (unintelligible) only if you want to find a community-like objection, then you have to be such an organization. That's the point I'm not talking about the TDL itself.

Michael Flemming: Thank you. So Kathy's comments are, "Anything could be argued in the public interest, but dot.cloud, dot.search and dot.book were open to all competitors – existing newcomers future domain name registering competitors – and they are doing well, dot.cloud is flourishing."

So thank you. I'm going to – we're going to shift now to vertical integration. I think we have ten more minutes in this? Okay. (Sophia) please.

(Sophia): Hi. This is (Sophia Fen) for Work Tract 2 culture leadership. So regarding the registrar of non-discrimination and registrar (unintelligible), so basically just a backgrounds of that – this topics. The 2007 final report requires the registry must use an ICANN accredited registrars which is our under contract with ICANN and fulfill the obligation of their RAA.

And so this topic's trying to explore whether this situation still fits the current existing practices and if there's any (unintelligible) accommodations need to be developed to address the new finals and seeking feedback from the public comment.

We have three cores – we have three cores to address this topic and the work group has discussed these topic details and we explored the history of how to switch from the registry and registrar separation to vertical integration occurs and examine the initial proposed potential benefits and harms of vertical integrations.

And furthermore, we also reviewed the mechanisms introduced to deter the abusive activity (unintelligible) combat and separate (unintelligible) of two points (unintelligible) agreement and to explore whether this mechanism (unintelligible) purposes.

So with all the deliberations, the work tracts reach the general agreement that the (unintelligible) existing vertical integration mechanism isn't necessary and but also we command to seek to allow to create a flexibility (unintelligible) code of conduct exemptions to those are qualified.

So the (unintelligible) flights to the (unintelligible) flights actually that we welcome any feedbacks on the types of additional exemptions that may be needed and seeking for the committee inputs whether since there's no consensus, you know, what additional mechanisms should be developed in order determine any sort of exemptions that should be granted. So we need

to publics (sic) for and seeking more feedbacks on (unintelligible) additional exemptions that may be needed.

So I'd like to open the floor any comments from the group on this recourse.

Yes, so (unintelligible) comments on the (unintelligible) comments that we comment that should be full integrations for the dot – especially dot.brand registries and so I would like ask the groups any consideration on this topic.

Michael Flemming: Perhaps for some more back, oh (unintelligible). Go ahead.

Man 3: Thank you. One area that on the report could look into is two exceptions targeted underserved markets which could be underserved region or any or could be (unintelligible) any cases where (unintelligible) don't have market interest, possible candidates for – either for forward extensions to the code of conduct or to extensions of the number of domains that can be registered with (unintelligible). (Currently) that number is 100 but for instance that could be a number where has (unintelligible) hey means that there is no market (in) like 5000 registrations that could possibly qualify for something in-between a full exemption like a brand and full application of a code of conduct like larger markets.

Michael Flemming: So to provide a bit more background information on the full integration, one of the ideas that we were struggling with on this topic that came out of CC2 was that the topic of allowing Specification 13 or Code of Conduct exempt registries to fully integrate and that means that you no longer use a registrar to register names and other words, self-allocating.

Sorry. I think one of – and our last discussion we were looking to seek feedback from more registrars on this topic about whether or not they would – what ideas or they had any concerns about allowing those registries, those single-register model registries to self-allocate in the future without going through a registrar.

So if there is anyone in the room that has feedback in regards to that we would very much welcome it. Oh, (Christopher) please go ahead.

(Christopher): This is history but what you've just said was the original proposal for registry registrar integration to allow small new registries to expand without going straight to the registrar system. It was regarded as an exception for new registries.

What we'd got was in defiance of the pro-competitive registry registrar separation across the board. And this resulted in large registrars investing in large numbers of TLDs a lot of which, I believe, would be completely non-viable on their own or stand-alone basis.

Worse, this has created a anti-competitive situation for this ccTLDs relied on neutral registrars.

So this is a big subject. I've written about it ten years ago I'll come back to you on this in writing. But what – but it is essential to solve this problem and I maintain that for new registries and registrars, for new registries there is a strong case for allowing them to self-allocate at least initially up to a threshold and that the kind of registrar investment in non-viable registries, should be the least.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, Christopher and we realize that this topic will open up a lot more discussion in areas that we will need to have those deliberations but all in all we hope to have more feedback from the initial report.

I don't see new hands or feedback instant chat so I would like to – sorry? (Jeff). Oh, you're just putting your hand - he's fidgeting, okay. So I guess I will turn it over so we can have a lot of plenty of time for Work Tract 1.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, (Sarah)'s very excited about that. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record and hopefully we'll be still continuing without a break for recording. (Unintelligible) someone will come and elbow me and tell me to stop. With that, (Sarah), you ready?

(Sarah): Over to you.

(Rocky): Thank you, Cheryl, this is (Rocky) for the record. Can you all hear me okay? So you'll see up on the screen we have the overview of topics that were covered by Work Tract 1. We covered 10, the 11th being that competition consumer trust which we did not touch on due to the other tract that was going on regarding that.

So you'll see that primarily for most of these we have some recommendations that are going to be more implementation guidance and not policy-related and then we some topics that do have questions that're going to be going out to the community for additional feedback when the initial report is published.

But today we're going to just sort of give you an overview of some of the topics of where we do have just implementation recommendations and guidance for making the process a little better than it was going the last round, so next slide please.

So for the Applicant Guidebook we're looking to simplify the Applicant Guidebook enough that a non-insider can use it and understand it so it's going to have less historical and policy information and make it a little more audience driven.

Looking to have an online version that is capable of selecting application types – types-specific information and have the ability to print out those sections as needed so that the idea of being is that it's going to be sort of a step-by-step choose your adventure file of guide.

Additionally, we're looking to make the online version easily searchable providing relevant information and some Work Tract members have suggested that the digital version could allow for advanced indexing so you'd have a core setup provisions available to everyone with additional provisions being more applicant or application specific. So the idea being that the text is tagged and searchable so that users can more easily locate the relevant information that they need and sort of parse it out.

And so those are the preliminary implementation and improvements that we're looking to suggest. I'll pause here to see if anyone has any comments. No? Okay, next slide please.

Okay, for systems, again we're just looking to make some improvements here and make it work better than it did before. So the systems we're recommending should undergo a robust testing and ensure stability and security of the data. Additional to the testing, the system changes should be transparent and systems should be easy to use and differate (sic) and preferably have a single login.

Again, just looking to improve the user experience, include things such as life support, automatic invoices, automated invoices, the ability to use non-ASCII characters, ability to upload documents as well as updating information and documentation across multiple fields.

We would like to see the ability to have group applications to reduce the number of like duplicate messages and action items for the applicant to review. And also looking to have a secondary contact for receiving communications and the ability to grant access to different users to sort of, again, make the user experience a lot more convenient, enjoyable, less frustrating.

And of course, all of this is in conjunction with the Applicant Guidebook that any sort of system access should be finalized in advance of the Applicant

Guidebook being sent out so that you're minimizing the obstacles and burdens on the applicants.

I'll pause here again. (Alan), yes?

(Alan): I guess that's my last question. Just one quick question. The Number 1, the abilities non-ASCII characters. I presume that's to add – put in names and addresses and stuff and not suggesting that we accept applications in multiple languages. Is that correct or am I incorrect?

(Rocky): I am recalling that that is correct. I don't think we were looking to have like any applications in multiple languages, no, that was just providing information regarding the applicant themselves I believe.

(Alan): Thank you.

(Rocky): Anyone else? All right we'll go on to the next slide. Okay, so for communications again we're looking to improve the user experience so that the knowledge base should be easily searchable and updated timely so you have the most accurate and current information.

It was suggested that we could have an Optin subscription service to receive – so that applicants could receive information regarding new developments, changes to the process, you know, applicant advisories, updates to procedures that are related to the applicant's application.

Also looking to improve transparency on the escalation process setting some expectations as far as response times and what you can anticipate – when you can anticipate getting information back or having a response back from ICANN.

Also posting information on that website so you have, again, better managed expectations for responses. Additionally, looking to have more online tools

so a general-like helpline. Things like having a chat function so you can get, you know, live real-time help while you're working on your application.

And also, finally, it was suggested that we could have a regional teams particularly in the underserved regions to help potential applicants and to help educate them also on other processes such as the applicant support program and the RSP programs.

So those are some of the improvements that we are suggesting for the communications and again I'll pause here to see if there's any feedback. Go ahead.

Man 4: (Unintelligible). Actually during the, yes, the around which happened – it was a situation where one of the valuable source of information was (unintelligible) and current financial plan doesn't have any kind of support for this product anymore and it could be a good idea to keep it because the station in which we as applicants we'll find ourselves by the time was that – we might to comment the simplification of materials but I'm not sure that it's good to be done better than by community itself.

So I suggest that we keep the additional source of information which community-based syncing.

(Rocky): Thank you, (Akson). Anyone else? Okay, next slide. Very easy and this is the only slide we actually will have some questions for the community for input so if anyone here has information they'd like to share, that would be great.

And so regarding the applicant's admission period, as you can see here that the Working Group is kind of suggesting sort of a hybrid approach where you'd have a single round set followed by an annual window. The idea being that you would have sort of three months of an application acceptance period.

The remaining nine months to be used to complete the evaluations and that would sort of repeat annually on a rolling basis and sort of using the first round of setups and means for have the continuing application process would get underway and start and so you would have those evaluations on a rolling basis.

This set application window would provide some predictability as well as allowing for applicants that were – applications that were in the previous, I guess window around being able to continue to run in parallel. And so it would just sort of be a process that would just begin to move forward.

The questions we have related to this was, is this three months' notice – would three months' notice be a proper amount of time for getting a application (unintelligible) created another way and is the concept of a six-period of time for accepting applications a wide approach or does this facilitate predictable schedule for submission and objections and comments.

Does anyone have, yes, go ahead?

Woman 3: Just wanted to ask you when you say, "Is three months appropriate amount of time." What you mean here is from the application gets in until it is accepted? Is that what's meant here?

(Rocky): I think this can meet either – is, would three months (unintelligible) acceptable amount of time for giving notice that the next round was going to start and then also once it starts going into a rolling sort of application period, would having that open window of three months be acceptable.

So I think it's kind of two-fold but are – do you think that other timeframes would be more appropriate?

Woman 3: Just a follow up question then, it depends on what we end up with geographical names. As it is today, with some names not being accepted at

all but if that changes, I think it would be really, really important to have noticing period or a publication period so that those who are opposed to that could have a reasonable time to react. And also the objection procedures perhaps would change in the next round.

So it would be really good to have some time from applications getting in until they are accepted that it's sufficient to be able to send in objection. So the – I'm not quite, I haven't gone to (unintelligible) to this Work Tract 1 so I'm not sure if that is covered properly.

(Rocky): Yes, we have noted previous discussions and having some sort of publication period where people would be able to comment so that is (unintelligible) very, very high level sort of given idea but has been noted. Okay, I think Jim was...

Woman 4: I'm happy to wait if Jim's ahead.

(Rocky): Yes, go ahead Jim.

Jim Prendergast: Okay, Jim Prendergast. With the annual window, taking into account the stresses that the ICANN budget is currently facing, do we know if there is staff in place currently to fulfill that function or would that require ICANN to go out and hire additional people?

(Rocky): I do not have the answer to that. (Jeff), do you know? Or is (Jane) here? Oh, there she is, go ahead.

(Jane): Hi there. Yes I can come in on that real quick. I think we've responded to one of the letters from Cheryl and (Jeff) with regards to rate of delegation. And in that letter we've - we touch on this point which is that the processing capacity is something that we can, you know, look at and determine once we have a better idea as to what changes are being made to the next round.

Obviously, as you know in the previous round we released up to a 100 initial evaluations results per week. We could potentially scale that up a little bit more, you know, I don't know depending on what changes are coming. Are we going to be performing some evaluations or not? You know, et cetera, et cetera, so that's a question that's, you know, I mean it's kind of a chicken and egg thing.

We could tell you or and that would determine the processees (sic) or through the PDP if you're going to be recommending some changes to the process, then based on those changes we can access and provide sort of a processing capacity.

So that's sort of the gist of what we said in the response to the Working Group. Thanks.

Jim Prendergast: So just follow, tract, so maybe the parallel would be registrar accreditation? How was that function handled internally? Is that through dedicated staff that just do registrar accreditations or is that just part of the work load that somebody else has on their, you know, daily schedule?

(Jane): So (Christine)'s here and she can answer but ask her only a separate team.

(Christine): (Christine McLeta) ICANN org. Yes, Jim we have a dedicated group that serve all registrars and provide a variety of services to registrars and one of the functions they perform is managing the Registrar Accreditation Applications.

We staffed that team based on historical experience with applications which is, in general, pretty low steady state with some high volume waves – family applications – so we have modeled the process to take into account both of those.

If I may, I would just supplement what (Janes) answer, once the – all of the policy's developed and the guidebook is developed, the program is further flushed out, I think the organization would be in a better position to address both the capacity and rate of processing, as well as the timeline.

I believe I saw in this month, this slide, the idea of nine months to process applications. I think that's dependent on the entire – how the process is overall defined by the group and what that might look like. And the volume of applications we receive in the interest of having consistent results and not - making sure that the first application didn't get evaluated differently or with different thinking than the 500th or 1500th application.

We spend a lot of upfront time in the 2012 round to ensure consistency of evaluation across all panels, across all provider firms so that factored into the overall lead time.

So there's sort of this next round or wave window of applications and then the ongoing steady state which I think once we've gone through one round or wave of applications, we'd be in a better position to forecast the ongoing steady state rate and general target timeline for applications beyond that.

(Sarah): Just a couple of points that might be helpful. In the 2012 round, perhaps one of the biggest problems was an applicant's expectation of how long it was going to take for them to apply for something and then be in business. And it is not acceptable, ever, to take three years to do something. It's just not. That just does not accord to best practice of any kind of procurement exercise that we might want to conduct in the real world.

How we might be able to help doing that is – and this addresses a couple of points around, the first thing it would be very helpful to see a couple of options with a dateline schematic. For example, when there is confusion about that first question there is their three months a proper amount of time. The proper amount of time for what? I just did a rough schematic on my

page here and I said to myself, "Okay, open the window in March, clarifying questions in April, evaluation in May, completion by June." Now it's entirely unrealistic but if we start to think about what it looks like in practice, and then we draw it rather than write it, I think we'll get around some of the questions for community input which is the understanding the questions that you're actually asking.

The secondary piece of that puzzle is to (Christine)'s points that she just made now. One would hope that the budget for developing the program support that (Christine)'s team deal with is done on a self-funded basis so that the application fee, if there is one, is the full cost through cost of the cost (unintelligible) for actually running the process. So it pays for its panels and it pays for its staff and it does whatever.

That budgeting exercise can perhaps take place for financially year '19 and we need some modeling around what kind of information questions we need to ask to determine things like fees, to determine lengths of time for evaluation and I appreciate (Christine)'s point about consistency of evaluation across the process. But how can you do that if you don't know what kind of applications and how many you're going to get.

So is it worthwhile doing an express of interest at some point somewhere along the way in terms of the community outreach engagement thing that says, that asks some of those questions of potential applicants in any future round.

So then we have a quantum of what we might be dealing with. It could be zero. It could be a thousand. It could be any number in between so just a quick summary is get some schematics around the amounts of time they're analyzing, think about an expression of interest so we can work around budgets and timing and think about community engagement and then think about quantum of fees because it has to be fee-neutral. It has to be budget-neutral to (unintelligible) the organization's overall financial accounting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. (Donna) have you still got your hand up? Over to you please.

(Donna): Thanks, Cheryl and thanks (Sarah). It's just in relation to the timeline and I guess this goes to (unintelligible) as well, one of things that's going to be important for this next wave I actually like that word (Christine). I think wave is works better around to me is predictability in terms of the date for the next application window. So I know that we're talking about tiering a very specific (unintelligible) but the communication process that takes place about a next application wave is just as important.

I'm not sure, I don't know, we're probably discussing that somewhere but I'm not sure where. But I think it's important to this question because if there is a good communication process, global communication process that raises awareness about the program, then I think maybe a three month application window is actually feasible and realistic.

But if there is not that lead-up, then I think maybe we need a longer window. But I just want to make that point that I think it's really important, the work that goes on before this in understanding what the first application deadline is going to be and the work that happens before that.

(Rocky): Thanks, (Donna). Very brief from (Alan) and even briefer wrap up from Jim. Thank you.

(Alan): I know how to be brief. I may have missed a meeting but my recollection is that we were because of the unknown volume and inability to guarantee there are no glitches, we were talking about a time period after some event, not necessarily time period after the first one is announced. Am I mis-remembering? I remember an answer from (Jeff) which said we're talking about a time period after an event.

As opposed to saying it could be nine – another round will be launched nine months after the first one, it'll be nine months after some threshold has passed.

(Rocky): Thanks (Alan). (Christine)?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Extraordinarily brief.

(Christine): I don't want to further create confusion between policy and implementation here but it – with that risk, I just highlight on the slide here we're talking about at least three months' notice before we begin accepting applications for (unintelligible) wave.

I would suggest that there's sort of three key phases and timelines to consider. The time from the point of which the program launch is approved, be that the guidebook et cetera to the time we begin accepting applications, the application period and then the processing of applications.

And given the work and preparation, I know there's been some discussion and some interest in having the organization begin preparation work and I think that's been discussed previously. But three months is going to be very short for us. I'm anticipating 12 months or longer lead time prior needed before we begin accepting applications for preparations. Happy to discuss at a later point.

Woman 3: Discussions will be forthcoming very shortly. Thank you (unintelligible). We've heard a lot of work to think about, a lot of things that have happened. Just going to do an extraordinarily brief wrap up now but while I've got the microphone I wanted to thank our leadership of the Work Tracts that are here because it's put an extraordinary amount into getting this together to you all but they've also got an extraordinary amount from you to now consider. (Jeff), floor is yours.

(Jeff): Yes, I think that's a good summary I was going to do part of that. There's a more comprehensive set of slides I just want to remind everyone to go to that link in the agenda for all the other issues we didn't talk about.

With this slide in particular, just to wrap it up, I think there's some issues caused by shortening a bunch of things to fit on a slide. So there's a lot of things on this slide that don't mean what people think it means. And that's our problem because we didn't word it correctly so don't panic, three months was not implementation. You're right, we have divided it, we'll fix it. So don't panic, please don't go out of here saying that that's what we resolved to do.

So thank you everyone, we have another session on Wednesday, 8:30, for Work Tract 5. We have other sessions talking about budgeting and preparation work so go to one of those sessions if you want to make a comment.

Other than that, we have to wrap up and thank you everyone.

Woman 4: Thank you, everybody.

END