

ICANN

Transcription ICANN Copenhagen

GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group Community Dialogue

Wednesday, 15 March 2017 at 5:00 CET

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 recording and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:

<http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Jeffrey Neuman: Welcome everyone on March 15, 2017. This is our Subsequent Procedures Working Group Open Session. We've had a very long week already I know and so I appreciate everyone turning up on the second to last day at 5:00 pm. And I'll try not to stand in the way to match of drinks later on. So we have an agenda up here and really this session is to encourage as much feedback as possible on our issues on the week, on anything you've learned during the week. And moving forward there have been a number of developments. This discussion of subsequent procedures I believe at this meeting has probably been more of a focus than at any previous meeting. So I really feel like there's definitely momentum building up on the subsequent application windows. And I know that there is certainly a number of groups that have discussed these issues and some of which as we heard at the overall review session there is certainly some in the community that are pushing us to finish

this process at least on time and then to also think about what happens after the - our work is done.

So the five items we have on here right now is to talk about how the recommendations from the competition consumer trust and consumer choice review fits into our work. And there were a number of recommendations that were proposed by the CCT Review Team in their initial report that if, ultimately if they become recommendations in the final report will be referred to our PDP. There's a number of recommendations also that will be referred to the rights protection mechanism or rights protection mechanisms PDP. And then there's a few items on there which don't yet have a home which may be items that we take on meaning our working group and others may be either taken on by the Rights Protection Mechanisms Working Group or frankly we'll have to find a home for a couple of them I guess.

So that said we'll then talk about the proposed Geographic Names session at ICANN 59 in Johannesburg and the preparatory -- I think I've got that right -- Webinar on April 25, 2017. We'll also finalize community comment number two and get that ready to get sent out shortly after this ICANN meeting formally out for public comment. And then we'll just talk about how our session on Saturday went whether there's - it went well and if there's any recommendations on improvements on how we can do it the next time. And then it's kind of an open any other business.

So with that said and again this is interactive so if anybody wants to add anything or anybody's got any comments I'll do my best to look around and Avri will help me out. Actually we probably should introduce everyone since not everyone's at our Saturday session. So at least everyone on the Subsequent Procedures Leadership Team. So I'm Jeff Neuman.

Avri Doria: I'm Avri Doria.

Jeffrey Neuman: And if we could have the two work chairs from - sorry the two co-leaders from Work Track 1.

Christa Taylor: Christa Taylor for Work Track 1.

Sara Bockey: Sara Bockey – oh, can you hear me? Sara Bockey with Work Track 1.

Jeffrey Neuman: Okay then Work Track 2?

Michael Flemming: Michael Flemming with Work Track 2.

Jeffrey Neuman: The other co-leader is Phil Buckingham. I don't know if he's on Adobe but he just – he was not...

Man: No just...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...he still signing up.

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes he was not able to make the trip here. Work Track 3?

Karen Day: Karen Day, Work Track 3.

Robin Gross: Robin Gross, Work Track 3.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thank you. And Work Track 4 I see...

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl, Work Track 4.

Jeffrey Neuman: Okay. And the other co-leader of Work Track 4 is Cheryl Langdon-Orr or who is not in the room at the moment, probably a conflict so thanks. That said let's

move on to the competition consumer trust and consumer choice. So I'm hoping that we have a couple slides. Oh I'm sorry.

Avri Doria: Yes I just wanted to add one point is at various of meetings, you know, we had the opportunity for people to ask questions. And at the end I would often say, "And if you have any other questions that you think of afterwards, you know, bring them to this meeting." So I just wanted to make sure that any of you that came with questions built up feel free to ask them at this meeting. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you Avri. Yes this is a great slide to stop on. So Avri and I went to a session of the Consumer Choice Trust Review Team and they had prepared a couple slides for us specifically on what subjects that we would be addressing as a working group. One of the things that I think we should do -- and I'd like your feedback on whether you think this a good idea or not -- is perhaps as a working group provide a set of comments back to the CCT Review Team not on the substance of the questions that they're asking but really on whether we think the question is clear, whether we think that's something within our scope and whether or not we actually think we can at some point come to an answer on it. So again not on the substance of what they're recommending but more on whether this is a subject that we think our group can and should address.

So if you looked at their recommendations and I know it came out, the full report came out just a day or two before many of us left to come here and haven't had time to read it but there is an executive summary and then there is a document that just has their recommendations. And if you look at the recommendations if you look at the red columns in the middle there you see that ultimately the total is that there are ten recommendations that are specifically referred to our working group in the middle there, three recommendations that are specifically to the Rights Protection Mechanisms PDP Working Group. And then there's this column at the beginning that just

says PDP WG which means that they didn't necessarily know where those four recommendations fit in.

So after this we will certainly coordinate with the Rights Protection Mechanisms Working Group to figure out whether those are recommendations for us or them or for I don't know, I guess we'll have to see what – I haven't reviewed the full recommendations at this point so we'll have to find a home for them. If you want to go to the next slide the first recommendation which is actually Recommendation 10 in their report the ICANN community should consider whether the costs related to defensive registration for the small number of brands registering a large number of domains can be reduced. And this was a – this was labeled as a prerequisite.

So the way the CCT Review report is structured there - there's a category called prerequisite which means we must solve this before any subsequent procedures start. And again this is in their view. There is a low priority – I should actually start the other way. There's a high priority recommendations which needs to be resolved in a short timeframe but not necessarily before the next subsequent procedures start. And then there's a medium and a low priority. Again the high medium and low priorities are not necessarily prerequisites to introducing the new application windows.

So Recommendation 10 which is also, you know, related to rights protection mechanisms they put on this slide as a recommendation for us. And I wanted to know if there was feedback on thoughts from you all as to whether this is a subject that you all think we should be handling or whether this is something more appropriate for the rights protection mechanisms because a few of us were asking ourselves the same question so I didn't know if you all had any thoughts on that. Rubens? Yes thanks.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl, looks rights protection for me. Can we do a roll call on Adobe and see if people agree? But looks RMP to me.

Avri Doria: No but this is Avri speaking. But we can certainly raise hands in Adobe.

Jeffrey Neuman: As I'm eating here so...

Karen Day: I agree with Rubens. I think this is rights protection.

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Your name?

Karen Day: Sorry, Karen for the record.

Jeffrey Neuman: Let's see Susan?

Susan Payne: Yes I think this is one - sorry Susan Payne. I think this sort of falls into both but I mean clearly needs to be only dealt with in one. If you were to be in the Rights Protection group they keep saying that cost isn't so much within their remit or at least cost of registration isn't within remit. I don't know. It might be helpful to read not just to the recommendation for what the underlying text is that goes to it because it may make it a bit clear exactly what they're talking about because I - to me it can go either way.

Jeffrey Neuman: Okay thanks Susan.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jeffrey Neuman: Oh, thanks. Jordan please.

Jordan Buchanan: Yes Jeff it's Jordan Buchanan. And to the extent it would be helpful right now I'm happy to give context around the recommendation or if we just want to - if you guys want to deal with that off-line that's totally fine too. I know people

haven't had time to read the report. I'm one of the people that has read the report.

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes thanks. And should introduce Jordan Buchanan is one of the members of the CCT Review Team. And yes I think if you have context absolutely please.

Jordan Buchanan: Just so the context here is one of the things that we looked at in the CCT on the consumer choice side was whether registrations of the new gTLDs really represented the consumer choice, whether people were doing it because they thought it was valuable to register in the new gTLDs or whether they felt they were obliged to somehow and particular looked at this at an issue of trademark protection and whether rights holders felt, trademark holders in particular felt like they had to register in the new gTLDs in order to sort of block other people from getting it or whether they we're doing it because they thought it was, you know, good for their brand or whatever. And I think in general we found that their RPMs seem to be working quite well. Most of the brands in the TMCH, even those that had registered in the legacy gTLDs either didn't register at all in the new gTLDs or registered a very small number, in a small number of gTLDs for a given mark. I think the median was three and that came from the TMC's review.

However there was a very small number of brands, only like 4% of the TMCH sample registered more than 100 across more than 100 TLDs. And there was one at the sort of extreme and there was one particular brand had registered across like over 400 of the new gTLDs. And that sort of bimodal behavior where most brands are not registering very much at all not very – bearing very much defensive registrations costs. We acknowledge there might be other costs as well that costs associated with defensive registration versus on the other end some brands being exposed to a very large amount of defensive registration costs.

We thought it made sense to go back and take a look and see whether it was possible to retune any of the RPMs or consider new RPMs that would make it

possible to address the cost of that some of those brands that were registering across a very large number of gTLDs were facing because it didn't seem to be as working well for some brands as for others. So that was the issue.

Avri Doria: You've got Philip with his hand up and then Christina up on the list and then Susan.

Jeffrey Neuman: Okay. Thanks. Phil?

Phil Corwin: Yes thanks Jeff, Phil Corwin for the record. Speaking in my capacity as one of the three co-chairs of the RPM Review Working Group the general cost of defensive registrations I would say is definitely not within the scope of our working group. That is when a trademark owner just decides to register a particular domain on a particular TLD outside the sunrise period that's just a decision and the decision to have no price controls on new TLDs was just an original decision and you see a whole range of prices from very low to very high. So that part is definitely not in my opinion within the scope.

On the cost of course one of the RPMs is the right of sunrise registrations for verified trademarks for which proof of use has been shown that are put in the clearinghouse. And I think the other day in one of the sessions -- they all kind of run together in my head now after six days in meetings -- we said that complaints about the - in many cases the very high price of premium of sunrise registrations for marks that have been designated as premium domains when they're also descriptive dictionary words is something we wanted to discuss with the co-chairs of your group to try to figure out whose jurisdiction the pricing of sunrise registrations was in. But so and our impression is that the relatively low level of sunrise registrations is partially due to price, partially due to the high number of TLDs and brands deciding it just doesn't make sense to try to register defensively against hundreds of them and relying upon claims notice to when I have exact matches registered

other monitoring services and in some cases the availability of protected marks lists at some of the portfolio TLD owners. I hope that's helpful.

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes thanks Phil. And let me just ask a quick question of Jordan. This question is not just talking about sunrise right? It's just talking about you look at some point back in but it didn't have to be registered during sunrise, is that right?

Jordan Buchanan: Yes the day of the (unintelligible) analysis came from the TMCH reviews so, you know, we didn't produce any new data on this particular question. But I do think that the TMCH review did not exclusively look at sunrise. It was any point prior to the - when the review was actually occurred.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Jordan. Avri who is next?

Avri Doria: Yes, Christina.

Jeffrey Neuman: Go ahead Christina.

Christina Rosette: Christina Rosette for the transcript. And Phil you hit on this a little bit and Jordan you did as well but I'm hoping that Jordan you might be able to pick it up and tase a little further. Given the absence of price controls can you help me - can you perhaps elaborate a little bit more on how the CCT thought that we might be able to get to this recommendation given that restriction?

Jordan Buchanan: So I – we didn't look actually specifically at the price per domain. I think the recommendation was more and it is – I want to suggest one thing as well. I think it is the intent of the CCT recommendations with regards to policy work that the relevant TDPs take a look at the issue. And in some cases they may decide actually this is an impossible problem to solve. We - you know, you've identified a problem and the reason why it's not solved is because it's not possible to do it. But we wanted to be sure that someone had the opportunity to take a look at the facts that this bimodal sort of behavior existed and see whether there was some retuning of the rights protections mechanisms or

new rights protection mechanisms that might be introduced in order to provide some ability for – to provide more – I’m going to choose my words very carefully, to make it so it was less necessary for some trademark holders to register defensively across a large number of gTLDs because our general view is that defensive registrations are not a good example of competition and consumer choice because if you're registering because you feel like you have to as opposed that you have a productive use for the domain that's not actually an advancement in either consumer choice or in effective competition. And so this is really focused on can we create mechanisms by which the small number of registrants who are registering across a large number of TLDs feel like they don't have to do that.

Christina Rosette: So can I just follow up quickly. So just so that I'm clear because I want to make sure that I am so basically what the CCT was talking about this recommendation was nonprice related mechanisms for reducing that cost?

Jordan Buchanan: I mean I guess it's possible you could create a – ICANN can mandate the – I don't think this is a good idea and it's probably not a good policy recommendation. It may not be - even be in the picket fence but you could theoretically say there's some magic bundle price. So if you buy 400 it's the same price as buying ten. But is - we didn't specifically talk about price. We talked about number of instances.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thank you Jordan and Christina. Susan's next and then Michael.

Susan Payne: Thanks. I was going to make a – I'm not going to make the point I was going to make but I wanted to just pick up on something Phil said. He talked about wanting – needing to talk about where something sets, you know who's remit it is. But the premium name issue is not just about descriptive terms in TLDs. There - the group has captured a number of examples of TLDs where the premium name was not a descriptive term. You know, in some cases even a coined trademark has been priced to premium. So it's not a purely descriptive name scope of protection issue.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Susan. Phil you want to quickly respond? Sure.

Phil Corwin: Phil again for the record, very quick clarification. The availability and effectiveness of sunrise registration is clearly within the jurisdiction of the RPM Review Working Group. But the extent to which trademark owners find that their marks are priced at high premium levels that deters the use of sunrise registration is a separate issue and we haven't determined yet whose responsibility that is as it affects the use of the RPM. But I would say the general issue of price controls or not is clearly within the jurisdiction of this group and not the RPM.

Susan Payne: Yes I wasn't disagreeing with that bit sorry. All I was saying was it isn't just the case that it's descriptive terms that are priced to premium.

Jeffrey Neuman: Okay thanks Susan. I have Michael then Rubens.

Michael Flemming: Michael Flemming for the record. I just I have a question towards Jordan and I don't want to downgrade the importance of this recommendation. But given the – especially to highlight the small number of brands and like I said not to downgrade their efforts for defensive registration I just wanted to see what was the or the criteria especially for labeling this I just wanted to see what was the or the criteria especially for how – for labeling this priority level is prerequisite in order to move forward with any of the policy development in this case.

Jordan Buchanan: Sure. Thank you. I'll try to reflect back on the discussion from the group. I think in general in places where we saw that we were recommending potential policy changes that would be onboarded onto a - into a subsequent procedure we labeled those prerequisites because we thought it made sense to try to get that policy work done prior to actually having the subsequent procedures.

I guess another way you might think about it is that the things that we labeled as prerequisites here and identified as policy work are at least the CCT, based on the CCT review the set of things that we thought would make sense for the policy development workstreams to really focus on prior to there being subsequent procedures. And so to a certain extent it's speeding metal zone and, you know, is sort of telling you guys hey, you know, as you're going through your own prioritization stack based on our review we found that these particular things were the right places for you guys to be focusing your energy. That is a total apology to answer your - and it doesn't really answer your question though because like I'm saying it's important because we said it was important.

And so I think the - that I guess the best answer I would have for you would be if it's really the case that there is a disproportionate cost being borne by some set of trademark holders that it would make sense to try to remedy that cost. Like the general approach that the CCT has taken is roughly a cost-benefit analysis is to say okay there's all these benefits in terms of increased consumer choice. We're seeing good early signs in terms of competition and adoption of safeguards but what are the downside consequences as well and how do they balance out?

And so here is a case where we said, "Oh here is a potential downside consequence." And if we can remedy that prior to allocating more TLDs then that would mean that you get all the positive benefits without necessarily incurring the negatives ones. So that's - we didn't find very many instances to be honest of significant negative consequences. And so when we did we sort of pointed our focus at it.

Now I just want to emphasize once again you may look or you or the other PDP may look at this and say, "Oh well the brands that are registering in hundreds of TLDs those are the really big famous brands." And it of course makes total sense that they' registering in lots of places. They have more cost to defend their trademark just like they have more - all sorts of things

that they're going to have to do across the world in order to defend their trademark. So that's a totally reasonable allocation of costs between trademark holders and so we don't really need to do anything here.

But we weren't able to sort of dig in at the level of detail and really think about the policy trade-offs. We don't think it's appropriate for the CCT to actually make the policy recommendations. So we identified what we thought were the areas of interest and tried to focus the policy workstreams on them.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Jordan. I have Rubens and then we'll go on to the next question.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl. My first point is a question to Jordan. His recommendation could be read as something suggesting DPML where an RPML like wholesale mark blocking services. Does the full content of the recommendation goes in that direction as well or just a possible reading of the summary?

Jordan Buchanan: I mean I agree that is a solution that someone might propose to this problem. I don't think we tried to - and we did not try to suggest any particular solution. I don't think it should be read that way.

Rubens Kuhl: Thank you Jordan. The other point I would like to make is that if you are talking about price that would probably get out of policy development scope do to picket fence. So could possibly looking to ensure that can't be sold at that policy development level.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Rubens. I think what they're looking for is not on the specific price but probably the methodology behind that - the pricing determinations or alternatively whether there's a form of price discrimination and whether we need to potentially look into that as opposed to the specific price. But we'll take all of this back and if we need some more clarity Jordan will - what we're going to do is were going to try to come up with a comment in response to the initial report. Yes.

Jordan Buchanan: Back to the comment you described earlier it will be super helpful in helping us refine the final report. So I appreciate that.

Jeffrey Neuman: All right thanks Jordan. Recommendation 14 the CCT Review Team is not recommending that at this point that there must be restrictions or that there, you know, must be certain things applied to or certain requirements for the safety and security of users. But what they did recommend at least initially is that there are incentives created to encourage registries to meet expectations regarding the relationship of content of the gTLD to its name restrictions as to who can register a domain name in certain gTLDs based on implied messages of trust conveyed by the name of its gTLDs particularly in sensitive or regulated industries. And three the safety and security of users personal and sensitive information including health and financial information. Well take a drink. Anybody have any comments on that while I drink?

Avri Doria: Michael has his hand up.

Jeffrey Neuman: Michael is your hand still up or is that an old one?

Michael Flemming: I'm sorry. No but we did have a common question to ask on...

Avri Doria: Okay. This one's from John McCormac. Question - okay on – on Recommendation 14.1 how can the relationship of a gTLD's content be related to the gTLD string be based - be the basis of an incentive when some new gTLDs are finding it difficult to get registrations and have had to resort to heavy discounting to drive registration volume? It seems that some gTLD applications have not survived contact with fiscal reality. Is that really a question? I guess the first sentence is a question is how can the relationship of a gTLD's content be related to the gTLD string?

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks. And on this one we did ask a similar question on what was meant by content. And Jordan actually explained during that meeting we're not talking

about the content that they publish on a particular Web site but looking at the domain name itself as being related to the string. So if you were talking about .food is the second-level registration related to food I think is really what they're talking about as opposed to the content on the second level being related to the TLD if that makes sense. And Jordan did I state that correctly?

Jordan Buchanan: Yes. I wouldn't say necessarily just the string itself but like it could be a registrant just for example like so like some TLDs have an excess requirement. So like .NYC you actually have to live in NYC and so that's the content of .NYC is a bunch of New York City residents essentially and so as opposed to thinking necessarily about the content of individual Web sites. But somehow getting at is there a relationship between the TLD and the stuff in the TLD.

Jeffrey Neuman: Okay. Is there any comments on that, any thoughts, clarity we need? No.

Avri Doria: Mr. McCormac is typing.

Jeffrey Neuman: Okay. Okay is there any - I guess we could go into Recommendation 38. This was a future gTLD applicant should state the goals of each of their voluntary PICs and again labeled as a prerequisite. Now this came out of - this is kind of interesting because the PIC process was introduced after early warnings. The governments have been able to file early warnings. There was actually nothing contemplated in the guidebook about Public Interest Commitments. It was developed after that fact in order to for applicants to address some of the early warnings although applicants could file PICs even if there were no early warnings. And does anyone have any thoughts of this one? I mean I gave kind of a short answer to it. It was, you know, the basic purpose of - basic goal was really to avoid getting GAC advice. I mean I think many applicants would probably argue that. But if anyone's got any comments. Donna?

Donna Austin: So I think that PICs were actually introduced as a result of the Beijing communiqué and the treatment of that advice from the NGPC. So it was kind

of while some introduced voluntary ones as a result it was kind of an enforcement. You know, you couldn't move forward unless you had this subset of PICs agreed to in your registry agreement.

Jeffrey Neuman: All right Jon do you want to - we'll have to go back and I think part of our work is to kind of remember the order or the chronology of how everything came about and describe it.

Avri Doria: Yes this is Avri speaking. If I remember though not everyone submitted a PIC yet many of those went forward anyway. So it's hard to think of it as enforcement.

Susan Payne: As a result of the safeguard categories that the NG PC came up with weren't the - or what's Specification 11 IIIB then?

Jeffrey Neuman: All right let's - so I'll go to Jon back to Donna if she wants to finish her comment. I know we have Susan as well.

Jon Nevitt: It's Jon here. The Spec 11 3 are mandatory PICs. Spec 11 4 are the voluntary PICs And whoever said - I think that Avri just said that not everyone did. I think it was less than half did voluntary PICs. And I think the recommendation is assuming that there will be PICs which I'm not sure whether we would do that are not so...

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Jon. I actually I did make that point to the Review Team as well that PICs were the vehicle chosen for that first - for that last round but may not be going forward which actually got a very surprised look from some of the members of the CCT Review Team. Next we have Donna did you want to - okay did you want to respond or - no? Okay Susan please.

Susan Payne: Hi. Susan Payne. I think they tend all to be sort of thought of as voluntary PICs but some are more voluntary than others. You know, a lot of people adopted the voluntary PICs because they had to because they were imposed

on them effectively. And then I think some people did come up with some what you might call voluntary PICs. They weren't in a standard set but they were ones that they having got, you know, having fallen into a category which seemed to be covered by some of the GAC advice thought well, you know, I want to try to work around that and make myself less objectionable.

So they came up with some voluntary PICs. But no one knew whether they were going to need to have them or not so people, you know, some people erred on the side of caution. I don't think you can really call that voluntary but, you know, they were what they were.

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes thanks Susan. And I think the reason they asked this question is what they explained as they want to evaluate the – whether the voluntary PICs worked. But it was hard for them to do without knowing why those PICs were actually created. I'm not sure even when they do get a response back they'll be able to evaluate it because of circumstances which were mentioned. But that was kind of what was behind the question. Does anyone else in the – all right this is not working so can you slide next one whoever's got out there oh we - I think we missed one. There we go.

Recommendation 39 was all voluntary PICs should be submitted during the application process such that there is sufficient opportunity for the Governmental Advisory Committee review and time to meet the deadlines for community and limited public interest objections. This is labeled as a prerequisite. And I think the comment, the same comment that Jon had made applies to this one as well which is this is based on the assumption that there will be public interest commitments in the future. Any questions on this one? Yes we have someone coming up sorry. Is this Trang?

Karen Day: This is Karen for the record. This question is for Jordan. Jordan the CCT RT when they - when you guys came up with these recommendations you do an assessment of these recommendations against the current ICANN bylaws, the restated ICANN mission and bylaws?

Jordan Buchanan: No.

Karen Day: The reason I'm asking -- and (Matteo) is here -- I'm -- so I'm concerned whether or not voluntary PICs are within scope of the new ICANN bylaws. So that might be an area where we may want to do some thinking around and maybe reread the ICANN bylaws. So I'll leave it there. Thanks.

Jordan Buchanan: That would be a super helpful public comment as well.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Jordan. I won't put (Matteo) on the spot so you can choose to respond -- okay come on up.

Matteo Ray: Matteo Ray speaking. Thank you very much Trang for putting me on the spot with this very interesting question. I guess that was directed to me in my capacity as CCWG co-chair for enhancing ICANN's accountability. And clearly the question of the -- whether or not PICs are in the scope of ICANN's mission was intensively discussed in Workstream 1.

There is certainly a significant amount of transcript recordings, maybe even documentation about it but I think your suggestion is certainly a valid one and maybe that could be something to be done with the - with ICANN legal about what their perception about the recommendation is at this stage. I - that would be the way forward I mean apart from the huge documentation effort which wouldn't be maybe going anywhere. But that might be -- I'm sure ICANN legal is going to review the recommendations from the CCT and will respond if need be.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks. Jordan yes.

Jordan Buchanan: Yes so just to clarify a couple of points. I think to the point that Jeff and John both raised this does presuppose that there's going to be such a thing as PICs and if there's not PICs then you don't need to worry about it. But the

intent of the recommendation is just too – if you're going to have PICs, voluntary PICs next time let's do it in a way that we can get the maximum value out of them.

I think when we look back and I think everyone that lived through it is aware that was a chaotic time. And, you know, people didn't know whether they had to file PICs. They didn't know what it was for. But to the extent you were going to have a mechanism by which a registry could make certain commitments to the future operation of the - of how they would run the registry if you were going to do that it would be most useful to have it done in the application workstream at a time when you could make sure that the GAC had that information before they issued advice and before for example communities had to file their objections and before if you were going to have something like limited public interest objections those were filed as well because then you would know whether or not the applicants had sort of bound themselves to do things to mitigate the concerns of those groups might have. And that might, you know, that might stop them from, you know, having the objections that they would have. So it could be they just decided you wanted a mechanism like that, that's fine. But if you're going to do it make sure it's at a time in the sort of application lifecycle where it's actually useful to those other processes.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Jordan. Annabeth?

Annabeth Lange: Annabeth Lange for the record. You were right Donna it's from the Beijing communiqué and it's very specific explained there. It's not long since I talked with my governmental and registry committee. They're representative about it actually. And I can't imagine anything else that they wanted also for the next round.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Annabeth. Any other questions, comments? No hands? Okay. Recommendation 43 I think these are fairly self-explanatory 43 and 46. And 46 we're - we are doing. So 43 is basically to set objectives for applications

from the Global South. There – they note that the applications were few but there was no concerted effort to encourage the Global South and so as a prerequisite their recommendation is that objectives be set. And that does make sense because they're trying to judge the success of the program.

The hard part is how do you set metrics for success in terms of numbers when you have no idea how many are going to apply or how difficult it may be to reach the Global South but that is the recommendation. Any questions or comments about again not to respond to the recommendation but whether that's clear or whether we need to file a comment? Jordan.

Jordan Buchanan: I'll just say Jeff I think it's the objective isn't really in terms of a metric. I think it's more a fundamental question which is, is it an objective of a subsequent procedure that there – that we actively encourage participation from particular regions? It could be that there's all sorts of ways, all sorts of things that the Global South really needs in order to be more engaged in the Internet or be more engaged with the domain name ecosystem. But having applicants from the Global South might not be one of those things. It could be we want TLDs that serve as the language communities from the global South or something like that but the applicant doesn't necessarily need to be from there.

So I think it's more of a question of like what's the goal? Like are we trying to encourage applicants from this region? Are we trying to encourage TLDs that serve this region, none of the above? Do we want registrars there, you know, whatever it is. But let's think through if we're going to have mechanisms to try to encourage certain behaviors let's make sure we understand what the behaviors we're trying to encourage are.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Jordan, that makes sense. Any comments on that? Oh there's in the chat it says why single - Jim Prendergast says, "Why single out one region such as the Global South?" Rubens has replied - Rubens from here, "Not to discourage is different than from encouraging." And John McCormac from

HosterStats says, What worries me is that there's so little data on the markets in the Global South and they are still developing."

So a bunch of others still typing in. But in the meantime we could probably go to the next slide because we do have some other subjects to talk about here as well. Recommendation 47 this one was I'm not going to read it right now because I think this one was the one that we had come back with question to the CCT RT that just really wasn't meant for us because this was more towards GAC advice – GAC providing more clear advice if I remember correctly. So Jordan?

Jordan Buchanan: Yes no so the intent here is that if there's going to be a process for GAC advice as part of a subsequent procedure that there be greater clarity about how that advice would be provided and to make it consistent with the new bylaws that these standards that exist in the bylaws for GAC advice generally also apply to GAC advice provided as part of any subsequent procedures. And in particular we just suggest like one example of that might - you might be like a template that the GAC should use for advice as part of the subsequent procedure as opposed to just having them issue a communiqué and ICANN trying to read the tea leaves and figure out what that means.

Jeffrey Neuman: Okay, thanks Jordan. Anybody have a comment on that? Okay no hands, going to the next one Recommendation 48 is about communities. And so it says again this one is also a prerequisite. A thorough review of the procedures and objectives for community based applications should be carried out and improvements made to address and correct concerns raised before a new gTLD application process is launched and then obviously to recommend them in an updated version of the guidebook.

I think this is one that we are already engaging in in Worktrack 3. But I'm not sure we need to discuss that right now. Any comments? Okay jumping to the next one 49. We should consider adopting new policies to avoid the potential for inconsistent results in string confusion objections. And then there's a

series of recommendations there. That is something there we are also working on in Worktrack 3. so I think this is one in our comment that we can kind of write back and say thanks we've got it and we're working on it.

And then Recommendation 50 is a low-level, low priority level not necessarily because it's not thought of to be important but a recognition that this - to engage in this would be a long term project and not so easy to do. But it's they're asking for thorough review of dispute resolutions on all objections to be carried out prior to the next CCT review. Jon yes?

Jon Nevitt: Jon Nevitt. I had a question about the last one actually if that's okay. And it's for Jordan. The fact that you talk in this recommendation about only string similarity and string confusion objections do – did the panel not think it should be extended to the other three, the inconsistent procedure or you just didn't deal with it?

Jordan Buchanan: Yes the latter.

Jon Nevitt: Okay thank you.

Jeffrey Neuman: Okay thanks.

Avri Doria: Christina.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks. Christina please.

Christina Rosette: Christina Rosette for Recommendation 50. So we do the thorough review and say, "Okay, we're done." Is that what you guys really meant?

Jordan Buchanan: Yes I actually don't think this review = this recommendation is correctly targeted toward subsequent procedures PDP. This seems like more of a staff thing. But the idea is that this should be an input into the next CCT review

because we didn't have the data that we needed in order to review this this time.

Jeffrey Neuman: Okay. No one else in the queue? There's a question in the chat of where they could find the slides. And so we will make sure we put this on the wiki after. All right go into the next one, next slide. That may be it. Great okay. So that's the CCT Review Team slides here is just if you want to see their next steps. But you may have seen this in a number of different presentations already. Their goal is to get comments in by May 25.

And so as I said before we'll work on developing a set of comments again not towards the substantive or not answering the questions but more explaining whether we think they're clear enough or whether we think more information is needed, et cetera. Okay any questions on that? All right going back to the agenda proposed geographic names session at ICANN 59 and Webinar on April 25, 2017. So this is a subject that has come up a number of times during the week. And as many of you know the topic of geographic names at the top level has been - is viewed by many to be a sensitive subject. Some are either happy with the way it came out and some are not happy with the way it came out in the last round.

And the goal is to - and there have been a number of groups that have been set up to address this issue. There's the Cross Community Working Group on use of country and territory names that they have published their preliminary report in early February I believe and is out for comment until April 20 - 21, April 21. There's a group within the GAC itself that is looking at geographic names as well at the top level with the distinction being that they are looking into geographic terms which are not announced on the specific lists that were in the guidebook so they're looking at additional protections for geographic names. And of course this is a subject within our PDP as well.

So the thinking there was to see if we can get everyone because everyone - because those groups are all on different timelines and because they don't

necessarily involve all of us we thought that we could bring everyone together for a session in Johannesburg. Sorry I had to think there for a second, in Johannesburg to try to see if we could do a working session to come up with a proposal or to work on the issue more with the ultimate goal of coming up with a proposal that we could all live with.

In order to do that we thought it would be essential to lay out in advance the foundation or the background for the different positions the different groups are taking. And so on April 25 we are planning on having a preparatory - I'm trying to get the right word there -- session to provide really the background on the different positions within the community. And that includes positions within the GAC, the ccNSO the GNSO and frankly the community at large. So the - what we're planning on doing is asking by I believe it's April 7 was the date that we had tentatively come up with to ask those that would be interested in presenting or making a contribution at the – during the Webinar to indicate their intent to submit a contribution.

I'm calling it a contribution and not a formal position statement because I think that would be a lot to require in a month. And really what we're looking for are just general thoughts on background. So anyone that's interested in presenting on the Webinar on April 25 please submit – and we're going to send it out. Obviously we're sending this out wider than just this room but to submit a position sorry, an intent to submit a contribution by April 7. We're asking that contribution to be received by April 18 which is one week before the proposed Webinar. And then of course having that Webinar on April 25. If it turns out we've got great interest in it we may have to do that Webinar twice so that we make sure that it is in - it's accessible in each time zone and there is not one time that we could do a call that would be - that everyone - it would be a good time for everyone.

So with that said I would love to have feedback on that proposal and to discuss it further. So is there anyone that has a comment? I see Donna. Thank you. Sorry Donna. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Yes thanks Jeff. Just a question about whether you're going to level set when you go into the Webinar with, you know, this is what we had for 2012 and this is how we got here because I think it's really important to have that historic context too so people understand that.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Donna. That makes a lot of sense and yes we'll definitely will try to submit something like that in advance for people to read and then also try to cover it briefly on the Webinar as well. And I'm sorry Annabeth is next.

Annabeth Lange: Annabeth Lange here. Thank you. I think that is a great idea to be honest because the – we have to find a way to discuss this in common so we don't end up with the same thing we had for the last round. And I feel that the climate for our cooperation is much better this time. We have come closer to each other and we're more aware of the different standpoints that's been raised. So from our point of view this is very good.

I want to ask where you set a date for in showing your interest in giving some presentation or some input to this 25th Webinar. We will send out on the announcement on the ICANN page so everyone can see it? Thank you.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Annabeth and yes sending that on the announcement page would be great. I unfortunately I don't control that but I will pass that request on to ICANN staff to see if that's something they'd be able to do. And actually I should before just moving forward and I'll get to Susan's coming up?

Avri Doria: Susan.

Jeffrey Neuman: Okay. Just before Susan I want to introduce ICANN staff that's helped us out greatly. So Steve Chan. We should have introduced you before. And Emily where are you? I'm blind. Oh and Emily I never pronounce your name Barabas?

Emily Barabas: Pretty close. It's Barabas.

Jeffrey Neuman: Barabas okay. Thank you. And Julie Hedlund also helps us out but there may have been a conflicting session with this one that she's out so they've been great. Sorry Susan you're next.

Susan Payne: Yes. It was a question first. I'm not sure is now the time to comment on the - this - the actual Johannesburg session or do you just want comments from the Webinar to start with?

Jeffrey Neuman: Why don't we - yes give me a minute to just describe the session and then - or sorry, the face to face and then I'll let you comment because I just realized as I was doing that I describe the Webinar but not the face to face. So just to add so after the Webinar the goal that is to have a face to face session in Johannesburg where we're able to have a working session to come to a two consensus hopefully on a proposal that would then feed back into the work that we're doing in the PDP.

The - what would be great as well -- and we haven't nailed down dates for this -- would be to have those - to have proposals submitted in advance before the Johannesburg session so that we have something to work through within Johannesburg or we as a team could try to work on our own proposal based on the inputs of from the community during the Webinar. So that's the plan and I'll turn it over to Susan because I know I interrupted. Thanks.

Susan Payne: No, no you didn't interrupt. I just wanted to check so I - yes I had a comment on the face to face and I don't know how much time you thought about this may be requiring and so on. But it did occur to me that it might be helpful to kind of do a split session so that we perhaps go in, you know, very early on in the week and have some conversation about the proposals that have come in. And then maybe reconvene towards the end. I know it's not a week, towards the end of the meeting when people have perhaps had a bit of time to socialize amongst themselves and noodle on it a bit.

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes. I think that - thanks Susan. That sounds like a great idea. But let's hear from everybody else. So I have Christina.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) responding.

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes Christina is this on Susan's comment or something different? Either way?

Christina Rosette: It's on Johannesburg.

Jeffrey Neuman: It's on Johannesburg? Okay. Then all go to Christina and then Donna.

Christina Rosette: Christina Rosette. I guess one thing that I would like us to consider if we're going to and make a decision sooner rather than later is whether or not whether we do it as a full day, we break it into half whatever, is that going to be - is any part of it going to be before the meeting formally begins simply because for many of us because of the cost of airline tickets we're all booking I think probably much farther in advance than we usually do? I'm neutral on whether or not it's the day before. I just want to make sure that when I book my ticket I book it for the right days.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Christina. Donna?

Donna Austin: Donna Austin. So Christina there's a meeting tomorrow morning of SO AC leaders to start preparing the schedule for or start hashing out the schedule I guess for Johannesburg. One of the things that I'm very conscious of is that this is supposed to be a policy forum and it's supposed to be a four-day format. And I'm pretty keen to keep it to that so I will push for that.

And I think it will be helpful to understand from Avri and Jeff what your - what you think your requirements will be for that meeting in terms of time and

format of what you want to set up. So any ideas you've got before 7:30 tomorrow morning will be gratefully received. Thanks.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Donna. I mean initially what we were thinking and hoping as an appropriate time would be if we split it up it would be something like two hours and two hours. But I'd like to just throw that out there and people think that's too short, too long? Thoughts on that or Christina?

Christina Rosette: I think depending upon the number of proposals you get I think four hours could be much shorter than what we would actually need. I mean I would be inclined to say I would rather allocate more time and not need it than come to the end of the meeting and say if we only have three more hours.

Avri Doria: Yes this is Avri. I wanted first of all ask Donna so what you were saying means if you have your way there will be no zeros and minus ones? It will only be for four days? And then I think I agree with Christina in terms of the amount of time. And I was thinking of two threes or even two fours but I was thinking...

Donna Austin: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...that if we're making a push to get this resolved that we really do need to put the time into it. And I'm not quite as optimistic as Jeff.

Donna Austin: Yes Avri. And I mean what I'm hearing is that people want to put the half a day aside of the first day for outreach. Other people want to tack on days for various, you know, review teams and things. So we'll have that fight tomorrow I guess.

Avri Doria: If I can follow-up. So will in terms of responding to Christina's request that we know early we'll know that by the end of tomorrow? You doubt it. Okay thank you.

Christina Rosette: Yes.

Avri Doria: So when would we know that?

Christina Rosette: I don't know Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Christina Rosette: Yes we...

Avri Doria: I figured I'd ask.

Christina Rosette: Yes look I don't know. We're going into...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Christina Rosette: ...a first planning session tomorrow and I guess I expect that a lot of time will be taken up complaining about this schedule before we get into the substance of what we're going to do in Johannesburg.

Avri Doria: Well that's too bad. I'm sorry.

Christina Rosette: Yes, yes. So...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Christina Rosette: But I'll let you know how it goes.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Donna. And we did ask or I should say I went up to the mic on the first public forum and, you know, asked the board if we could make sure that our session or sessions are conflict free. There's always that hope. And really

the only way to make it work is if it's going to be conflict free. Annabeth I have your hand raised. Is that new? Oh, that's an old one thanks. Anyone else with their - want to talk about this?

Avri Doria: Oh there's a ...

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes please?

Laura Watkins: Hi. Laura Watkins. I would support the call for it to be two sort of separate sessions both at the beginning and end of the week to allow time. I also wonder if there's any opportunity may be to have some kind of independent mediation service. I know Jeff you said you wanted to try and kind of have an output and sort of have something the community could live with from this session in order of having some inclined mediation service might help not - and or arrive at an impasse. Thank you.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Let me – we actually we're talking about that before and there was kind of an unsettled feeling in terms of getting someone that can be neutral and can mediate is a good thing. But finding a mediator that knew what they were talking about and didn't have us spinning off into the wrong direction because they were trying to mediate from a point of ignorance was also a risk. So we're talking about that but there's great sort of insecurity in terms of doing that but it is something that's being considered.

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes thanks. And Laura is with Nominet just to - just for the record. And I think it's great that we have the CCs participating so and feeling welcome. Any other questions on the proposed geographic names session or the Webinar?

So we intend to move forward with this and to immediately after this meeting if not before to put out the dates and to make sure that we have everything in place to set all of this up. Obviously we may not know what the session in Johannesburg looks like at this point or shortly after but we will put all the

dates at least for the times for the Webinar so that we can make sure that there's as much advance notice as possible.

Okay let's move on to the Community Comment 2. Really the only thing here is that we wanted to make sure that based on the discussions of the week whether we needed to update our Community Comment 2 questions either with new questions, taking out some of questions or modifying some of the questions based on feedback.

And from what I've obtained or from what I've gathered during the week there really was not much comment on taking anything out or modifying the questions that we do have but there was - there were a few questions raised at the Saturday session that we had which were topics that we did not have in the CC2 document relating to GAC early warnings and GAC advice. We seem to not ask any questions that covered those subjects. So what we had planned on doing is - and we have I guess skeleton versions of those. We plan on adding questions to make sure that we do ask for feedback on those two subject areas. I don't know if we have the questions a post or...

Avri Doria: Did you...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Might as well. So two questions that we got and well, there's sort of a test question there 3.1.10, "Do you feel the GAC early warnings were helpful in identifying potential concerns with applications? Do you have suggestions on how to mitigate concerns identified in GAC early warnings?" And then a 3.1.11, "What improvements and clarifications should be made to GAC advice procedures? What mitigation mechanisms are needed to respond to GAC advice? How can timelines be made more precise?" Don't know what people think of those but those seem to be two questions that were missing from the discussions we had.

Jeffrey Neuman: Rubens you have your hand up?

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl. But my question's not about those additions but is still about CC2 they make (unintelligible).

Jeffrey Neuman: Okay. Let's start and see if there's any questions on the questions and then we'll go back to Rubens.

Avri Doria: So no reactions on the questions. Okay Donna please.

Donna Austin: With regard to how can timelines be more precise what timelines are we talking about?

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes so the thought there was timelines on when GAC advice had to be on. The reality is there were some timelines in the guidebook. They were not necessarily followed. So we're really trying to make to - the question is is there anything we can do to make these timelines more predictable? And it sort of ties to one of the questions that Jordan had in the CCT Review Team that Jordan talked to a little earlier. Okay.

Avri Doria: Sorry Christina please.

Christina Rosette: Christina Rosette. It's related to GAC early warning but doesn't really speak to these two questions. And that is I think we might want to think about how - what we call it because folks who weren't involved in kind of writing the guidebook a lot of folks assume that a GAC early warning meant that it was an early warning issued by the GAC as opposed to an early warning issued by a member of the GAC. And that is a really, really important distinction.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Michael?

Michael Flemming: Yes thank you. Michael Flemming for the record. This Question 3.1 .11 in response to GAC advice who are we thinking of as the intended responder? Are we thinking of the ICANN board or as each individual gTLD to respond to GAC advice that was perhaps sent in regards to their application? I'm assuming that this is for when if we have future - so we have subsequent procedures and at the time after application they - I'm sorry GAC advice would come out whether or not that would be addressed or it's certain applications or not?

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Michael I think that's - it's an excellent question. But perhaps that's better put into an answer to this. So we were kind of agnostic in this as to, you know, who respond - I mean technically the bylaws say it's the board the response to GAC advice but the board - yes but that's not what happened here is the board responded but then put the burden on the applicants to respond to the board's response to the GAC advice. Is there a better way you think we can word this question to cover?

Michael Flemming: Perhaps. But probably not at this level I don't think that's intended. But I don't think that's necessary. My second question would be are there anything in the new bylaws that kind of help provide clarity with regards to timing or well yes and timing for example of how yes?

Avri Doria: I think there is bylaws about response time and such like that but not about when it - when the GAC gives advice. The GAC can give advice I think pretty much whenever it has advice to give.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks. And we'll take a look at that and we'll have to go back to it yes. I see is anyone else on this particular - these two questions? All right then I'll go back to Rubens please.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl for the transcript. I wonder whether we should add CCT RT recommendations at least of (these) two questions? Do I say or do you think that we should dot, dot, dot, dot, dot, dot?

Avri Doria: If I can answer my first – this is Avri Doria -- I would say no in that they're putting out their questions now and that'll be a separate call and I don't think we've have to because then we'd have to include all the background that they included in their reports and everything else. And then I think we'd be one plusing ourselves into and a possible set of questions to answer. So I think that, you know, we will be responding to theirs in some sense but I don't think so. I would recommend against it but I'm interested to hear other people have to say. Michael I assume your hand is from before?

Michael Flemming: It's actually a...

Avri Doria: Oh, it's a new hand okay great. Michael please?

Michael Flemming: Kind of related to Rubens' point. I think it might help if we look at - if we at least look at the CCT RT recommendations to see if we can't perhaps maybe relate them to some of the questions that already exist? I think there might be some parallels there that we might be able to better flush out some of our own questions that could provide for better response perhaps.

Avri Doria: This is Avri again. Can I ask you how long it would take us to do that?

Michael Flemming: How many days do we have?

Avri Doria: None.

Michael Flemming: None? Okay well let's go.

Avri Doria: I mean we could take the time we need to fix the questions but the intention had been to do a quick fix if we needed it and get the questions out so I'd just be curious how long it would take us to do that if we felt we needed to do it?

Jeffrey Neuman: Okay. Any other questions on the questions? I like saying that. No, okay. So then what we're going to do is we are going to finalize this, package it up. And Steve will - Steve and Emily will send it out first thing let's see this meeting ends Thursday so Friday? I'm kidding. Hopefully we'll get this out by early next week I guess is the goal and to have a due date as of - a due date on May 1.

I would ask everyone to go back to their respective constituencies, advisory committees, stakeholder groups, et cetera, the clients, customers -- anyone else their parents to respond to this request because it's going to be essential that we get feedback. I will note again that we had gotten feedback on CC1 only from the IPC, the Registry Stakeholder Group and the GAC. ccNSO did give us a response. So everyone else let's get a response in. Donna yes please.

Donna Austin: Thanks Jeff. Is it the intention that we would just send a letter to the SO AC leaders like we did before and take input or is this something that will go out in public? But James I know we can't call it public comment but...

Steve Chan: Thanks Donna this is Steve Chan. The intention is to do what you just said but also publish it for public comment. So we'd go the normal route of sending it to all of the SA - SO AC leaders and also do public comment to get additional voices? Thanks.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Steve. And also to provide different comments for each of the different work tracks. So if they wanted to just respond to Work Track 1. Is Steve giving me the eye because no or that was my hope? Steve?

Steve Chan: Thanks Jeff, on the spot. So I'll give you a little more context. What we were thinking of doing is putting the questions into a survey form, something like Survey Monkey or something like that so that there's prescriptive spots where you put your responses in which makes it easier for people to respond what they want to but they can - but it also makes it much easier for us to extract questions and sort them and consider them where they're relevant to. So I don't know if that - I don't know if that's exactly what you're looking for but I think it's one way to get to the organizational concerns you had.

Jeffrey Neuman: Well yes I mean - sorry, this is Jeff Neuman. We'll take this off-line to provide a way because I'm not sure every group that we're trying to get input for will go into Survey Monkey and fill it out and issues with saving responses and things like that. I think a lot of people will submit PDFs. And so we'll take that back but we're trying to figure out a way that we can easily separate responses so that when - after they come in each of the work tracks can then start the review on the comments related to their own work tracks. So we'll figure out the best way of doing that soon.

Any other comments, questions on CC2? Not seeing any and we have 15 more minutes I think.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Jeffrey Neuman: Right? So 14 minutes now. Really this is just to see if there's any kind of feedback on the session on Saturday other than it conflicted with a number of other sessions which people couldn't come. And I think I hope I'll give my own personal comment what I would like to see and maybe Donna you could take this back would be great if for the last meeting of the year that we could do kind of like tracks where if you were interested in new gTLD issues that none of the issues related to new gTLDs would be overlapping.

So if you could, you know, like it would be okay in theory for Whois to - and to overlap with Subsequent Procedures but it would not be okay in theory for

Subsequent Procedures to overlap with Rights Protection Mechanisms for the new gTLDs. And if possible if we could establish like tracks like that that might be helpful. I know that there are people that are on both the Whois and the Rights Protection Mechanisms and, et cetera, but it would just be I think if we could have these types of tracks and then people interested in those issues can go to those. I'm getting confused look so Jon?

Jon Nevitt: Quick question. Do we have data on how many people are actually involved on Crossover? Is there a way to pull that pretty easily? And then...

((Crosstalk))

Jeffrey Neuman: So we did update on Crossover. I think we did a, like a kind of informal and it seemed like there were more people conflicting with Whois an Rights Protection Mechanisms then there were for Rights Protection Mechanisms and us. And therefore they were better with the conflict for Rights Protection Mechanisms and Subsequent Procedures as opposed to Whois and RPMs so that's the way they did it.

But no one actually went through and said well who's going to actually attend the conference? It was strictly by lists of Whois the overlap. Other than that any thoughts on Saturday's session? We kind of tried to make it interactive on asking questions, getting responses? Oh I'm sorry Christina?

Man: Over here.

Christina Rosette: Christina Rosette for the transcript. Not so much a comment on Saturday's session but I've been hearing a lot this week about just kind of generally that we need to hurry up. And we have a lot to do. And I don't necessarily and I do not need to ask for additional deliverables from staff but I think it would be really helpful if we could have even a rough list ahead of time like here are the topics we're going to be discussing this month in each work track so that we can spend more time ahead of time kind of thinking about what our issues

are, what our questions are so that when we're actually having whatever the particular call is A, we can make sure that we're there if it's a topic that we're concerned and B I think more informed participation is going to be better participation the faster we're going to go.

Avri Doria: Yes this is Avri responding. The leadership group with the staff have actually been doing that for like the last month or so before this meeting. And the intention is to try to get ourselves to basically be doing, you know, three to four weeks ahead in terms of that. They'll always be variations because a topic didn't complete the week before as we thought it would, et cetera. But then indeed we have been working on that, probably wasn't too noticeable the couple weeks before this meeting but that has been the intent and in fact have been advertising to various groups like the GAC and others that that would be available going forward so that they would know when, you know, they needed to be at the sessions that they were most interested in.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Avri. And yes to just to add to that we also are working on a - we already submitted one or published one newsletter which covers in very bullet form what we did the previous month and then talks about the sessions that will happen in the next month. So we're going to get into a better pattern of doing that. And I think that goes towards your question. So we're trying and I think that's, you know, that's our intent. Jordan?

Jordan Buchanan: Yes thanks Jeff. As a hurry up proponent I really appreciate Christina's suggestion. I was going to say I think that the biggest win in terms of hurrying up though is not so much as either compressing your schedule or making sure you hit it although that latter point is really important as much as figuring out how to get from the completion of the policy to actual sort of landing of the opening of the subsequent procedures. And so I think there was some pretty good discussions over the past few days about various ways to do that thinking about, you know, thinking more about the implementation bits along with the staff who are going to implement that which hopefully is a different set of staff so we don't have to just overtax the staff already working on this.

But to the extent you Avri and Jeff can spend a little bit of time at least thinking and talking with staff about how to make those bits happen I think that will probably have the biggest effect in the long run on the overall timeline.

Avri Doria: Yes thanks. And I think some of those have already started. One of the discussions that I've had with several people over the last couple of days is, you know, why don't you also start, you know, suggesting the edits and the rework to AGB as things start to fall together so that there isn't the need for a two to three year gap while that gets written? So yes the whole notion of how do we compress the endgame as opposed to trying to compress the policy work is something that we're talking about. And, you know, a lot of comments have come out about the AGB is a hard book to use and, you know, can you think about as you change something recommend the change? And perhaps that's something we'll be able to work with GDD on in terms of that. Though I say that when Trang's not in the room so I have to repeat it at some other point but yes.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff. I've already asked Trang for a Word version of the guidebook. It's not a joke. Actually I did. She told me she couldn't find it so we'll see. We'll hopefully obtain an editable version.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. That would be a good test of the PDF to work the conversion tools.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks. Any other questions, comments? Any other hands? Anybody else? Any other additional input? I know it's been a very long meeting. Oh good please yes absolutely. And this is not just restricted to the table so please yes.

Avri Doria: That's why we've got a mic.

Jamie Baxter: Hi. Jamie Baxter. I'm with the Community Applicant for dotgay and I've been observer of a couple of the groups. And I appreciate all the work that you've done with these questions. We look forward to contributing when they're available.

There's two quick things I wanted to add. In one of the groups I had heard mention of some intentional outreach to get additional data points potentially from some people who aren't even with us anymore because their applications have went away. I'd strongly encourage that. And I certainly make ourselves available to answer any questions specifically maybe around communities. So I encourage you to continue with that effort going forward because I think there is some very valuable information to gain from that and it's just unfortunate that we don't have necessarily access to those people anymore. The other question I have is sort of linked to this in some way but we're talking in this group a lot about what's going to happen and or at least how we're going to the direction we're going to go in the next round.

I'm wondering if there's also in aligned track to how we're going to promote this to the world because I get a little bit anxious when I hear about the first come first serve and how this is going to roll out specifically because there are some types of applicants who can't just turn to a department in their company and say write the application it's due tomorrow. They actually take engagement and through a multi-stakeholder process to actually develop the application.

So what I would hate to see happen is that when all of this wonderful work is finished that somebody says okay in six months it's due because that may not be conducive to some of the types of communities or I've heard a lot of discussion about the Global South. It may not be conducive to them if they haven't actually been informed of about this taking place because they will take time to gather the money that's needed to do it, to have discussion and build consensus within their group whatever that may be defined at.

And it's incredibly important that there be somebody thinking about how we're going to communicate that because we all know in the round that went through already there wasn't a whole lot of advertising. And a lot of it stayed within the group that was ICANN leading into it. And so I really encourage that somebody be thinking about that even though it's not necessarily part of the PDP work because when this work is finished it has to get put into play. And if we want to do this quickly which I hear consistently at these meetings there needs to be at least an opportunity for those groups who will take longer to build their application to be part of the game. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Yes it is one of the things that actually we started talking about in another context in terms of we had a meeting the other day and there were people that sort of said we want the comments that you get and the drafts that we put out to be seen by a wider audience by that. So in fact we've started talking to the Global Stakeholder Engagement group, the GSE I guess it is. And I kept saying GSE to people and that was an acronym that even the acronym masters here didn't know because Global Stakeholder Engagement hadn't engaged enough of us but to tell us their name.

So anyhow we've gone to them and are trying to basically say how do we start getting people to know all about this early to actually give us comments on what we're doing? And I think part of that feeds into if we're engaging them early on the process as we're asking questions on the policy as it were that also builds into their awareness going forward so hopefully even getting started very early on. Please be engaged in our policymaking should at the end of the day also help us be engaged more in the program itself and then what would you - me mention about translation?

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes. I just wanted to also say your first question on getting more data points and encouraging responses from even those that applied but maybe withdrew from the process. We are planning on translating the CC2 questions into the UN languages, six UN languages. And we will look into whether we can use some other list to send out to maybe the old applicants list. We'll take

a look and see what we can do to try to reach some of them. Thanks Jamie.
Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: Kathy Kleiman. Thank you so much for your hard work. It's amazing what's going on in these PDP working groups. So just seconding what Jamie said but I wanted to know the community applicant even they got the strings are often not here. They're back in their communities doing their thing. So that kind of direct outreach to them if there are specific questions that involve communities would be great. Their back ends are here but they're not here and the communities are not.

So and I'm sure they have many stories to tell. And I know some that would probably love to tell the stories but they probably won't respond to a general engagement request. They're not going to be involved in ongoing ICANN proceedings but they might answer a few very directed questions about their own experiences. Thank you.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks Kathy. I think that's a great point. And when you said their back ends are here you meant their RS, their Registry Service provider, not any of the other kind of backend.

Avri Doria: You didn't have to get specific.

Jeffrey Neuman: I did. I had to go that next step. Is there any other comments or questions? Okay just a reminder for the working group that we will have a meeting, not next week. Next week's a week off but we will start again the following week with a full group call with a Track 1 and Track 2 call. So please check your calendars, look at the topics now that are on the calendars on the wiki and look forward to seeing you all there and thank you everyone for participating.

Avri Doria: Yes thank you.

END