

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN Barcelona
GNSO – New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Session 3 of 3
Monday 20 October 2018 at 1700 CEST**

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

Jeff Neuman: We're good. All right. Thanks. We're going to get started with the third session here. Given the amount of material we have to cover, we went back during the break and realized that we had pretty much covered everything from the last session so there was one last question on anything that ICANN needed from us or anything that they thought was not feasible. And the answer they would have given was basically that their comments which are - they filed to the initial report has all that in there and so there was nothing new to add other than what they've already submitted.

So I think with that we can move onto the third session, which we're going to start off all together, talk about some general things about the subgroups that we're forming and then we'll split up and ICANN staff will help us with the logistics of where we're going to break up into to talk about this. So let's without further ado let's go into the next slide.

So just a review of the three groups, are Subgroup A, which deals with the pre - sorry, the foundational and overarching and pre-application period; Subgroup b which is Christa and Rubens deals with the - basically the evaluation or sorry the application and evaluation sections; and then Subgroup C are things like disputes, objections and other post delegation type issues.

So moving to the next slide, the - I'm going to need to put this up on my own, sorry. I was looking off the one in front of me, but let me just use this one, yes. So as we all know, historic - I think we repeated some of this but basically there - they are over 70 comments to the initial report which doesn't sound like a huge amount; it's a good amount but when you look at not just the quantity of the comments but the quality and the comprehensiveness of the comments that came in, there is a lot of material in there and some really good stuff. And so there's a lot of work ahead of us in the next several months.

The - so let's just go onto the next slide because the rest is just generic. So just - we were asked before we got to ICANN a couple weeks ago, you know, how are these groups going to operate? What's the purpose? So these next couple of slides talk about the general and then when you talk to the leaders of the subgroups they will help you understand with some examples of things that the group will be doing. It's, as I said before, although the three groups today are meeting at the same time, don't feel the need to go for a few minutes to each one, you can if you'd like, but you're not going to miss anything in terms of covering substance; it's just really to just kind of get to know how things are going to work.

So the assumption that we're making is that each of these groups will be meeting and we'll talk a little bit more about that, through conference calls and the assumption is that at least one topic could be covered on each call. So the goal is to finish the review of all of the comments by the - by February of 2019. That seems to some a little bit far away but when you - and to others

too close - when you consider the - some of the world holidays that fall in between.

But it should be enough time to get everything done. So starting the week of November 5, which is not this week, not the week following, but on the week of November 5 the subgroups will start meeting for once a week for 60 minutes. We'll strive to not have a call at the same time, as I said, but there may be several in one day. We can't promise - we only have certain limited number of times because of all the other groups ICANN has on when we can hold meetings so there may be one or two meetings in a given day.

The full working group will move from its weekly - it's been meeting weekly, we'll move to biweekly and that does not mean twice per week, that means once every two weeks. And so I think I should have used, what, fortnightly, is that the other term?

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Fortnightly, there we go. So it's once every two weeks. Each subgroup will have their own space on the wiki and each will have its own email list. We strongly encourage to use the mailing list to work out issues because unlike the way we've been operating where we've tried to resolve every issue on a call, we are going to look to resolve issues through email. We are in the Internet age so we shouldn't always need a call and plus with rotating calls and not everybody all around the world being able to make calls we shouldn't have to actually - we should talk about it at least on one call but we shouldn't have to always resolve issues on a call.

Leaders are going to be responsible for sending emails to the subgroups summarizing conference call discussions and on topic email threads. So to the extent that emails you know, 50 emails have come in on a particular subject, the subgroup leaders will - working with ICANN staff of course try to

summarize those and where they are on those issues because we're not necessarily going to have separate or additional calls on all of those items.

Go to the next slide. So the expectations for the subgroups, so the point of the subgroups really is to review the comments and assess their potential impact so which could include things like these 10 comments from these groups supported a preliminary recommendation or a particular option. And these opposed it. These suggest that they generally oppose it but suggest modifying these couple things. I know we have to talk in pretty vague terms here because this is applicable to all. As you get into the subgroups they'll be much more narrow situations, but you know, these are the types of things we envision the subgroup coming back with to the full group.

Subgroups are responsible for assessing the potential impact of these comments and making recommendations to the full working group on how to treat the comments. So that's going to be a very vital role because not everybody in the full working group is going to be able to read and dissect every single comment.

So as a full working group member, you should be able to rely on a subgroup to bring to you the pertinent information, of course you're free to read everything as well, but this is really to help the other full group members with the materials that they may not be as familiar with because at the end of the day it's going to be the full group members that are going to determine the recommendations and it's going to be - we're going to take a consensus of the full working group, not - well we'll get into - so not the subgroups and we'll talk a little bit more about that.

One other thing I put in here is that the subgroups are responsible for extrapolating any common patterns, trends or concepts that are in the comments received and for providing alternatives to the full working group on potential recommendations, options that may bridge or resolve some of the differences expressed. So you'll see in some comments that yes, you'll see

the definitive comments, we oppose this or we strongly endorse this, but there's other comments that say, you know, we are concerned about this option because of A, B and C.

Well if bridging the gap means that you think we can solve for that A, B and C, then a subgroup may recommend to the full group saying you know what, there were these comments that initially didn't seem so 100% supportive but if we change these elements, then we go from 10 people supporting or 10 comments supporting this recommendation to - and 10 against - to 15 supporting the recommendations and only a few against. So recommendations like that, again we're talking very general terms here, but just to hopefully try to set expectations.

Go to the next slide. To the extent possible subgroups should also identify areas where they believe compromise may be possible but also areas where they don't believe compromise is going to be possible. So there may be some issues, some very controversial issues that, you know what, you have people - you have some comments on the one side, some comments on the other. We've tried exploring different areas or thinking of different areas that can bridge it but you know what, there's just no - there's not going to be agreement here. So that needs to be known to the full group.

The subgroup leaders will not be doing consensus calls on any of this because they're not in itself making - they're not making final report type substantive recommendations. That's going to be done by the full group. But the subgroups can obviously get a sense of the group or the subgroup and say you know, we took a - I'm not even going to use the word "straw poll" we took a sense of the room with the subgroup and they think that, you know, if we solve for these two items then we'll have 100% support for this as opposed to just whatever support we have now.

I put this in here to the extent that Cheryl or I are - are helping out in the leadership, if you have an issue with the leadership of one of the subgroups,

in general you're supposed to go to the overall working group chairs to help you resolve that, if I or Cheryl are one of those subgroup chairs that you have a problem with, obviously bringing it to the same people, not necessarily going to help, so in that situation Cheryl or I will ask one of the liaisons to substitute in for us if we are the ones that are impacted by whatever the disagreement is.

So that said, going to the next slide, so what we're going to do over the next hour I guess or more is to meet your coleads to meet with some of the other subgroup members. Each subgroup has selected a single topic to serve as an example of how the review process is expected to work. Don't expect in these small sessions to resolve any issues but just to kind of go through the kinds of stuff you will eventually look at. And each subgroup will have its own individual Adobe Connect room, so remote participants will have the opportunity to listen and have their voices heard.

Again, we understand that some of you may be members or want to be members of more than one subgroup, and you absolutely will be able to, it's just during this meeting they'll conflict with each other but after that it should be fine. So these on the slides which everyone should have a link to, and maybe we'll post these links on the chat on as well, on this chat, tells you which Adobe room is going to have the conversation on it that will join and also the room. So Subgroup A, because I am in inherently lazy, we're staying in this room. That was a joke, nobody - no laughter anywhere? Thanks.

All right, I know it's the end of the day, Subgroup B is going to go to 121 and Subgroup C will go to room 129.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The furthest possible point from this room.

Jeff Neuman: Which is why we've put Cheryl there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I thank staff particularly for that.

Jeff Neuman: One twenty nine, so Subgroup C - do we have another slide just before everyone goes? I can't remember.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Yes, please, jump in.

Steve Chan: Thanks, everyone. This is Steve Chan from staff. And just wanted to add one tiny detail in that we sent around details that he just read off or Jeff just read off via email. But also in that email is documents basically, it's a PDF of the relevant section, the comments and breakdown of those comments per option, question, recommendation, all that. So those will serve as a supplement to these breakout sessions and consult your email to be able to look at that on your own device because...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Before we break out let me just ask is there any general questions before we do this breakout, sorry, break up, breakout, very different.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I assume you're not getting the table back here after the breakout.

Jeff Neuman: No, so once the breakout sessions are over the leaders will - when they're comfortable that things have been covered then they will end it there and you do not have to come back here. So anyone - so thank you, everyone and if you're Subgroup A, here; Subgroup B, 121; and Subgroup C...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: One twenty nine.

Jeff Neuman: ...129. Subgroup A is the foundational overarching issues; Subgroup B, the application contract, right, is that part of it? I can't remember. Pricing. Pricing, that's a good one, Subgroup B, if you want to talk about that. And Subgroup C you're dealing with objections, disputes and post delegation type things.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: All right. So for those staying in this room let's just - I'll give you like two minutes and then we'll get - we'll restart and make sure we're on the right Adobe room. Thanks.

Okay we'll get started in one minute, I just want to - if people in the back can move up since this is kind of a smaller group setting, more intimate, and also in this session we're going to - if you want to speak we're going to use the mic up here as opposed to the roving mic that's going around. So one more minute and then we will get started.

All right let's check with the tech in the back. Are we good? Thumbs up? All right. Welcome everyone to the third session or the second part of the third session, so this is Subgroup A which deals with the overarching issues, the foundational issues and the prelaunch issues. And so this is Robin, everyone say hi to Robin. Hi, Robin. Okay, Robin and I are leading this and so what we'll start out doing really is just looking at - Robin will go through just all the issues that we are working on and responsible within this group.

There was a document sent around a couple weeks ago that had this division, it was called Division of Work. And then we'll go through a specific example of how the comments were broken out and how we'll have to look at certain issues and the example we chose to look at was dealing with rounds, and so why don't I just kick it over - oh, Julie's got a comment as well.

Julie Hedlund: And just - so to make sure that everybody is on the same page with respect to those who are in the room and those who are participating remotely, we do highly suggest that those of you who are in the room join the Adobe Connect room and that will be the place that staff will be taking some notes in the bottom right hand pod and that way we can all see those at the same time as well. Thanks, everyone.

Robin Gross: Hello, everyone. My name is Robin Gross for the record. And I wanted to go over what the different issues are that Subgroup A will be working on. Basically we've got about 15 different sub issues that break - that can fall into basically three buckets. One being the overarching issues; the second being the foundational issues; and the third being the prelaunch activities.

So in terms of the overarching issues, the sub issues that we will work on, we'll deal with continuing subsequent procedures, the element of predictability, community engagement, clarity of the application process, applications being assessed in rounds, and as Jeff noted, this is something that we'll dive a little bit deeper in later today, different TLD types, application submissions limits, accreditation programs, such as the RSP preapproval. And then with respect to the foundational issues that we will look at, the sub issues are competition, consumer choice and consumer trust, the global public interest, application freedom of expression and universal acceptance.

And with respect to the prelaunch activities, we will go into the Applicant Guidebook, the communications and the systems. So that's just a very brief overview of the 15 different issues that Subgroup A will be working on over the course of the next few months. Jeff, over to you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, so Steve sent around, and I know it's really small in the Adobe right now, but Steve sent around a PDF document just a little while ago on the subject of applications assessed in rounds. The reason I wanted to pick this issue to just start with just for this meeting, even though it's not the first issue,

was because when I was reading through the comments it seemed like there was some agreement in this area on a couple of the aspects though other aspects are clearly diverging.

And so what we - the exercise we're going to engage in is to review the comments that were submitted, keep in mind who they're submitted by and what kind of role they are in the ecosystem, and then ultimately make sure we understand what those comments say, take notes on where we may not understand what they're saying and therefore may need to do some follow up with the respective groups or entity or person that submitted those comments.

And then ultimately though this probably won't be today on this issue, is to kind of think about if there are patterns emerging, so while some groups ultimately may say that they at the end of the day want a first come first serve process for applications, I think what we'll see without too much disagreement is that the next opening or the first opening of the next window should be in the form of a round. Right?

So even at the end of the day we may not have all - all the comments may not be in agreement on what should happen down the road I think we'll see - I haven't reviewed every single comment so I'm saying that with some reservations, but I think what we'll see is most groups agree because of the timeframe in between the last round and the next application window that it should be in the form of a, quote, round.

So those are the types of things we would want to pull out and also look for items in there as to, you know, maybe some of them going to - we could accept - let's say they push for first come first serve, but then some of them may say that's our preference but we're okay with a predictable series of rounds if you knew exactly when it would start, etcetera. I don't want to dive too far deep into the weeds although we definitely will.

So the question here that we're going to look at stated that the working group recommends that the introduction of new gTLDs shall be in the form of a round with respect to subsequent introduction of new gTLDs the working group does not have any consensus on a specific proposal, it does believe that it should be known prior to the launch of the next round rather - or either, A, the date in which the next introduction of new gTLDs will take place; or, the specific set of criteria and/or events that must occur prior to the opening up of the subsequent process.

So an example is provided which says you could say that prior to the launch of the next round you could say that the next round after this one opening up will be exactly on January 30, 2020, just making up a date here. Or you could say that we're going to start the next round one year after the date in which 50% of the current applications have passed initial evaluation. Those are the types of options we could say, and that went out for comment.

We received a lot of comments on this area. I think most of the people that submitted comments in general submitted to us, we have comments from ALAC, from the GAC, we have comments from ICANN Org, which I thought were really good and interesting, comments from the International Trademark Association, Registry Stakeholder Group, we have comments from the Brand Registry Group so and then an organization that calls themselves the Public Interest Community. So I think we got a pretty good cross section.

And as we kind of review the comments, so we would look at let's say the ALAC comments because they're first and what the ALAC states is that they oppose first come first serve and believe that regardless of whatever mechanism is chosen that there should be a batch - that applications should still be batched. ALAC believes that regardless of whether future applications are called a round or whatever it's called that applications should continue to be batched for assessment to allow but not only fair competition in string selection. There might be a word missing there or I might have missed it.

But so in looking at that comment, you know, they say in any case, the ALAC strongly advocates against immediate commencement of a permanent first come first process of accepting new applications for the program. And so that's their first comment. I think what we'll see is that there are others that share a very similar type of comment as well. And so we would just need to, in our role in the subgroup, is document that and basically say well the ALAC and whatever other groups all have concluded this while others may have concluded something different.

So in looking at the comment the first thing we need to look at is do we understand what the comment means? Do we need any clarification on that comment? Anyone? I mean, I think it's pretty clear the way it's worded but - and what that comment does not address is how the next round should be handled. I mean, it just says it opposes first come first serve, but it doesn't say what it does support. So that's also interesting because it's not necessarily - it still leaves open some alternatives. Chris. Christopher.

Christopher Wilkinson: Christopher Wilkinson for the record. Having participated to some extent in the preparation of the ALAC comment, I would just say that first of all there is a strong preference for batches per topic. And secondly, that the batches ordered in a way that gives priority to those groups and interests who lost out most significantly in the previous round. I'm also - and here I add a personal comment in relation to what I said earlier on today, I also feel that the English language generic concept really has to go to the end of the queue because it has been so enormously over-represented in the 2012 round and we have serious doubts as to whether the market for English language generic TLDs can absorb much more.

This is why I emphasized in our earlier discussion absolute importance of ICANN reporting to us as to what the economic and business consequences were of the results of the 2012 round. I'll answer other questions later as they arise.

Jeff Neuman: Just chewing something. This is Jeff again. So to Christopher, you brought up a couple different issues, so as one of the coleaders of this group what I would say is that on the topic of priority that is going to be something that Subgroup A addresses, not particularly in this section which is just dealing with whether it should be a - or multiple rounds or first come first serve but...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Yes, so priority is a different section in here but on the rounds concept versus first come first serve, it - the ALAC comment didn't say it supports rounds; what it said it is did not support first come first serve, so as someone with the ALAC, and I don't know - this is also one of the reasons why we asked for each group to provide a person or persons that could serve as a liaison so one of the things I would ask the liaison of the ALAC would be okay so we understand that you're not in favor of first come first serve but does that mean it's okay to go with a round? Because it didn't - it just said what it wasn't okay with.

You don't need to answer that now, it would be the question that I would ask the liaison to confirm with the ALAC on that so we can then say yes, ALAC is not in favor of first come first serve but we'll put that in the camp of in favor of doing predictable rounds. So that's the kind of thing that we would do is to not just find what the comment explicitly says but what it may not and we need more info.

Christopher Wilkinson: Well to elaborate slightly, I would take the word "rounds" out of our vocabulary. There should be batches, groups, over time of specific policy areas where ICANN can bring together the necessary resources of expertise to do the evaluation professionally, batch by batch. And it can take place over a couple of years' time. But the - as long as we talk about rounds people do think that even if it's not first come first serve, it's a land rush and I think that has to be prevented because we got it so wrong in 2012 where the land rush concept produced vast dominance of English language generics and less

avored regions lost out, communities lost out, and pending the details data from ICANN, I wouldn't go into greater detail now.

But for example, batch brands, brands have to be treated by an evaluation group with very high qualifications in trademarks. No point in creating expert groups in trademarks to deal with communities. Not to speak of other categories. So I'm really arguing for a batching process based on the characteristics of the applications and the expertise necessary to conduct the professional evaluation.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, Michael.

Michael Casadevall: Michael Casadevall, ICANN Fellow. I fundamentally disagree. The problem you have with batches is you inherently create a land rush situation, even if we set the dates and periods, everyone is going to try and get into a certain batch and period because once that batch goes in the string essentially is locked unless we allow new applicants for a string to come up in batches. So by actually following the suggestion and locking the system into batches or windows or rounds, we're actually creating a land rush period and we're simply going to recreate what happened with the first auction over and over again unless we allow for string - allow for strings to be applied for over multiple batches and rounds but that opens an entirely different can of worms.

Jeff Neuman: Vanda please.

Vanda Scartezini: Yes, in relation to the ALAC statement, I believe that the lack of information about anticipation, the time before because one problem that we had the previous round was exactly lack of time to promote in less developing regions and it was too - the speed was too fast and people could not react in timely to apply. I made a survey some time ago and with Andrew Mack in our region and we identified a lot of big companies, quite interested in the next round but with the need to be less timely to make all process.

I have been involved in the first round and we had no - even I was alert, time to reach for instance cities, governments to apply was not enough for the bureaucracy they needed to have. So I believe that the statement of ALAC that I agree, it's lack this anticipation needs for qualified information beforehand of the round.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you, Vanda. Michael, you want to respond?

Michael Casadevall: So as a practical follow up to that, I mean, ICANN - basically have two contradictory goals is that groups and organizations need considerable amounts of period of time to even know if they want to apply for a top level domain. We also want to avoid a land rush situation. The flip side is we need a - as I understand it, please correct me if I'm wrong, ICANN itself needs a group of experts and such to essentially be available from Period X to Period Y to go through these evaluations and having them come in first come first serve is difficult to impractical, that is what I'm understanding.

So it sounds like what we need to have is to allow for multiple batches and allow for string connotations to be applied for for multiple batches so once a string is applied for one batch, it can be applied in the next X batches and then that string becomes locked out because then that allows for the additional time required but doesn't or at least hopefully avoids the land rush situation that we've been seeing.

So and then if no one applies for a string in X number of batches then it starts the normal process. So that may be a practical compromise between the two points because obviously first come first serve we don't have the resources but batches, as pointed out, you know, situation we want to avoid.

Jeff Neuman: Just to continue on with the ALAC, also talks about - just lost it, sorry - that again this is more on the batching, and then that it should - I mean, there's

other - some general principles in there. But I think the one related to rounds we've pretty much covered and the issues with first come first serve.

Then the next comment was submitted by - next comment was submitted by - oh that's the wrong one, sorry, it's still ALAC. Why is my screen not changing? Your Adobe changed, my screen didn't. BRG, brands, okay. So the Brand Registry Group also thought that the next - what should be rounds but the length of time expected before the next application window they're concerned about how long it'll be until the next application window, so that it's interesting because that goes a little bit against what was just said from Michael, was it you or - yes.

Michael Casadevall: It was me but...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Christopher.

Michael Casadevall: Let's get this on record, if each batch is on a regular schedule, I think it solves that concern. So say that we have - actually, you know what let me take the model of the FCC? The FCC every X years makes a number of broadcast licenses available and then applications come flooding in, they get closed, the FCC reviews them, they get issued, the series repeats. And they're dealing with limited spectrum for, you know, which is sort of applicable to ICANN because in truth there's only so many words in the English language or let me rephrase that, words in general that people are going to want as top level domains.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, any questions on the ALAC or sorry, in the BRG statement? Just to go over some more things in the BRG statement, they recommend that session of smaller targeted application rounds could be completed in parallel, so they're basically saying that perhaps because some of the issues may take a long time with the generic TLDs that you could start with a brand only round.

The Business Constituency supports the recommendation of having rounds, essentially because that helps with predictability and it also they think it works better for underserved countries.

They - scrolling through here. I'm on Number 5 just FYI - is that unlocked on Adobe for everyone? All right so it's just - but you still control this one. Okay, but I mean, this very monitor you would control this monitor? Well I'm in Adobe too I was just - was also looking at the monitor that was in front of me.

Anyway, so the Business Constituency supports the recommendation of having rounds and they also believe that it may be better in serving underserved communities and they have - and ICANN Organization - so the organization itself, so Trang and her team supported the option that gTLD to be known prior to the launch of the next round the date in which the introduction of new gTLDs take place unless the aim is to eventually get an ongoing application process using to accomplish - oh wow, I think this is a little bit out of order here. But it's basically talking about the date of the next round and having a predictable process.

Questions. Okay, then move onto Number 6 which is INTA, they again support the concept of rounds so we're sort of getting a pattern here. I haven't seen yet a comment in support of first come first serve but there probably are. Discrete rounds allow for not just the applicants to know when to file their comments but also assists in those that do objection or dispute resolution so if you did first come first serve, you wouldn't know when an application was filed and you may miss the time period to which to object to an application.

The ICANN Board, they want the group to consider a mechanism for determining when a round is over, so it's not just the fact that we should do rounds but it's - we should determine when a round is declared over such that either refunds could be issued from applications or any other thing that could come up that may necessitate a monitoring an application. Then we have

another one in here, it's the Registry Stakeholder Group, they support the recommendation but ultimately believe that they should go to a first come first serve.

And then the - let's go through so I mean, that's kind of the range of opinions we have now. So there's no overt support for - at least in this question, overt support for a first come first serve process, but there - and while there are some differences between the comments in having rounds, I think each of them would agree that the first or the next application window should be a round.

And it seems like if we recommend it because of a lot of the reasons stated here, if we recommended to the full group a proposal to ensure that TLDs are only launched in rounds and that they are - that the distance between two rounds is six months, a year, whatever we want to do or maybe there's some comments that affect. But like that's a pattern that clearly emerges is and very few support the full - very few prefer starting on Day 1 with a first come first serve process. I think that's where we sort of diverge a little bit in that some of the comments believe you should go right to first come first serve.

Michael, please.

Michael Casadevall: Is it the thoughts of the working group that we should have overlapping rounds, specifically round 1 - let's break down a round - a round could be basically be broken down to phases. You have the application period, the review period, and then the rest of the handbook as ran. Do we want - always have a round open where you can start applying for a name and then have them processed in batches? So basically you can apply at any time and then that would go into a round; that round closes and then the review process begins; a new round opens and begins applying for applications. That should also help prevent the land rush problem at the same time.

Or do we want one round to go from start to finish before the beginning of the next round? In which case you're going to get pandemonium. So basically do we want to get a whole lot of stuff coming in all at once? Or do we just want to break things into usable batches by essentially accepting applications at any time and then processing them in rounds? That's the question for the working group.

Christopher Wilkinson: Notice that there's a comment about that in the document and it sounded sensible that basically the opening of the rounds would be phased. If for the next round is opened evaluation process has not yet been completed, then there would be a priority in ICANN to complete the work on the (unintelligible) example or staffing the evaluation on Round 6. I do think that opening days for Round 6 should be preannounced predictable for predictability reasons. You don't have to - you can't have everybody sitting around waiting for the last difficult case in Round 5 before you can even open Round 6. That I think is - that is...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Excuse me, could I ask, can you speak directly into the mic when you're speaking? And can - when you respond, Michael, if you could also speak into the mic. I'm not sure a lot of that was caught actually. Sorry about that.

Christopher Wilkinson: Okay, no problem.

Jeff Neuman: So if I could just - just let me just interrupt for one second, also. I've kind of let this discussion go on a little bit just to make a point. So these are all kind of good views, but I think our role as the sub team is to find support in the comments that were already submitted as opposed to our own ideas. At the full working group level, we're going to be discussing our own ideas plus the comments, so our focus as a subgroup is to try to tie the comments that have already been submitted together to find some patterns without kind of going into our own necessary feelings on this.

So if your feeling is like when Christopher started and Vanda I think, had kind of views and said well this is the ALAC position because they helped write it and so there's support in there for some of it, but then it went off a little bit on a tangent, important, I'm not trying to say that the view isn't important, but we'll have time for our own view with the full group. Our key role, otherwise we'll never get this done, is to really see what patterns we can find emerging from the comments that were submitted. So with that kind of caveat, I know you want to respond to Christopher, which I'll give you a minute to do but...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Oh good, better, respond to me. That's great.

Michael Casadevall: Michael Casadevall. The thing is that looking at the comments and the review we just did, everything for the most part that obviously we got ratholed a little bit, is directly brought up from things here. For example, Item Number 4 is support for recommendations and believes that rounds are better for underserved countries. How do we make rounds better for underserved countries? If we have one large land rush round, it doesn't actually solve the problem.

I mean, I see this as a logical conclusion to bring to a logical thing to the larger working group because if we just take the items to the larger working group as is basically saying XY and Z believe that we want batches, that's not going to help, I mean, then we're just going to have the larger debate. If we can go for the larger debate and have reasonable conclusions then - and then the larger group can look at them and see we are, you know, saying and then get through these, because I mean, realistically we've gone through the first few issues relatively quickly, I mean, obviously there are going to be some that are going to be more debate, but I don't see this as beyond our scope.

Now obviously you're - it's your view over mine but I think exactly what we just did is exactly what needs to happen if we want to get through these and then have the main working group not be overwhelmed especially because it's going to be biweekly now.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. I think the key though to get through all this is going to be basically trying to point out patterns so like the pattern that I pointed out was while some of the comments clearly say they don't support first come first serve, they may or may not comment on whether they support batches or not or sorry, rounds or not. Christopher was able to correct me on that and say well no, they use the term "batches" but so that's kind of important.

Let's - all I'm saying is that we need to just try to make sure that when we're analyzing these things we're keeping our eye on the comments and to the extent our personal opinion can help us to kind of tie things together great, but to the extent our personal opinion is just saying well I disagree with the ALAC because X, Y and Z, that's not going to help us move forward.

So like so that we can - we'll talk through the next - so the Registrars basically they talk about here in expressions of interest process, which I'm not really sure why they decided that this was the right place to do that unless I just accidentally moved ahead, hold on. Yes, never mind, I scrolled ahead. Never mind what I just said.

So look, what I would think for this 2.2.3.C right? 2.2.3.C.1 I think if we took some things out of there we could certainly say that some - that there are comments that - there are some comments like the Registries at support ultimately going to a first come first serve model, however, all of the comments seem to support the notion of having this next application window be a round that may or may not, you know, how that round is created, we'll talk about a little bit differently, but that's the kind of thing we need to do in this is to try to find these common patterns.

I don't know if you want to add anything or - I don't know if we - because everyone's exhausted and so I don't want to like go deep into some more of these details of other ones on here. But basically to just again stress that our role is to try to break down the comments to see if there are areas where which we can find agreement in, areas that we don't think we'll ever find agreement in or areas where we could suggest something that might bridge the gap.

So if you read the comments on rounds, which I have, you will find there are some that strongly support first come first serve, some that I think more of them support the you know, always doing it in rounds, but whether it's - whichever comment you're looking at I think everyone supports that this next one be an actual round. And then if - even if you look at the ones that support first come first serve there are still some support for a potential of a few rounds before you ultimately go into first come first serve, sorry, I'm sitting back a little bit.

So I don't want to keep everyone for longer because it's very late and people are tired and jet lagged and I include myself in that. But we will basically - Robin and I will send out an email letting you know when our first call will be on the week of November. We'll choose - we'll probably - we haven't actually discussed what order we're going to go in because I think we wanted to just look at the comments that came in. We may go in chronological order or we may start off with - continue on this one.

So we'll let you know in advance, we're going to create the mailing list. Make sure if you're interested in this subgroup there are some pretty kind of cool issues in here, make sure you're signed up on the subgroup. If not see Julie because Julie is our staff person on this and she will make sure you're on the list and listed on the wiki and on the email. So with that I'm letting everyone go early because I think that's probably more productive. Julie, anything else to say?

Julie Hedlund: No, I can't think of anything else. And to the extent that I don't see any councilors here but I've got my reading glasses on but I know that they've got an event too so some folks have to get off too. So thanks.

Jeff Neuman: All right. Thank you, everyone. Have a good night and see everyone tomorrow.

Christopher Wilkinson: Just one...

END