

**ICANN  
Transcription  
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group  
Monday, 25 September 2017 at 20:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-25sep17-en.mp3> Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p83di3i4v19/> Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/7BkhB> The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the new gTLD subsequent procedures working group call on the 25th of September 2017. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room.

If you're only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourself be known now? Okay. Hearing no names, I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

And with this, I'll turn it back over to Avri Doria. Please begin.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you very much. This is Avri Doria speaking, and I want to start by going through the agenda, and then we basically go through the SOIs as normal. We have a change to the agenda and we've inserted a discussion on the co-chair update. Then we'll move to the Work Track updates of the four Work Tracks.

We then move into continuing the discussion on the drafting team discussion from last time. Jeff will be taking us through that discussion. Then we'll go

into a Work Track 5 update on where we're at, and then any other business. Is there any other business that anybody wants to mention already at this point?

Okay. Seeing none, then I'll ask again at the end of the time, time considering. Okay. Any other changes or objection to the agenda as it currently stands? No. Okay. I see Kavouss needs to be connected. So I'm sure somebody is working on that as we speak. I guess that the operator is trying to call, but having trouble.

Okay. So moving on - going on to SOIs on this meeting of 25 September. Update with especially changes in circumstances that would impact your role in this meeting. Do we have any? Okay. I see none. So just remind people that if your circumstances change, you do need to update your SOI and you need to speak with all the relevant parties (unintelligible) after the meeting.

Okay, moving on. On the co-chair update, we've had an open period for people to either volunteer or nominate others. We've had one nominee, Cheryl Langdon-Orr who has received a fair amount of support, and there have been no objections lodged to that.

So at this point, I want to open the discussion briefly just to check if there are any objections. The process after this meeting would be for the meeting to basically name Cheryl as a third co-chair at the moment provisionally. These need to be confirmed by the GNSO council.

So after this meeting, we would take that step and then within about six weeks, when I step down from the co-chair role, there would be two co-chairs. At this point, I'll open up the floor to anybody that wishes, especially to lodge any concern, either with the naming of Cheryl as the third co-chair or with the process that has been followed today, or the process we're following to finish this up.

Does anybody have any comment? I see (Sam), basically in terms of support, yes please.

(Sam): Yes, thanks. I want to voice my support as a comment. I think Cheryl would do a - is going to do a fantastic job. I lost audio there for a second. So just want to point out that if you didn't say it, Avri, and you might have, technically the GNSO council has to approve the appointment of a co-chair for the group. It doesn't have to approve Work Track leaders, but it does have to approve any on the co-chair position.

So we will get on to the agenda for the next GNSO council meeting so that we can have her hopefully approved in as part of, I guess it will be part of the consent agenda unless there was any reason for the council to discuss it further. So sorry, Avri if you already mentioned that. I lost video or audio there for a second. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. I had already mentioned it, but it's always good to mention it again. I have Ken Stubbs. Please.

Ken Stubbs: Yes. Thank you, Avri. I'd like to voice my support for Cheryl. I've been on some committees that she's chaired and been involved in the nominating committee with her. She's very disciplined and very organized and is the kind of person who can keep things on track, which I think is extremely important at this point in time. Thanks for hearing me out.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Ken. Alan, I have your hand up next.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Given that the call for volunteers ended just prior to this meeting and there have been no other volunteers at this point, I'd like to offer Cheryl my congratulations.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you very much. Hearing nothing but praise and acceptance and such, I believe that we do have consensus in the group at this point to name Cheryl as the third co-chair at the moment. This is provisional pending the approval of the GNSO council.

But let me be the first to - oh no, the second I guess, to welcome Cheryl as a third co-chair as I say, provisional on approval by the council. So thank you. Thank you, Cheryl. I feel much better now and I guess it's time to move on.

Work Track updates and I'm seeing good congratulations. I also see a note that relation to Kavouss, that the operator is getting error messages. So we're still working to bring Kavouss into the call.

Work Track updates. So starting with Work Track 1, and I apologize. I've been away for a week, so I don't know who's on - Christa, thank you. Please go ahead, Christa.

Christa Taylor: Hi. Really for the next Work Track 1 meeting, we're going to be continuing the conversation from the September 19th meeting on the registry service provider accreditation program. And I don't think we'll get to any other topics other than that one, and just continue the conversation.

So we're hoping everyone will join us. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Christa. Any comments or questions? Okay, moving on to Work Track 2. Who do we have to speak on that at today's meeting? Yes, Michael. Please go ahead.

Michael Flemming: Hello, Avri. Can you hear me?

Avri Doria: Yes, I can.

Michael Flemming: Good. So Work Track 2 this week will be continuing our discussion on closed generics. As part of our view, the CC2 calls, we have invited a couple of individuals to take discussion - take part in this discussion. So we will be able to hopefully move towards a path forward for how we can put together this topic and finalize it towards the initial report.

So that meeting today - this week will be at 15 UTC on Thursday, which I believe is the 28th of September. We look forward to having everyone participate for discussion. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Michael. Any comments or questions on Work Track 2? Okay, moving on to Work Track 3. I know that Robin is away this week. So Karen - yes please, Karen. Go ahead.

Karen Day: Hi Avri. This is Karen for the record. Work Track two will be meeting tomorrow 1500 and our topic tomorrow is string similarity. We'll be going over our CC2 comments, as well as a proposal for dealing with the issues that arose in the last around that had been put forth earlier in the year by a group of registries.

So if you have interest in string similarity issues, singulars and plurals, please join us tomorrow at 1500. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Karen for the WT3 update. Any comments or questions on that? Hearing none, Michael, I see your hand is up, but I believe it's still up, but just want to confirm. Yes, thank you. Okay, moving on to Work Track 4. Either Cheryl or Rubens, who is taking it? Rubens, thanks for your hand. Thank you.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks, Avri. This is Rubens here. On Work Track 4, I thought the last call we discussed financial evaluation when it was presented as (unintelligible) mushing of our proposal to simplify financial evaluation a lot. So I was - people were interested in that topic to join the list.

On this week's call, which will be Thursday, we believe we'll be able to discuss name collisions and registry services. The name collision discussion is contingent on us getting back at least today for any definition of today depending on time zone.

Information on the name collision that occurred the year 2012 around. If we don't get that information, that won't leave enough time for our track members to discuss this thing on Thursday. So then we will reset the agenda based on that. But if everything goes by the plan and we discuss name collisions and registry services and everyone is invited. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much, Rubens. Are there any questions or comments on Work Track 4? Okay. Hearing/seeing none, thank you for the Work Track updates and we'll move to agenda item number four, which is the drafting team discussions on the overarching issues.

This is continuing the discussion on the different TLD types, and I turn the four over to Jeff Neuman, who happens to have his hand up also. So Jeff, please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, Avri. I wanted to just take a minute to just talk about Work Track 5 for a second. So we're not quite on to agenda item four yet. Seems like we're getting a lot of feedback. Is that from my line?

Avri Doria: Sorry. I saw - I think it started with your line. I hadn't gone into Work Track 5, though that was my inclination because it was listed as agenda item five. But please go ahead now if you think we should talk about it now.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. And let me know if it's my line that's causing the issue too. If it is, then I'll just dial in separately. So on Work Track 5, sorry. I guess we're moving it up. I forgot that it was listed as five - as agenda item five. But so we've had a nominee from the ccNSO it seems like forever.

So thanks to ccNSO for acting so early. We are still waiting for nominations from the GAC and from the ALAC. I'll ask if there's any update, if Alan -- not to put him on the spot -- has an update on the ALAC. But On the GNSO, we've received three nominations over this past week or so.

So we will - the leadership will take those, make sure we have the information we need this week and then make a recommendation to the full group. We might start a lot of this on email simply to just move the process forward. So I'll be talking to the leadership team, including the Work Track leaders this week on the candidates that we've gotten.

So I will now - I see Alan's hand is raised, so I'll turn it over to Alan, and then Avri and then come back.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Unless I've messed up my dates, we have completed a consensus call on selecting the leader and once we let the candidates know, we will be in a position to let you know.

Avri Doria: Thanks, Alan. That's great news.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Sorry. I was just going to ask Alan while you were on the mic is that, so are you thinking this is something for this week or? Just trying to get an idea of timing.

Alan Greenberg: It might be for this hour. I need to make sure all of our T's are crossed and I's dotted and such. And we also have an ALAC call tomorrow morning where we will be discussing terms and conditions associated with our support. As I mentioned earlier, we will likely have some conditions, but not particularly surprising ones.

So yes, we're talking about hours and days, not more.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Alan. This is Avri and I was only going to add one brief thing. I did have a conversation in the last couple days with (Rick Archer) who assured me that they were working on it, that they would be providing someone a little bit down that road and I did not get a date, but I see Kavouss has his hand up. So perhaps he has more up to date information. So please, Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Do you hear me please?

Avri Doria: Yes, I do hear you, Kavouss. Please go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. First, when you speak Jeff speak, both of your voice is distorted. When the other is speaking, they are very clear and they're clean, but is there any problem with your microphone, with your telephone? Are you too close? Are you in a particular area and so on? So it's very difficult to hear you without this distortion, number one.

Number two, I don't know the discussion of the chair of the GAC. As far as I know, the person has been nominated already, maybe has not been informed you formally, but it has been nominated because the person send a message saying thank you very much for agreeing for my nomination.

I don't want to take any responsibility and to inform without the agreement of the GAC chair, but the nomination has been made. So I don't know why it has not been informed you, why you have not been informed. But it has been named because the person thanked everybody for support given to their name. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much, Kavouss. I'm sorry about my line. I'm using a telephone and the same headsets I always use. But I will, while Jeff is going through the next session, ask to check and see whether there's anything wrong with my line that can be discovered.

But in any case, we're going into Jeff's discussion now, and I thank you for the update on the news. I see no one else up with their hand on WT5. So okay, yes Anne. Please.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. Thanks, Avri. I had asked a question in the chat a couple of times whether you guys are at liberty to disclose the GNSO nominees for WT5.

Avri Doria: Jeff, did you want to speak to that?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Sorry. I've been trying to mute my line when Avri is speaking because it seems like it's when we both are speaking that we have this issue. Anne, we will - we've not yet let the candidates know that we were going to make that public.

So I want to just check with the candidates to make sure they're comfortable with that before I just say the names. So we won't do it on this call, but assuming the candidates are fine with having us release their names, we'll do that.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. Just a quick follow up. Jeff, will we as a working group, know those names before leadership selects the person or how is that going to work?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, Anne. So it's a good question. So essentially the instructions we got from the GNSO council was that initially, if you remember, we had asked the GNSO to select someone. Their instructions back was that the (leadership) team should take in nominations and then make a recommendation.

And based on their evaluation of who it should be, and of course we'll run that

by the full group to make sure that you all are comfortable and can raise any objections. So that - I'm sorry. That was the - hopefully everyone heard that.

Avri Doria: Yes. I heard that. Yes.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I'm sorry. It wasn't real clear, Jeff. You're saying leadership will select that person and will be - that person will be let - we'll know who it is and we can raise objections, but we won't know the three who were nominated. Is that what you're saying?

Avri Doria: That's not - this is Avri. That's not what I understood him to be saying. What he said in the first instance is that we had not cleared publishing the names of the three people nominated.

So wanted to make sure that we were clear on that before announcing the three names, at which point the names that were to be listed would be listed and that yes, you're correct that the leadership group would go through the selection process and then they'd make a recommendation, that they would come to the group with and see whether there was any objections to that recommendation. Thanks. Does that make it clear?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh yes. Thanks, Avri. Yes, thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay. Now, Jeff can correct me if I got it wrong. At the moment, we've got Jeff, Kavouss and Greg in the queue. So Jeff, you're next and let me take my name out. Okay, Jeff is out. Kavouss, it's yours again. Please go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. Excuse me. I heard that there are three nominations from GNSO. Is it that for each house having a nomination, each constituency having nomination, each stakeholder having nomination and just why three from GNSO? Wasn't it that each charter organization have only one? So why there is difference between others and GNSO? What is this criteria? Who has decided that three from GNSO? Yes.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much. We have three candidates for one slot at the moment and this is the GNSO taking the GNSO member of that foursome. So there will only be one from GNSO. They were names that were put forward by various people and through recruitment, etc.

It was not done on a constituency or stakeholder group basis. It was done essentially on volunteers and people suggested and people willing to do it. There were far more names listed who did not want to go through with it, but it's to pick the one GNSO person.

As each of the SOs and ACs is picking their own in their own way, this is a GNSO working group and we're talking about the GNSO way of going forward with it while reporting on the status of all the others. Greg, I have your hand up. Please.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. Not to put a fly in the ointment, but I'm wondering if it would make more sense for the GNSO participants in the group to choose the GNSO seat if it were - if you will, or at least to have some communication with the GNSO participants specifically since the other groups are kind of choosing their own as it were and yet here it seems somehow this one is falling into the lap of leadership, which - so there seems to be, you know, a little bit of a disconnect in that regard.

If there were only one candidate, I think obviously would be - this would be a non-issue, but since there are multiple candidates, I think it is an issue.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you, Greg. Okay. We had mentioned this process before and the group will have the final say on it. But are you recommending that we should basically scrap what we've done so far and just open it up to the group?

In fact it was opened up to the group and the group was asked to put forward

people and they did in various ways, and now we're going to make a recommendation. But that does not force this group to accept that. So I'm not sure what you're recommending we do differently.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg. If I could respond, what I'd recommend is taking the GNSO participants in the group and forwarding that caucus, if you will, of the names at least for recommendations from that group rather than having the leadership do the choosing.

I'd also recommend putting a formal end to the time for open nominations so that there is kind of a now it's, now you can still say it, now you can't say it because there's - you know, there hasn't been any form around that process, and that's just fine. We're kind of doing this as we go.

But it seems to me that if the ALAC members or the ALAC is choosing the ALAC co-chair and the GAC co-chair that the GNSO members should choose the GNSO co-chair from among the nominees that were brought up during - from the process from here.

So nothing needs to be scrapped. The question is, where do we go from here? Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you, Greg. I have Anne and then Jeff. Anne, please go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you, Avri and Sam for the transcript. I definitely agree with Greg about the deadline issue. I also think that it would be just terrific if leadership would allow members, since there are three nominees at least, to have input into that decision before leaders announce their decision, just because it's really hard to come against, you know, any choice made by leadership.

It's easier to accept a choice made by leadership when participation and input has been sort of, you know, full and open so that leadership can even

consider the views of those members of the group. And I personally may differ - I support Greg's idea about GNSO members having input, but I wouldn't object to really, you know, everyone having input so - before leadership makes a decision.

But I do think that leadership should be willing to accept our input on those three nominees prior to making a final decision that we would then be required to reject your decision if it's been announced to us. And that's just not going to happen, guys. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much, Anne. Jeff, please. The floor is yours.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. And I don't mean to contradict. I'm looking at some of the comments that are posted on the chat room. Sorry. Excuse me. And I'm actually sorry, Heather. I'm going to contradict you for this comment.

Now you - Heather's comment is that given that Work Track 5 leaders each represent an SOAC, I think the GNSO should be deciding its leader. GNSO did not have input into the SOAC leader nominations.

So although this was not in writing, which I kind of hope that the GNSO council would have put this in writing to us, but it's my understanding from the GNSO council that they would like us to pick our nominee the same way that, or in a similar way that we pick all other leaders of GNSO working groups, which does not segregate between SO and ACs that - of members that participate.

So I don't see at this point, although I understand completely Heather and Greg's point, I don't think our instruction that we got sent back were to segregate that in any way. So with respect to what Anne has said, Anne, let me go back and make sure that the candidates are comfortable with that, comfortable with the release of their names.

I don't object to that at all, the way that you've put it. So let me just make sure that the candidates are comfortable. What we can do is, if they are comfortable with releasing their names and the information they've given us, we can do that and then go your - then you all can provide comments and leadership can provide its recommendation.

So let me just - the only reason I'm hesitating is because that wasn't what was explained to the candidates. So I'd like to just make sure that they're all comfortable. Does anyone object to that?

Avri Doria: Thank you, Jeff. Any comments, objections? Okay. So we can ...

Anne Aikman-Scalèse: Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you, Anne. Okay. So then perhaps this conversation is shelved until the next time and Jeff will check and see with the candidates, whether they're willing to put their names forward publicly. I expect they will be and we'll see what happens.

So with that, let's end the WT5 update, which was item number five and move back to item number four. Let me try to start that one again, which is the drafting team discussion continued on different types. The table is in the Adobe Connect room.

The - also the document URL is in the agenda for anybody that wants to follow it through and perhaps an easier to follow form and the ability to jump between them. And Jeff, the floor is yours.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Avri. Great. I was just waiting for only Avri to mute. Okay. This is Jeff Neuman and as Avri said, it's easy, much easier to follow along at the link. So Avri, I'm going to ask you and ICANN staff policy to just help me because I'm going to be looking at version within the Google Docs.

And so if anyone has got their hands raised and I'm just not looking at it, just please jump in and let me know that there's someone with their hand raised, or if you can't hear me.

So the tab that we are looking at, so actually let me go back and just do a real quick recap where we ended up after the last meeting. So at the last meeting, we spent a good amount of time discussing a number of the different categories from - that existed in the 2012 round and then some new ones that either came up after the 2012 guidebook came out and then some other categories that in theory could be categories.

What we're doing at this point, and then we'll switch about halfway through this meeting to the next step, but at this point we're just identifying potential categories, not how those categories can or would be used. We're really just kind of brainstorming or using the list here that we initially brainstormed on whether these are potentially viable categories where we potentially could bind the definition of who would fit into those categories.

And then we'll take the next step as to define attributes of these categories. And then once we get through defining certain attributes of these categories, meaning whether we can define that group, then the work then kicks out to, for the most part, the Work Track to see how those categories, if at all, fit in to the work that they're doing.

So for example, if we agree that yes, Brand TLD should be formally now recognized in the policy as a category of top level domains, and we all then discuss the definition that's currently in spec 13 and we all let's say, agree that that is the definition we want to keep or go with or maybe we gave some modifications.

Once we agree on that, then we kick it out to specific Work Tracks that discuss the different applications. So for example, we would then say to, you

know, Work Track 4 okay, we're definitely going with this category called Brand TLDs or whatever we call it.

And then Work Track 4 through Rubens and at least for now, Cheryl Langdon-Orr as the work team leaders will then make sure that when they're going over let's say the evaluation questions, to make sure that they bring up within the group to say okay, we've all decided that in general, these are the evaluation questions that we - or areas that we think should be asked.

Now, should anything different be done with any of these recognized categories? The answer may be no, that they should be treated sort of the same. Or the answer may be yes and this is how they should be differently treated.

So that's - the glory now as far as the full working group, is to come up with different potential categories and then different attributes or defining that group so that we can then kick it out to the Work Tracks to apply if at all in their work moving forward.

Let me just - I want to stop there just to look at the comments. And as Kavouss says, we should have justifications to add new categories, if we are adding them. And then Heather points out, that wondering if any of the benefits that we initially saw and burdens have changed since 2007 when we did have a discussion of - early discussion on categories.

So with that, where we left off on this chart of discussing the potential groups was we started discussing the not-for-profit, non-profit gTLDs NGOs. And it sort of morphed into a discussion of creating a group which you'll see at the end of this - actually you don't see them at the end of the list. It's actually in tab - can we post tab five as opposed to this one? Let's post them on Adobe.

Sorry, because I know in tab five we added applicant support as a separate

category. Sorry about that. I'm just waiting for ICANN staff to just confirm that we can do that.

So anyway, while they're doing that, what we ended up doing is we started to get into a discussion of well, you know, maybe we should create a category for applicant support and we have created an entry, at least in tab five on that, oh sorry, in - yes, I think it's tab five, on the attributes one where we can discuss that separately.

But I do want to go back to see, just to kind of cross off the list that if we created something for applicant support, that there - that we're not talking about differentiating the not-for-profit or non-profit gTLDs NGOs, or are we? So Ken, you've got your hand raised. I'm going to turn it over to you.

Ken Stubbs: Thanks, Jeff. I think the title may be somewhat misleading, because I'm trying to figure out whether or not you're implying that my local garden club, which is not-for-profit, falls in the same category as all the rest of these other things.

I think we need to be a little more specific, otherwise you're going to either impose significant burdens possibly by categorizing and co-mingling them with other specific items that could be much more complex.

So I think, just from a practical standpoint, and I'm not just trying to create another category, but rather clearly differentiate what we're trying to identify in that category. Thanks, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, Ken. I think it's - certainly the next part of the discussion would be to, if we did agree that we should think about having not-for-profit or non-profit gTLDs or - and or NGOs be a separate category, then the next part of this in the next column would be okay, well, are we talking about it, as you said in, your example, your local gardening club? Or are we talking about a

different type of non-profit organization that perhaps has presence in multiple countries, or whatever it is that you would define it.

I'm just trying to just test the temperature in the room to see what - you know, if we have the separate category we create for those organizations that need applicant support, do we need to separate out not-for-profits or NGOs for any reason?

Let's give a second for people to - Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: I don't - it's Alan Greenberg speaking. I don't really have the answer, and I mean part of it comes down to a rational - part of the rationale for applicant support is it is in the public interest to make sure that some classes of organizations can get a TLD or run a registry, whereas they might not if there wasn't some level of support, be it financial or in kind.

And I'm not sure that not-for-profit alone is synonymous with that. So, you know, is the garden club something that is in the public interest, or is it just a lot of fun to do? And I'm not - I think I know my own answer, but I think that's part of the complexity that we're looking for.

So I'm not sure that non-profit as a category makes sense. It may be a criteria for the funding, but I don't think it's a sufficient category in its own - or a sufficient criteria in its own right. And I'm not - I want to be convinced that if we have not-for-profit as a category in its own right, that we really can defend that. I'm not sure we can. Thank you. If you're speaking, you're muted.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. No, thanks. My line kind of got stopped there for a second. So I'm just looking also at the comments. So while Alan you were speaking, I saw that Anne, I think was agreeing with you. She had a checkmark and it seemed like Donna also had made a comment in the chat that was supportive of what you were saying.

Susan also brings up a comment that says that not - some not-for-profits are very wealthy, like ICANN and others are not. So what Alan - just to kind of summarize and then I see Ken in there as well. And I think this is sort of where we were ending up on the last call too, was that creating a separate category just for not-for-profits did not necessarily make sense and that it could be a criteria used in the financial support.

But for any other kinds of - just separating them out, it just didn't seem to fit in as a separate category because essentially the not-for-profit could or would be either open geographic brand. It would seem like the not-for-profit would fit - the TLD would generally fit within one of the other "categories" that we are creating. And then the real question is kind of the applicant supports.

But if you think I'm off base, please make that comment and I see Ken and then Alan.

Ken Stubbs: Yes. Jeff, listen. Let me start off by saying if either I'm off base or this isn't the right time to talk about it, please bring it up. I am concerned about one thing and I don't know how to place it in here. Again, I'm going to use a rather flagrant example.

Suppose that I want to form a non-profit. Let's call it the Catalonia Enthusiasts, okay or Catalonia Separate Enthusiasts. I want to make sure that a government can't step in and block a TLD because they feel that the kind of speech there is what they would consider to be a violation, or could be a violation of their laws.

And I don't know where we go with something like that in here. And if you think you'd rather talk about it later, please step in, Jeff. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Ken. Just take a note of that. Let me go to Alan and then put myself back in the queue.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Although I love it when people agree with me, several people in the chat have said they agree with me that we can't limit applicant support the non-profits. That's not what I said. I said applicants non-profit status might be a criteria for applicants, a mandatory criteria for applicant support, although I suspect that it is not.

But what I was saying was I don't - can't justify having non-profit as a category in its own right, because as has been pointed out, there are many, many types of non-profits and they range from rich to poor, and doing things the public of public interest or not.

I won't go into US politics right now, but there's lots of not-for-profits which might be not looked at positively by many people, but they're still non-profits. So I don't think non-profit, a category in its own right, proves anything. Whether we use it as a criteria, either mandatory or optional is a different question completely. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, Alan. It seems to me we're kind of coalescing around this notion. Heather raised a comment which I think is shared by all of us, right, is that, you know, it's hard to, at this point, to say whether we agree there should be a category. We know the benefits or burdens or whatever of being in that category and it's the classic chicken and egg problem.

So what we're trying to do is trying to create a model to say okay, if there is a category, can we in theory define it? And then once we define it, can - you know, what would be the significance?

And it may turn out that as we go through the exercise with the Work Tracks that - you know what, wait a minute. If we did create it as not-for-profit, it would still be - category, it would still be treated like a regular let's say open registry if it was an open TLD in every way whatsoever, except potentially for the ability to get applicant support.

But that's not something we're going to know until we at least do this kind of exercise. And as Heather says, what are these categories going to be used for? So the exercise right now again is to come up with potential categories, see if we can define these potential categories, and if it becomes possible to define, then to say okay, now that we have these categories, do we treat them differently in any aspect? Do we treat them differently in evaluation and delegation in the contract, in applicant support, whatever the purpose is?

But we need to start somewhere in documenting and putting these attributes down. And at the end of the day, we may come back to the same conclusion that some people have already, which is you know what, the categories that we have and have come out in the last round are sufficient, but at least we've gone through this exercise of coming up with and brainstorming and trying to go through this exercise.

So the question - sorry, just going back to the chat and then I'll go to Anne. But in the chat there's some support for going through this exercise. Gg Levine from the NABP says, will an applicant have to be identified as a member of a designated category to be considered eligible for financial support?

Gg, at this point, to the extent that - the answer is I don't know. None of us know that yet until we decide that that's one of the benefits or burden I would say, of being a member of the category is to - how to ensure that they are members and then how they would fit in into the - whatever process they're going to benefit in. In this case, in theory it could be financial support.

So that's a definite question that will be addressed as we go through the exercise. Anne, please, you go on, then I'll continue with some of the comments in the chat.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. Thank you, Jeff. It's Anne. I think you've hit the nail on the head. I noticed Cheryl also commented in chat that it's - the exercise is worth it. And I think the issue that we face policy wise is that applicant support program was just not, you know, not that successful in 2012 round.

And so I think what we need to consider is, are there policy issues that need to be, you know, more fully considered in relation to this particular category? So yes, we should go through the exercise, and we don't know the outcome of it yet. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, Anne. And so that's exactly right. That's why we're going through this and at the end of the day - and as Rubens says, you know, this could affect things. Evaluate - financial evaluation, contracting. In theory, it could affect priority, right?

Again if we still have community TLDs going forward, we are able to define it and solidify it, then there could be some other impacts if we can - if we do have this. My audio is bad apparently. I'm going to ask ICANN staff, can you dial my phone number and then I'll join that way. And Avri, if you're around, can you take over for a sec?

Avri Doria: Sure. I'm around. Okay. So it sounds like - you know, the discussion is going well, but it does look like it's not making the cut threshold for being a category that will come in full.

There are certainly attributes that we'll look into, into other parts, but that particular category, unlike some of the categories before where we discussed the nature of the category and we didn't necessarily all agree on how the category was defined, but we had a notion that yes, that was a category that we should seek to define better and possibly include.

This looks like the first one that we're taking and sort of saying, this one, perhaps it needs more definition in terms of attributes, but that it is not one

we would currently include in our list of categories going forward. Of course we can come back to the decision later. Is that a problem statement? Yes, Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. Avri, I would disagree with that. I think most of the discussion - this is Anne again from the transcript. Most of the discussion is about whether non-profits only are, you know, eligible in that category and what are the implications for that?

Although one might decide later hey, there's no reason to separate out this category, I don't think that decision has been made right now at all. That was not what I heard from either the chat or the other - the comments.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. I thought that we were saying we need to explore that further.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. Okay, and that's why I made the statement I made. This is Avri again, basically checking on whether what I was seeing as a consensus. So I guess I have a question for you. And is the category a not-for-profit category if we say that we're going to let for-profits into it? Aren't we then talking about a different kind of category, but not a not-for-profit category? So I guess I'm confused. Thank you.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. This is Anne. I would agree with those who say that certainly there are plenty of not-for-profit organizations that don't fit within applicant support. And I think that there are potentially organizations that could qualify for applicant support that are not organized as not-for-profit. So if ...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: ... we're saying that - if we're saying that a non-profit is a type of category, do I see that in this list? Is that actually being referred to as a category in and of itself?

Avri Doria: Yes. On another line on tab, I don't know. It's on the types list. One of the types listed was not-for-profits. It was - we weren't at that, you know. So there's two different issues here and that's what I was trying to get. There's certainly the attributes that apply to those that would be included in applicant support, but what I was hearing is that we weren't defining it as a category that one applied is that I am applying for a not-for-profit TLD.

And so I was saying that that particular thing doesn't seem to have made the list of types. The fact that there are attributes that may apply to non-profits, may apply to NGOs, but may also apply to other types of entities, is I think a different issue. Thanks. And Jeff, are you back yet?

Jeff Neuman: I am back.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Avri, if I could just follow up.

Avri Doria: Okay. I'll let you take over the call - take over the issue now. I don't know if you've been - are up to speed on the discussion that Anne and I have been having

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Most of it. Anne, you seem to have a follow up. So I'll go back to you, Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. Just very quickly, I think applications can fall in more than one category and that is normal and natural. For example, you could have a non-profit that also needs applicant support that is also a brand. It's not because something falls in more than one category that, you know, you should exclude it from any particular category.

Applications can fall in several categories. There could be non-profits that are doing charitable work that maybe they're formed solely to address problems of the hurricane in Puerto Rico, but they need applicant support or something and they could have a brand established as well.

You know, I just don't think we want to say look, if it fits in this other category, then there shouldn't be, you know, some other category for it, because applications can fall in more than one category. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, Anne. I was hearing some crackling noise and I thought that that was mine. Anne, it may be your line, but we did get all of that. So at this point - I think at this point, we're going to provisionally take that out as a separate category, though of course keep it in our notes in case we add it back in to see if there's any other reasons why it should be added back in.

But Anne, you're correct. There are some, not just within this category. There are some that could fit into a number of different categories, which is another issue we're going to have to deal with if we do create some additional ones.

On - so Anne - okay, Anne, so you don't agree with taking it out. Does anyone have any other - I'm looking at the chat. It says that - Donna says, regardless of category, all applications will likely undergo same base line processes. Donna says, Dot NYC is not a geo TLD as defined in the applicant guide book.

Donna, that may be right, but we are not sure yet. So we can't quite make that statement of that they'll all undergo the same base line processes. But that's something we'll figure out as we go through this exercise. And Anne is saying, the reason we need a separate category is because this effort failed in the 2012 rounds.

So I'm sorry. Maybe I missed it that this is the (unintelligible). So Anne, you're saying because the financial support effort failed in 2012, we may need it as a separate category in the sense of - I'm just trying to - Anne, in what sense? For financial support as part of a different program? For differences in treatment, like you foresee differences in treatment in terms of evaluation, priority or other aspects.

Just if you can give an example of how in theory the not-for-profit category would be treated differently, just so we can kind of, you know, take it a little bit out of the abstract. Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I didn't - at least in her comment she said, those who have applicant support, who need applicant support, may be a separate category. I didn't read that as not-for-profit.

If we are talking categories where, as Anne points out, any given TLD might satisfy multiple categories, I'm presuming that we are going to use the same rule as we did in the first round, and that is you have to pick what you are. You cannot say you're both geographic and the brand or whatever, assuming brands were formal TLD, a formal category.

So if you have to pick one, then I would strongly argue that although we may attribute criteria to applicant support, candidates that are similar to some of the categories, that that would be a separate category where you would have to pick applicant support at the expense of being something else such as a community TLD. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Alan. I don't think we've fully established that you'd have to pick one as opposed to others. You could be able - if we are going to create the second category for applicant support applicants, then you may or you would likely fit into one other category, either being open brand or some other form of it.

But I want to move on - okay, Alan. One last comment, then I want to move on to the next part.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Thank you. Yes. If we have a matrix where you can be - have multiple categories or any category, plus you can have applicant support, don't consider a category in the same. And I (think we need to) be very careful.

If with categories, we end up having different attributes that is you sign different terms in the registry agreement, or you have to pass through - jump through different hoops in the process, being in multiple categories could be a really confusing thing.

So I think we want to make sure we don't make this impossible to administer. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Alan. In jumping to the next potential category, and Kristina, I see your comments in there. We can either - you missed a whole part of this, but if you're still - hopefully it's reflected in the notes and if you still have any questions that we can all - just send us an email and we can kind of explain the exercise we're going through.

So we did talk a good amount about highly regulated and sensitive TLDs on the last call. What came out of that discussion and looking at the transcript, and I want to make sure that everyone agrees, is that out of that discussion, even though we have them in one category here, that perhaps they actually need to be separated, that highly regulated is not the same thing as sensitive TLDs.

And then there was a discussion of if you move up the chain, a couple of validated (registries) because there was a discussion of potentially grouping that in with the highly regulated and sensitive.

And what came out of that discussion was know that there are really three different, again potential categories. they may end up being treated the exact same as we go through this exercise, but potentially there are different attributes between those three different ones.

And so what we'll do for the next step of this exercise is separate them out into two different ones in this one here. Highly regulated is one category and sensitive TLDs as being another. Again, we're not saying that we're adopting this as official categories. We're just doing this exercise as separate categories.

In the chat there's a really good discussion about geographic TLDs, which I don't want to lose that content. It's actually really good. Not necessarily hugely pertinent to the discussion here at the moment, but certainly ones that we need to keep when we do talk about geographic TLDs.

Going on to the next one. In this chart is exclusive use registries and this was defined essentially as a key word registry limited to one registrant and affiliates. What I'm going to propose, since this is a large discussion within Work Track 2 and will be discussed again this week, is that we just kind of leave this where it is for now because it is essentially an item there where we are really kind of hashing out as I said, in Work Track 2.

So I'm going to gloss over it for now, come back to it after we get some input from Work Track 2 on the discussion that's going to happen this week. But at this point in time, until we get some kind of agreement that exclusive use registries or closed - so exclusive use registries is not necessarily the same thing as closed generics.

Exclusive use registries could be - it could fit into the brand TLD category because those are exclusively used by the registry. It could be the closed generic issue. So I want to make sure, before we discuss any more the full

group, that Work Track 2 has had their chance to flush that out. Does that make sense?

And the same thing with the closed generics category, which is below it. So for those two, I'm glossing over those. Yes. There was a separate kind of category that was initially brainstormed and mentioned and these were essentially open top level domains that may have a - that may be restricted in the form of self-certification or some other restrictions.

Like dot biz technically has restrictions in the sense it has to be a business and business is defined. Dot name has restrictions. Dot tickets and dot law and others have restrictions that don't necessarily fit into the validated TLD category.

The comment that we initially had through the - through CC2, sorry, CC1. This is in CC1 and through the earlier discussions was that this did not seem to be materially different from then being - from being an open registry. And therefore it was generally thought that we did not need a category for this.

The note in there in red was my note was just to basically give some more policy authority to that potentially you might create it, because it gives more policy authority to the restricted TLDs. But it seemed, from the sense of the discussion, that it did not need to be a separate category.

can I get any thoughts on that from the group as to whether this is really just kind of an open TLD or that it's extreme, a validated TLD but don't really need a new category. And as Donna said - well, actually sorry, Donna. I don't know if your comment there of splitting hairs is on the chat discussion or on what I was saying. Chat discussion.

Okay. Is there anyone that - because I have not been following the chat discussion, is there anything - I'll kind of put Avri on the spot. Is there

anything, Avri that we need to, or we should bring into the discussion from the chat that we can - that we should bring in at this point?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I don't - I think there are issues that come up about things like categories and attributes and the whole notion of the overlapping. But I don't think it is directly pertinent to the point the chair discussing at the moment. So things that we'll have to come back to it another time.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Thanks. Governmental organization applicants is the next one on there. And at this point, the question as to whether that's - we have a category that's been discussed and that was recognized in the applicant guidebook, primarily through the contract and not really through other aspects of intergovernmental organizations, IGOs.

But there was a brainstorming session where other types of governmental entities that may not fit within the definition of an intergovernmental organization need to be treated separately as a different category. I'm not exactly sure as to at this point, why we create it separately, but if anyone has got insight into that, that brought it up, now is a good time to discuss it.

And I'm not seeing any discussion on that at this point. Again, some good discussion. And just as a reminder, because Kristina again kind of brought it up, we're going through an exercise to discuss what are the potential categories, and if we can come up with a way of defining that, which is the next part of this exercise, is to go through all the different aspects of the application, evaluation, contracting, et cetera, processes to see if there would be any deferential treatment.

If at the end of the day it comes down to you know what, no, they're all treated the same and all these aspects, then there's no need to have that category. If it comes out to say like intergovernmental organizations, they should be treated just like every other applicant, except for in the contract

where you have these different provisions, well then it's still a spate category, but only for that one purpose.

So it's a chicken and egg problem. We're just trying to do a - go through this exercise to see whether we're going to be having these types of categories.  
So Anne ...

Avri Doria: You have Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. Thanks guys. It's Anne again. That so right. The reason you have categories is to be able to ask the question, whether policy differences, whether policy variations should apply to the particular categories.

And I think, you know, there are enough questions around both governmental organizations and questions around applicant support to have the category established initially as a basis for a discussion as to whether or not any policy differentiation should be made in the application process.

I don't think those questions have been answered yet as to either one of those categories. If you eliminate the category, you answer the question before full discussion of the policy issues. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, Anne. In a way, yes, I do agree with you that if we eliminate the category, we may potentially be eliminating it -we're eliminating it from the discussion. But I think in some of these cases, if we can't think of reasons for deferential treatment, then I think we may have - again, we may come back and add these back in, but I want to try to focus the discussion on a limited number of categories, at least to start with.

But I am going to throw out the general question right now and basically say, are there any other potential categories that we don't have covered by one of

these other categories already listed to go through this exercise? Oh, I'm sorry. We did add applicant support as being a potential category as well.

Okay. I'm not seeing any. I know that there's 15 minutes left in this. I think this might actually - if we start getting into - actually you know what, I think we can get into one more thing before we do any other business. So the next part of the exercise is to say okay, now that we have these potential types of categories, we've documented so far what we think are certain attributes of these types of category.

And so for next time, or hopefully for email, is to look at this column and the next two columns essentially, which is, you know, what would be the attributes and purpose of having these categories and how would we in theory define this category?

Are we happy for the existing ones to define them the way they're defined either in the guidebook where they are defined or, you know, in a specification to a contract?

So for example, if we were to jump again to like brand specification 13 TLDs, you know, we've kind of noted that these brand TLDs are often closed - have closed registration policies, likely to have minimal need for registrar services. We've put in, they're likely to not depend on income or sorry, depend on registrations for income. And, you know, they're - in theory, there may not be a need to have some of the same stringent requirements, especially those that relate to registrars and others.

And then the next column is well, for brand TLDs, how would you define it? Right now it's defined in specification 13 and we would need to look at that and say, is that - did we get it right? Are there any changes that should be made to that? Or are we noticing that there's any issues given the current brand TLDs? Should there be additional aspects of it?

So for example we said that they're in - for specification 13, it specifically says that there's no sunrise. You know, it would - the claims process also be something that's - brand TLDs are currently required to do it. Is that something that we still need to do? Or is it something that maybe is a partial service?

Now, the example I just brought up is one that may intersect with the - or does definitely intersect with the RPM group. So even if we had some recommendations on that, we would have to kind of cross reference that with the work that they're doing.

But are there other aspects of the brand TLD that you know what, it's not - we don't need to evaluate - like in Work Track 4, we don't need to evaluate their financial model because it's a pure expense as opposed to making income. So that's the type of things that we'll be talking about next on these categories.

And then we'll go through these other columns to ultimately come up with, and help solve the chicken and egg problem of, do we really need these categories, and if we need them, how are they applicable and under what circumstances?

So I hope that makes sense as an exercise. But I think we should go to any other business at this point. So I know that Steve has an any other business item. And Avri, I'll turn it back to you.

Avri Doria: Okay, yes. Thanks. So yes, there's been some good discussions and points that we shouldn't lose, like some of the finer points and we should get back to those while we're talking about these attributes further. And so I'd like to move to any other business.

I know Steve has an item. Does anybody else have an item? No? Okay.  
We've got 11 minutes left on the call. Steve, the floor is yours.

Steve Chan: Thank you, Avri. Steve from staff. And so the topic that I want to bring up is a set of summary documents that staff has prepared. It's been shared with the leadership team and I think it's going to be rolled out to the full working group very shortly.

So the purpose of creating this summary document was really from a recognition standpoint, that there are so many topics that this working group is considering, and it makes it very difficult for, you know, no matter how engaged you are in the working group, to really understand where the status is for any given topic.

So that was really the basis for creating this document. So the thing is, it's not really necessarily just for the working group members. It's also for other folks in the community who might be interested in the work of the working group, but don't have the bandwidth to follow every single working group meeting or work track meeting.

But as I noted, it's also useful for the folks in the Work Tracks themselves, and to be perfectly frank, the leadership and staff as well. So that's the standpoint we came from. What we developed is a set of summaries that for every single topic within the workgroup, it tries to capture the deliberations, the problem statements, the integration of CC2 comments.

So it's mostly about capturing the current deliberations. And I think one of the future things we'd like to try to add is the dependencies between topics that exist. So for instance, if one thing is dependent - or let me say it a different way.

Sometimes some of the things we work on might need to be developed in a

sequential pattern. So one of things we'd like to try to add to this document is a set of dependencies or the set of topics that are dependent on some work being done.

So I guess an example could be the RP pre-approval process. And so something like that might be influential on say the technical requirements topic discussed by Work Track Four. So that's a future thing we'd like to add.

So this is just a real quick description of the document we've prepared. I'll try to put this up into a more formal description in email, and also to share the link. Well, I'll share it in the AC room in a moment, but also share the email. So folks that are not on this call can also get a chance to view, weigh in.

And this part is really important to also give us comments and feedback about what we might have gotten wrong or how to improve this tool, you know, whether or not you even find it useful. So I think that's all I had. I'll share it in the AC room and also share it via email sometime after this call. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you, Steve. Any questions on what Steve has just said? I see no questions or comments. So there are a couple of comments in the chat about it being a good idea and people looking forward to it. And there's the pointer in the chat.

If there are no more comments on that, or is there any other item of any other business before I end today's meeting? I see no hands. I see no comments on any other business. So with that, I thank everybody for the call and for their contribution during the call today, and the call is now adjourned. Thank you.

Terri Agnew: Thanks everyone for joining today. (Marvin), can you please stop the recording and everyone, have a great rest of your day.

END