

**ICANN Transcription**  
**New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Group A**  
**Thursday 21 February 2019 at 1500 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

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

Adobe Connect Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p8ubcw00u0z/?proto=true>

Attendance is on the wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/hJsWBg>

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

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

Andrea Glandon: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Subgroup A call held on Thursday, the 21st of February at 15:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect Room. If you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourself be known now?

Thank you. Hearing no names, I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for recording purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I will turn it over to Jeff Neuman. Please begin.

Jeff Neuman: Hello, everyone. Welcome to the call. I apologize if there is some noise in the background. I am working at home today, because of some snow that's on the ground here, but otherwise okay. As always, our agenda is on the top right-hand part of the screen, where we'll essentially just continue discussion on the next several topics. I'm wanting -- I just want to make note of now and we'll try to make note of again towards the end of the call, is that we have a call scheduled this week. We have a call scheduled for next week. And we did place another call on the schedule for early in the week of the following. I understand, I know people may be leaving for the ICANN meeting towards the middle till end of the week, so we scheduled a call very early on that week. That's really an if-needed call. So I think that's on March 4th. But my expectation is that we can finish the materials between this call today and the call next week, so we'll probably end up canceling -- or hopefully we'll end up canceling that one anyway. But since we're so close to the end, I figured we should probably finish off before the ICANN meeting in Kobe, as opposed to having a month in between meetings and finishing up towards the end.

So as Julie put in the time in the chat there, so we'll try to mention that again under any other business. But hopefully we won't need that last call. So any questions on the agenda?

All right, not seeing any, are there any changes to statements of interest that have not previously been reported?

Okay, not seeing any, we're going to then just continue from where we left off. Anne has posted the link. I believe that's the right link to Subgroup A. We are on the tab that starts 2.3.4, Universal Acceptance. This was a relatively short section. There were not too many recommendations in here. And as you'll see, they're not very controversial and not much divergence, some new ideas, but for the most part agree with what we have in the initial report.

So there was a general comment that was filed by the ALAC, which suggests that the rejection of new strings by legacy code is a primary obstacle for successful expansion of the domain space. And they suggest conducting outreach. They acknowledge the challenges with outreach, but just strongly encourage it. Getting more specific to the questions that we asked or the recommendations, we amended principle B, which was from the original GNSO policy back in 2007, approved by the board in 2008, which now states, some new generic top level domains should be IDNs, although applicants should be made aware of universal acceptance, challenges in ASCII and IDN TLDs, and given access to all applicable information about universal acceptance currently maintained in ICANN's applicable web page and through the steering group, which -- as well as any future efforts. A pretty non-controversial recommendation or actually amendment to the policy recommendation.

BRG and registries support it. The ALAC and BC also support it. But the ALAC also should include and consult -- or the ALAC wants the UASG to consult their advisory committee on any new or developing initiatives. And the BC states that IDN applicants should receive a letter or memo from the UASG, which should describe up-to-date status of the efforts of the group and the future plans. It should also detail all of the different challenges that IDNs face. I think that's a -- and a confirmation from applicants that they're willing to continue despite -- or not despite, but understanding what's in the memo or letter or information that they get.

So that's what we have on that recommendation. I think nothing controversial there, but some good suggestions. So we'll take that up as a full working group, but again, I don't see any obstacles for those new ideas.

In 2.3.4.e.1, work track line 10 in the Google doc, there is no additional work that the work track is recommending for the UASG, and just basically it's really just lending support for the UASG and what they're doing. The registries (inaudible) if the brand registry group supports that notion of nothing else needed and supporting the UASG. The BC thinks that there should be more involvement and outreach efforts than just what the UASG is doing and in regions in which IDNs are not broadly deployed, there is still according to the BC, not enough support and understanding. And that's reducing IDN effectiveness.

The registrars and ALAC have a couple new ideas. They are -- registrars are stating that there should be more -- or investment into online services -- I'm sorry -- educating online service providers about the new TLDs as there is still not universal recognition of all the extensions and awareness is a key. So there's a distinction that registrars and in fact a lot of registries make between awareness and acceptance. So this really pertains to the awareness. Although the tools exist for the acceptance, they think that there needs to be more investment spent on education and awareness.

The ALAC has some specific recommendations for registries and registrars, if they're owned by the same entity. There should be universal acceptance ready as part of their application. This means that their system should be ready for IDN registration, ready to handle IDN and IDN new gTLDs consistently on name servers and other machines and able to manage any email address internationalization as part of contact information and be able to send and receive emails from these types of addresses.

So the example, if a government department wants to use an email address internationalization to communicate with a business, the registry should be able to accept the email and respond to it. Registry systems that store any registrant data, including email address or name servers, or anything else; just be able to accept IDNs. So I guess it's really kind of a comment from the ALAC on ensuring that any registries, registrars kind of expression here in the U.S. of eat your own dog food. Or if you're going to offer support for those TLDs, you should offer the corresponding support for services like email as well.

Anne has a question. Who bears the cost of creating more awareness? Is it in the ICANN budget? Great question, Anne. I think there definitely is some budgeting for the UASG in the ICANN budget. But I think certainly it's been the subject of comments, I know, from the Registry Stakeholder Group for ICANN to increase the spending on awareness, but not a question we can answer really here.

In fact, there were suggestions of using, if you look back at the Registry correspondence, I think, and someone can correct me if I'm wrong. There was some suggestion by some members of the registries to use some of the excess fees for that purpose.

Does that bear on application fees? At this point, it's a good question. But at this point there is nothing in the fee discussion where we say that it should be part of the application fee itself. But there is some mention in -- I want to say Subgroup B -- of how to spend excess funds if there are any.

Okay, any question on this material here? As said, it's pretty straightforward and nothing very controversial. All right. That takes us to 2.4.1. This all deals with the applicant guidebook. It's not necessarily specific provisions in the applicant guidebook, but more the format of the applicant guidebook. Is it the right thing? Is it the right instrument that should go to applicants and what improvements, suggestions, et cetera could be made? Like the universal acceptance section,

there's a lot of agreement for the recommendations in the initial report, a couple new ideas, and maybe one or two items where there is some concerns expressed. Like there's not -- well, let's just go through it.

General comments from the registries and INTA is general support for the creation of a new applicant guidebook that's accessible and easy to use. So in general, if the registries do not make the comment on a specific thing in this section, they agree with it. And INTA is -- let's see. They basically say that they want to make sure that their important goals of consistency, transparency and predictability and they want to make sure that the guidebook is as unambiguous as possible and not subject to change during the application period to ensure fairness. They encourage a level playing field and to do that and help predictability and investment in new TLDs, they support ICANN's efforts in this direction.

So more specifically to the actual recommendations, the first point was that we, the work track I should say, agreed that the applicant guidebook is the -- a sub form is the right form and should continue. But they do think or did recommend that there should be some work on making it more user friendly. ALAC, BRG, INTA, FairWinds all supported this recommendation and the suggested improvements. The BC agrees with the suggestion as well and then also puts in a -- it's listed as a new idea. I'm not sure it's necessarily a new idea. Well, I guess it is in the sense of it's adding to the guidebook wanting to make it less English dependent. And so there's -- it's support for the recommendation of making it more user friendly and the BC is saying that one of those ways is to make it less English dependent, because they thought that the way the complexity was a barrier in the last round. And that seems to make a lot of sense and very much in line with the recommendation.

In order to enhance accessibility -- so this next part actually deals with that. This was a bunch of recommendations, especially for non-native English speakers. Neustar, the government of India and FairWinds all support the recommendations that are in. But there are some qualifications from Neustar that changes should be flexible to cater for any proposed implementation of an application period and be defined and limited to ensure there is not undue delay caused by making such changes. Now support for the principle, but again just those slight cautions there of not making it too complex, but also keeping some flexibility and not limiting the types of TLDs and models.

The government of India supports the recommendations and of course especially with making it more easily understood by non-native English speakers and those that are less familiar with the ICANN environment. So again, not just for non-native speakers, but also for those that aren't insiders, I guess is another way to say it. So more specifically, the recommendation was to be less focused on historical context and to the extent that it's included, put this content in appendices or supporting memos. This was widely supported by the BC, BRG, INTA, FairWinds. The ALAC agrees and just -- it just wants to make sure that this other historical information is accessible, easily accessible or available. So it's a concern, but it's in general support for the recommendation of not having the

historical context directly in with everything in the guidebook, but making certain that is available to everyone.

The next recommendation was that it should -- the applicant guidebook should be much more practical, less about policy, stronger focus on the application process; again, widely supported. BC, Brand Registry Group, INTA, FairWinds all support it. And as well as FairWinds and ALAC, registries did support again just to remind everyone the registries basically said that if they don't say anything specifically that they support it. The ALAC again wants to make sure that there's a link between the application process and the policies. So that's in line with their last comment of yes, we can make the guidebook easier, more practical, shorter, but wanting to make sure that there is for anyone that wants information, additional information, whether it's on history -- historical information or policy, that it's easily available and linked.

Anne does not believe that the AGB was particularly verbose. It strikes me that it will not be less verbose as a result of this complicated policy process. It seems pretty clear that it will take time to redraft the AGB once our policy recommendations are approved by the ICANN board. Yeah, thanks Anne. I think, yeah, I think it's unavoidable that there is going to be a lot of words in the guidebook. But I do think there are certain areas where they spend a considerable amount of time on rationale for certain things that are in the guidebook. And rather than having that rationale necessarily in the guidebook, it could certainly be an appendix, I think, is the main point. So that those that really don't care to read the rationale can just read what they have to do and if they are curious, they can certainly as the ALAC suggests, to be a proper link, so that the information is there and easily accessible.

Okay, the next recommendation that the guidebook should be focused on serving as a practical user guide for applicants to apply like step-by-step instructions and some have called it the almost the choose-your-own-adventure methodology. Meaning that, okay, if you're going to apply for a geographic TLD, here's everything you need to know. Or you're going to apply for an open TLD, or you're going to apply to the community. Here's everything you need to know.

Again, good support for that recommendation from the ALAC, BRG, INTA and FairWinds; a note from the BC for cases which are not clear, there should be a process via which they can get a definitive answer before starting the application process. This should be an interactive component, hosted on ICANN's website which can be coded relatively easy and cross compatible via HTML5. I think again that goes to just providing support before the process, so that an applicant can be sure the type of application or the part of the guidebook that they need to pay attention to.

Anne's comment; does this suggest that someone should start identifying their sections to be placed in annexes as if staff were not overworked? What about independent contractors to speed things up? So Anne, that really goes towards implantation. I think that could certainly be either taken up or that notion by the IRT that's created or even by ICANN Org on its own. That's certainly -- you are

right. There is a ton of work to be done for implementation and this is just one of many.

Okay, the next one, pretty simple, having a table of contents and index and the online version should contain links to appropriate sections. So if you recall, the AGB was basically -- not basically. It was a PDF document, not the easiest to navigate through. And so there was again wide support for this notion of having it online with an index and links. So that's supported by ALAC, BRG, BC, INTA, FairWinds; not controversial at all. Online version -- sorry, I'm on line 40, 2.4.1.c.2.5. The online version could have sections that apply specifically to the type of application being applied for with the ability to only print or view those related sections. No disagreement there from anyone that filed comments. ALAC, BRG, BC, INTA, FairWinds; and I guess registries as well since they offered support for everything except where specifically noted.

Advanced indexing is the next recommendation in 46, line 46 that there's this of course, a core set of provisions that's probably applicable to everyone. But additional provisions may only be applicable to some. And if you could search and have the text tagged, then users could more easily locate the parts that relevant to them. No disagreement there from anyone, including the ALAC, BRG, BC, INTA, FairWinds.

Line 52, any agreements or terms of use should be finalized in advance and included in the applicant guidebook with the goal of minimizing obstacles and/or legal burdens on applicants. This principle actually has been stated in a number of different parts of the initial recommendations. So this is not very controversial here. I think the only added part is including it in the guidebook. So we have agreement, general agreement across the board with a little bit of concerns from INTA, which we'll get to in a second. Just to cover, FairWinds strongly supports this recommendation. Potential applicants need to understand risks of and requirements for applying and any agreements or terms must be -- that are in a click-through, must be finalized in advance and included in the guidebook. INTA supports the recommendation, just notes that they're concerned with the notion of any terms of use being non-negotiable. They should -- the working group -- we, I guess -- could explore whether there's a way for those who wish to negotiate to indicate their intention to do so.

So that's a new idea as well. So let's put that in blue, because I want to make sure we capture it. It's not a concern for having for most of the recommendation, because they do support the notion of having it in the guidebook and having it in advance. I think there's -- it's just a new idea for -- right, that's a good way to do is highlighting that last sentence in blue.

Martin has stated that the output from the ICANN board workshop suggests they have tasked the ICANN CEO to discuss implementation planning at ICANN64. And it could be useful to start listing ideas that could be passed to Goran from the working group. Thanks, Martin. I think that's a good idea, and maybe let's -- I'll ask ICANN staff to put that as an agenda item for the next full group call.

Anne states that in terms of getting an edit on the AGB as to putting policy and history into links and appendices that may not need to wait for an IRT, not sure. Anne, I think certainly that could be the case. If our policy is that we approve that it's not necessary, sure, ICANN can -- I mean I would think again that they could start to work. But probably not our call.

Okay, any questions on the applicant guidebook? Again, nothing real controversial in this section.

All right. Let's go on to Communications. This one has a number of parts to it. So we'll hopefully get through it. But let's see. So the first part of this deals with education -- information, education and outreach. The work track believes that for the next round there should be a minimum or should continue to be a minimum of four months from the time in which a final applicant guidebook is released and the time until applications would finally be due. Sorry guys, let me just dismiss this. I apologize for the noise. It's a reminder that's set for me that -- anyway, sorry about that.

Okay. So support for this recommendation was indicated by the BRG, BC, Neustar, and FairWinds. They have suggested a window of three months. The time between final applicant guidebook and window could depend on factors like RFP preapproval. They would suggest an application window of approximately three months. Right. So that's the application submission period. The amount of time necessary between the final applicant guidebook being approved and the opening of the application window would depend upon possible factors such as RFP preapproval.

Okay, that makes sense. Does everyone understand that comment? Any questions on that one?

Okay, I'm sorry. I missed the ALAC comment. I did not mean to. The ALAC believes that the amount of time between when the final applicant guidebook is released and the time until which applications would be due is really a function of clarity of policies, rules, and procedures and how well they are set out in the guidebook. So it's not committing to agreeing to the timeframe. It's not disagreeing. It's just stating that it would really depend. They're not putting a stake in the ground in terms of time, but more a function of wanting to make sure that everything is clear and accessible and then I guess the timeframe would depend on that.

Now this deals with the communication period and starting at line 10. There should be a sufficient period of time prior to the opening of the application submission period to allow for outreach efforts related to applicant support and other program elements and execution of the communications plan. I think there is certainly a lot of support for this principle from BRG and the BC. ALAC supports it and then adds that the lead time -- they believe the lead time should or could very well exceed six months, especially when you need to consider the applicant support program. So it certainly is -- agrees with having a sufficient communication period, but thinks it may prove to be longer than six months. And Neustar is really citing to its own proposal, so it's a new idea in the sense of that

they do indicate that the way that they have put their phases is a way to target or you can use that if of course the Neustar model is adopted. That's a model for -- or that could give guidance to how long a communication period could be or targeted it could be or should be.

And FairWinds has some specifics in the points below. So this is just on the notion of starting on line 16, clear statement. Communication period should be at least six months. BRG and FairWinds support that as a -- well, FairWinds supports it as a minimum. And the BC is stating that it's really proportional to the amount of effort put into getting work out. Using previous communication efforts as benchmarks and assessing those efforts for the next round is a way to assess how long those communication periods should be.

Now this is basically if this group adopts a series of rounds as opposed to going one round, then a first-come-first-serve. Actually, you know what? It's not actually -- sorry. I take that back. After the first round, our working group made a suggestion in the initial report saying, well, the initial communication period should be six months. But for subsequent rounds after that or whatever is done after that, you could in theory shorten that to three months, because it will be known in advance according to the other recommendations and therefore the BRG and BC supports this notion. ICANN asks whether -- it basically cites to another recommendation to make sure that there is consistency.

So 2.2.3.c.1, if we go back to that, 2.2.3.c.1. I'm trying to find that. Is there a number missing there? 2.2.3, which is 2.2.3 is Applications Assessed in Rounds. And c.1-- okay. So again, this is just to drawing the link whether it's going to be rounds or date certain, et cetera. And so these are, I think, ICANN's point that these are linked and we need to make sure that they're consistent, whatever we end up doing.

Back to the chat, Anne says, if there are windows proposed by Neustar, you could consider that a shorter period is appropriate for brands and longer for a period of outreach before a window opens for applicant support and community applications. And Anne's looking at the point in line 14. And so yeah, Anne, this will be a topic discussed with the full group. Again, if the full group does adopt the Neustar proposal, and again, I'm not presupposing that they will or won't. But if they do, then we would absolutely have to bring this part into the conversation.

Okay. I accidentally lost my place here. Okay, we are on line 20. In the event following the next round of new gTLDs, application opportunities are organized in a series of windows. So in the even that we have windows, the communication period may be shortened to three months. So this is really kind of restating a previous item, no. I'm sorry. I just read that one. I don't know. Sorry about that. We're on line 24. Sorry about that.

And Justine is importantly noting that ALAC's comment for c.2 covers c.2.1 and c.2.2. So we won't lose sight of that. We are now on the c.3. This is -- no, I'm sorry. Yes, we are. Sorry about that. I got lost when we went back to the previous section because of the ICANN Org comment. But I am here now, line 24. Publish all program information on the main site, as opposed to using the new gTLD site.

So that it's -- but you can have links to improve usability and accessibility. I think there is agreement from the BC, agreement from Neustar, not so much with the ALAC. They think that there are merits to having this separate sub site. But they state that's what's important is that there's a permanent entry on the main ICANN site to direct all attention to the program if they're interested in that and approving links and accessibility is important. But it doesn't necessarily have to be on the icann.org site.

The BRG actually does not support this. They say as long as the information is comprehensive, accurate, accessible; it can be maintained under the main site or at the sub site. So it's not necessarily divergence. It's really just kind of an indifference, as long as the information is comprehensive.

The LEMARIT or however that's pronounced, I must apologize again. They support -- they want to just make sure that there is webinars explaining the process, how to apply to navigate applicants through the application questions and provide links. Mailing lists for each category could be created where people can discuss issues and share experience. Justine agrees that line 28 is not really divergence. It's more of a -- they're fine either way, but as long as everything is comprehensive.

Okay, looking at the chat, nothing new. Okay, back to 2.4.2.c.4. This is again dealing with education outreach that we should leverage global stakeholder engagement staff to facilitate interaction between regional ICANN organization teams and potential applicants, not very controversial, supported by Neustar, BRG. The BC adds that we really need to do more to track effectiveness of communication and that we have more time for market sensitization, giving the need to bring in new audiences. We should be aware of business cycles, so for example the last two weeks, first two weeks of each year are not a great time period for Latin America is what's said in here. So it's not a great time period for most of the world. And there's a recommendation to push more content out through local partners.

ICANN Org would like to make the PDP working group aware that while ICANN stakeholder engagement is placed in the regions, they're capable of assisting. The participants in ICANN technical and policy -- oops, I skipped a line. The team's current focus is supporting the community, both current and new stakeholders to be active contributors and participants in ICANN technical and policy work. Adequate time would need to be provided after the adoption of this policy therefore, so that they can plan accordingly for this shift in focus.

Anne asks a good question. Should we ask ICANN Org to estimate what would be adequate time for this shift? I would add to that, saying, what would be adequate time for the shift and what do we do during that transition period? Okay, good questions, good comments. ALAC is some concerns about the global stakeholder engagement team that they don't believe that necessarily they've been successful in getting underserved and middle applicant region countries targeted for the applicant support program. They are encouraging more use -- oh, I'm sorry. They say that RALOs, the regional at-large organizations, are well-placed to assist but are disadvantaged when outreach opportunities funded by

ICANN are limited to a few CROP flocks (ph). That's an existing program. As an example, the Asia Pacific RALO deals with over 70 countries, with the fastest growth in the internet. Such is the extent of this problem. Regional teams need to be organized within underserved middle applicant regions to more effectively introduce, educate, and inform people who may be qualified, but without the right context to learn about the RSP program and ASP. So I think that's while certainly related to our work here, I think that is also related to a much broader issue.

The LEMARIT does not support this recommendation. They just say it's not needed, not much other information provided there, just that they don't think that this is needed.

Some comments in the chat of how things are classified. Line 28 I'll let that continue on the chat. At the end of the day, line 28 -- Justine, were you pointing to a different line? Because I kind of agree with Anne that it does say Neustar supports. Did we just miss the wrong line here? Oh, okay. Thank you, Justine.

All right. We are on line 39. It's about communication with applicants. So the recommendation here is to provide robust online knowledge-based information that's easy to search and navigate, update, in a timely manner; focused on issues with wide-reaching impact. Offer an opt-in notification service that allows applicants to receive updates in real time or near real time.

ALAC, BRG, BC, Neustar, FairWinds, LEMARIT; they all support this. So it's not controversial. ICANN offers let's see, they basically state this is operational guidance intended to enhance the experience for applicants. It would be helpful if the PDP working group could confirm this intent or state the overall goal and objective it wants to achieve, where these preliminary recommendations implementation guidance could possibly serve is non-exhaustive. This would serve as guidance.

So I think-- oh, sorry. And then they also state with respect to the knowledge base they anticipate that many of the capabilities currently offered in the microsite would be available. This includes the knowledge base for current and prospective applicants, as well as access to public portions of applications (ph). They also anticipate communications to applicants with respect to their applications we have provided to rate contract management portal or systems such as the current naming services portal.

So I think here we have two different things. Number one is ICANN basically saying to us, don't be too prescriptive that we really should state the high-level goal, which I do think that we do. But we should not be so rigid in the formulation of our policy to prohibit or to unintentionally prohibit certain types of tools that ICANN may want to put into make things more accessible. So I think that's well noted. And then the second part is -- the second part to me is just making it clear that what they had previously should be available. But I think it does miss some of the elements, because I think we're saying more that the current site was okay, but that there are certain improvements that do need to be maintained even from what is currently there.

All right. The next recommendation, not controversial as well. They just want to make sure that updates are provided in a timely manner and that applicants can have an expectation of when to get replies to questions, and then as well good information on how to escalate inquiries that remain unresolved. That was certainly a big issue in the last round for a lot of groups. We're on line 47 at this point. There's general agreement on all of these, support, support from BRG, BC, Neustar, FairWinds. ICANN Org has service-level targets that are reported at their website and they plan to publish response times as well as methods for escalation prior to the opening of the next application window. So I think what they're saying there is that they believe that they're already on their way to implementing this. So I think, again, I see that as support for the recommendation, but more just showing what they've done already and have already started working to make things better.

And then the next recommendation, not too controversial as well, line 54. They want to facilitate or the recommendation is to facilitate communication between applicants and the ICANN organization by offering real-time customer support with a telephone line, help line, and online chat; so you can interact in real time. No objection from ALAC, BRG, Neustar or FairWinds or LEMARIT. The BC supports this, but only for those that are actually committed to apply for string. So that's an interesting new idea and one that we would, if we adopted, would have to think about how that would be made known. But I guess the BC is recognizing that to provide support to everyone who's even thinking about it could be a burden.

And ICANN Org anticipates continuing to provide 24 by 5 phone support that applicants or prospective applicants could utilize. However, online chat would incur significant cost and is currently not in the plan. It should be noted that many of the inquiries received during the application window and evaluation period for the 2012 round were quite complex and required significant consideration by ICANN Org to provide a fulsome response. Online chat would have very limited benefit for these inquiries. Okay, that is certainly something we should think about for the final report.

From my own perspective, taking off my chair hat for a second and putting on my previous applicant hat, they initially offered the 24 by 5 support, phone support. I remember. But then they took the numbers off their website, so you could no longer find them during the application period. So I find it interesting saying they're continuing to provide 24 by 5 support. I haven't looked at the new gTLD site recently to see if the number is on there now. But I do remember very clearly and vividly that they took the number off and stopped offering it once the application period started.

So, but they are certain of their point on complex questions would certainly not be able to be done on online chat, and they are stating that online chat support may be very expensive, something we probably should or may need to look into.

Okay, the next couple questions all deal with new ideas anyway. So they're all in blue, which makes a lot of sense, since they are all relating to suggestions. The first one on what criteria or metrics could we use to determine success for a new

gTLD communication strategy? Is it just number of TLDs that are submitted or number of people in the support program? The ALAC suggests that we can measure it in terms of number of people who apply for training programs and successfully achieve its outcomes. Those who eventually get set up with their own RSP, success could also relate to the number of outreach opportunities within each of the regions that results in getting people to apply and talking to them about the program.

The ICANN Org states that the PDP working group may want to consider defining goals. So do we want to have a certain number for increase in IDN applications or a certain increase from a particular region? This will allow ICANN Org to focus its communications and outreach efforts to achieve those goals. Justine's going back to line 6 of the BC comment, applicant has demonstrated willingness to go through the entire application process implies a non-first-time applicant. It's a question from Justine.

Justine, I didn't read it that way. But I didn't read the comment in that way that is would be limited to or just implies that someone hasn't already gone through. Because there will be changes inevitably to the process introduced by us, by our recommendations. So as Steve says, it's really more of a gating factor and it may be that they've paid the registration fee. So in the last round in 2012 there was a \$5,000 fee just to have the ability to enter into the portal and enter your application in.

Communication, next question 65, 2.4.2.e.2, communication period prior to the 2012 round was approximately six months. Was this optimal, too long, too short? We have Jamie Baxter who's also on this call still, I think, yes. Hey, Jamie. The suggestions here are that this may -- it may be different for the different types of applications. So he just wants to make sure that the chosen communication period length does not create disadvantages to any type of application. So if it's too short, as Jamie has pointed out before, that may be a disadvantage. Communities? So what he states is in order to fully understand the impact, we should get some data points like how many applications are submitted by applicants that only learned of the new gTLD program during the communication period? How many applicants may have started the application process after exposure to the communication efforts, but were unable to submit because of time? And what data has been gathered from the community applicants on the length of time required to build community endorsement?

All good questions, not ones that I think we are easy or we have an easy way to assess. We will certainly look into that. Going back to the BC recommendation of the gating factor, Anne states, it would be odd to deny phone support to those considering applications for the first time. That's kind of the opposite of promoting outreach. Justine agrees and Anne states that we have to stop creating the impression that new gTLDs are an exclusive playing field where only the big players are able to apply.

Okay, going back now to line 67, the Registry Stakeholder Group believes that we should start the communication period sooner rather than later. There's no reason why we need to wait until everything is completed before starting

communication. So there could be some -- and actually no reason why you can't start communicating about a subsequent round while a previous round is going on and applications have already been accepted for that previous round.

FairWinds states that communications period was seen as too short for many corporations outside the domain industry. While there certainly has been an increase in awareness, they do not want to see the communication period be shorter than six months.

And then finally 2.4.3.3; the question is, would a communication period prior to each window, if we have one round after the other let's say in regular intervals; do we continue to have a communication period? If so, does it have to be the same length? Or if windows are predictable, could those communication periods be shorter? And I think we saw agreement from Jamie, from ALAC, BRG, and the BC for shorter communication periods if they are predictable and known in advance. LEMARIT does state that four-month communication period prior to the launch of the first window, and then three months after is acceptable.

Sorry, Steve. Did I skip some. Yes, I did skip some. I apologize. No, I think I did by accident. This is on the length of the communications period. ICANN states that there are other considerations for determining length of communication and steps. So such steps maybe become aware of the program, learn more about it, assess it, go through internal organization approval process, et cetera. The registrars again agree that we should start sooner rather than later. And we already covered FairWinds. So sorry for skipping this. I didn't mean to. But I think that takes us to the end. So that leaves us with one section to cover on the next call. So I think we can get through that. I know it's a lot of comments in that systems section. But if we can get through it on the next call, we can cancel the March 4 call.

So call for any other business? Great, not seeing anyone. Thank you, everyone. We will talk to everyone next week. Have a great weekend and yep, thanks everyone. You can end the call.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of the day.