

**ICANN  
Transcription  
GNSO New gTLDs Subsequent Rounds Discussion Group  
Monday 06 October 2014 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO New gTLDs Subsequent Rounds Discussion Group call on the Monday 06 October at 14:00 UTC. 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-20141006-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#oct>

Attendees:

Brett Fausett - RySG  
Susan Payne - IPC  
Craig Schwartz - Applicant  
Jennifer Wolfe - Non Commerical  
Stephanie Duchesneau - RySG  
Tom Lowenhaupt - ALAC  
Sam Lanfranco - NPOC  
Tobias Sattler - RrSG  
Donna Austin-RrSG  
Jeff Neuman-RySG  
Jeffrey Eckhaus-RySG  
Mason Cole-RySG  
Liz Williams- RySG  
Michelle Sara King – SOI  
Christopher Niemi-SOI  
Stephane van Gelder – BC  
Katim Touray – Individual  
Bart Lieben-SOI  
Michele Neylon-RrSG  
Dietmar Lenden – RySG  
Jon Nevett – RySG  
Michael Palage – RySG  
Johannes Lenz-Hawliczek – RySG  
Kristina Rosette – IPC

Apologies:

Philip Corwin – BC  
Ron Andruff – BC  
Pam Little – RySG  
Iliya Bazlyankov – RrSG  
Avri Doria-NCSG

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings  
Steve Chan  
Lars Hoffmann  
Terri Agnew

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Rounds Discussion Group call on the 6th of October, 2014.

On the call today we have Michele Neylon, Thomas Lowenhaupt, Craig Schwartz, Bret Fausett, Jeffery Eckhaus, Michele Sara King, Sarah Falvey, Mason Cole, Susan Payne, Dietmar Lenden, Jon Nevett, Katim Touray, Christopher Niemi, Kristina Rosette and Michael Palage.

We have apologies from Pam Little, Phil Corwin, Ron Andruff and Iliya Bazlyankov. Joining us a little later is Avri Doria.

From staff we have Steve Chan, Lars Hoffman and myself, Terri Agnew. Joining us right now is Jennifer Wolfe.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, Bret.

Bret Fausett: Well good morning, everyone, and thank you for joining us just a week before the ICANN meeting. I thought it was healthy and helpful for us to have a quick call to talk about process and maybe the way forward.

As we've done in previous calls if you're in the Adobe chat raise your hand if you would like to be recognized for speaking. I heard lots of names on the roll call that are not in the Adobe chat so I know that some of you may just have to interject and that's fine too. Ask to get in the queue and will make sure to get you in the queue.

For those of you in the Adobe you'll see in the right-hand margin the proposed agenda for today. Also you'll see the date and time of our face to face meeting at ICANN 51 in Los Angeles. We're scheduled to meet on Wednesday from 8:30 in the morning until 10:15 local time, so we have just under two hours which I think will be a very helpful session for us.

Let's get to it in the agenda item that I think we'll be able to have a fair amount of time to work. I hope it's a working meeting and not just, you know, presentation meeting.

Anyway, I'll ask for any updates to statements of interest as we do on every call, if anyone has changed positions or have something new to announce now is the time to announce it.

Hearing nothing we'll move on to our work today. As those of you who have been involved from the beginning know, this is a discussion group to come up with a possible issues list that we can put through to that GNSO Council for the creation of issue reports. Issue report creation is the first step in the policy development process.

And if we do want to change policy for subsequent rounds of new gTLDs this will be the mechanism by which we do that. It may be possible that after we've reviewed everything we decide that everything is implementation and

there's not much policy and that we don't want to put through too - we don't want to put through too much to that GNSO Council but if we do this is the process to create it.

We have asked for, in previous meetings, people to come forward with a statement and issues that they would like. We have not tried to edit it down. We also haven't, as a group, as a staff task, ask anyone to, you know, create issues themselves. This has really been bottom up driven. So anything that we have collected to date has come from members of the group or people that members of the group have reached out to.

And it's fairly full. As you'll see, we've got - I want to say what you think, Steve, I think we've got about a key issue submissions to date; that's pretty substantial so far.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Bret. This is Steve. Yes, that sounds about accurate. And I'll actually go ahead and share the active mind map on the screen so people can see it while Bret is talking.

Bret Fausett: Yes, so the - we wanted to collect issues and then I think at some point right around the LA meeting, I want to try to turn this event and move from the collection of issues to the organization of issues and then to trying to figure out which of these we want to put in an implementation report and which of these we want to pass to the Council for possible policy work.

So I don't want to lose anything that we've collected here. And what I envision a some point, and I'm open to suggestions about how to do this, there are probably multiple ways to get to the endpoint of what that GNSO Council has asked us to do. But I would envision that we would divide - come up with some sort of consensus on what we think is policy work and what we think is implementation work.

And then I would hope that we create to drafting teams, maybe a small drafting team to put together an implementation report that we can put forward to ICANN staff and for them to - things for them to take account of as they develop subsequent rounds.

And then just a small drafting team to work with staff to create the request for issue reports that will go to the GNSO Council. And again, I think given the fact that we've already got 80 some odd issues and we're still collecting them, I think we may be on track to finish this by the end of this year which is still my goal. It may not be possible but I think we should work toward that.

So that's where we are. I think we're still in the issue collection phase and I think will continue in that phase probably throughout our work. If anyone is late to the party I think we'll always add something in. I want everyone to feel like their issue has been heard and accounted for.

And that's where we are. So right now I think it's helpful to see the mind map that Steve Chan from ICANN staff has put together. This is his attempt to try to collect everything that has been submitted from the working group members to date and organize it.

And I think one of the things we're going to try to do in Los Angeles is to provide feedback on this and help Steve move things around into areas that make sense, maybe change some of the large categorizations. But this is a draft and I think our next task is to help Steve refine this and put it in a way that makes the most sense for everyone.

So with that as background I'll let Steve talk through it. And maybe, Steve, you want to talk about - I don't know how you want to do this but maybe start in the middle and work outwards so I'll let you take it from here.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Bret. Yes, I guess just a little background on why I thought something like in mind map would be useful. I think it's - and I see a note

from Lars that he can see the document. Let me try to work out sharing with that.

But just to finish my thought and so I thought that the mind map would be useful in that it would allow people to see where perhaps we're missing issues. And I think that's actually already come in to fruition. And some people noticed that perhaps under the area related to underserved regions they realize that there's probably a few things that we could include in that section.

So I'm hoping that that's what this accomplishes in that it helps us identify things we missed and then also to obviously organize our thoughts and make sure things are categorized in a logical fashion.

I think from where we would probably go forward from this as a suggested approach is as we have these high level categories I think those could turn into what Bret was talking about, recommendations basically to the GNSO Council. They could be either, as he said, a policy development process requests or an issue report request, that is, or it could also be, as he also mentioned, is something more along the lines of simply things that staff needs to take into account as they implement the subsequent procedures.

So I think the way forward that Bret suggested is one way we could do that. We could establish drafting teams to tackle - probably the two separate tracks for those are all the issues.

And I think, before we get to that point though it might be a good idea perhaps maybe in this meeting to edit this document live or perhaps more appropriately in the face-to-face meeting where we're all in the same room. And it might be easy - easier there to actually edit the document that I need to figure out how to share properly because no one can actually see it right now.

Let me go ahead and turn that back to Bret for the moment so I can try and get this shared properly.

Bret Fausett: Okay, and then maybe it's possible to put a link just to the PDF. I've got the PDF for the most recent draft here on my screen. Michele, I see your hand raised.

Michele Neylon: Yes, I was just going to say maybe just post a link to it or post the PDF to the list so we can actually see it would be helpful.

Bret Fausett: That would be helpful. And I think one of the things we'll also try to do before Los Angeles is also make it available in outline form for people who find the mind map hard to parse. I think it's a very helpful way of viewing things but I think some people may prefer a more conventional linear text based approach.

Jon.

Jon Nevett: Thanks, Bret. I just want to go back to something you said. and I guess I'm a little confused about drawing distinctions now on policy versus implementation in that I'm not sure this what we're being asked to implement. I guess my concern is in the prior two, three years when we talk about implementation that seems to be a staff decision and not a community decision.

And at this point, you know, I think it's all policy until we, as a community, get together and issue some kind of policy directives that staff would then implement. So I think it would be really difficult at this point to draw a distinction between policy and implementation when there's nothing yet to implement.

Bret Fausett: I think that's a fair point. As I view this there will be subsequent - here's the way I think of the status quo. There will be subsequent rounds and they will

be based on the policy that was developed by that GNSO back in 2008. So if we want a major course correction it's going to take a policy development effort to do that.

If we want - some of the comments, if you look at a mind map for things like, you know, ICANN staff should be more efficient, too many delays, things like that, I don't know that those kind of comments rise to the level of policy work.

And so I didn't want to - look, if that - if someone thinks that the policy I don't want to argue that now. But I didn't want to lose those comments so I wanted to make sure that that input got back to ICANN staff that these are concerns that have been raised. We want you to be cognizant of them going forward.

But so that was the distinction I was trying to make right now, what do we actually want to put through that GNSO policy funnel and what do we - what do we want to take as - this is advice to staff that would like to have going forward.

But, you know, I think that anything that anyone feels very strongly about, and the kind of thing that, you know, this must happen next time, I think the only way to guarantee that, the only way to mandate it on the staff implementation project is to put it through the policy ringer and call it policy. So I think your comment there is well taken on that point. If we feel very strongly about it and want to mandate it it needs to go through I think the policy funnel.

Michele.

Michele Neylon: Yes thanks, Bret. Michele for the record. Now I just think the assumption that any subsequent rounds would be based on the existing policies is a very dangerous assumption to make. I mean, I think both applicants, registrars, existing registries, and third parties have run into plenty of issues with the current policy.



So I think, you know, the - if there's going to be any subsequent rounds surely they should be run better with better policies and better processes. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: Good. And I want to have - I want part of our meeting in Los Angeles to talk about this and to figure out sort of what are we going to do with this big collection of issues. And, you know, one possibility is that we push everything through.

We organize it as best we can if we've got, looks like the current mind map has one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, major issues. If we can - if that's what we agree on then maybe we create seven different policy development groups and maybe we decided that makes no sense, that we just want to have one big policy development group and maybe have seven focuses inside it.

You know, there are lots of ways to proceed. I want to dedicate a substantial amount of our time in Los Angeles to talking about that and figuring out how to go to the next stage.

Steve, I think the mind map is up there. I don't know - is there anything else that you'd like to say about it at this point? Oh, I see your hand raised, go ahead.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Bret. This is Steve. I guess what I wanted to bring up is that - it's definitely a fair question about how we're going to take this gigantic list and turn it into - and perhaps it is premature about trying to figure out what his policy versus implementation.

But as a reminder, one of the things that staff had developed was that issue collection template which is intended to ask some of the questions that I think we might want to consider and how to try to address some of the issues that are brought up by the discussion group.

So one of those questions was, and I think you summed it up pretty well about how you might consider something policy in that - sorry, I lost my train of thought. But entering that template is I think maybe going to get us closer to where we want to go towards the end in understanding where things are supposed to be addressed. So sorry, that's all I wanted to bring up. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: And, you know, it's very possible that, going back to Jon's point, that the path that at least I had envisioned that we divide it into policy and implementation is not the path that - is not the best path. I mean, maybe everything gets put through to a subsequent policy development group, and we use the work that we've done here in the fall to organize it. I don't have a strong view on this either way.

(Fatim), I see your hand raised. Go ahead. I can't hear you if you're speaking.  
(Fatim), is that a hand?

(Fatim): Oh, okay yes. I did have my hand up but I didn't hear my name called and it's really to (unintelligible) that I want to comment. Can I go ahead now?

Bret Fausett: Yes please, go ahead now.

(Fatim): Oh okay good. Thanks. My (unintelligible) good afternoon, evening, good morning everyone. I just wanted to suggest, and this is a very good point Bret raised and I think that's very helpful. And what I would like to suggest to help things forward a little bit is that maybe (unintelligible) should be on the people (unintelligible) suggestions for them to suggest what policy (unintelligible) there are, if any, between what they are suggesting so we can, you know, we can say okay this particular issue is relating to this policy aspect and then hopefully they'll be able to help us (organize) the suggestions into various policy issues for adoption by the GNSO.

And just (unintelligible) move things forward. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: Good - that's helpful. So - I know that some of you have not seen the mind map until now. Please - it's been circulated to the list. I don't - Steve, you think we'll go through another version between now and Los Angeles? I know that some submissions have been made to the list in the last few days.

Steve Chan: This is Steve. Yes, I think so. I've actually already started incorporating some of the comments that were shared to the list and that's partly why I was trying to share the live version just to show that I started taking those into account. But Adobe Connect foiled that attempt. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: Okay great. So there will be another version between now and our Los Angeles meeting. Steve, you think you can get that out maybe before people start flying, like midweek, just whatever the current version is circulated again?

Steve Chan: This is Steve. No problem, we can do that for sure.

Bret Fausett: Yes, and so look for that sort of midweek before people start coming in, maybe helpful thing to be able to read when you're out here. And then we can go through it in more detail in our meeting. Which brings me, I think, to our next subject - before I move on - (Fatim), is an old hand or a new hand?

(Fatim): It's a new hand. I was just going to suggest that if we're going to have a new version of the mind map before the LA meeting it would be helpful to start (unintelligible) on the process (unintelligible) right, you know, as we get the next iteration of it.

Bret Fausett: Good, good. Okay. So...

((Crosstalk))

Bret Fausett: I'm sorry?

(Fatim): Yes (unintelligible). Yes, okay.

Bret Fausett: Okay. So thinking about next week we're meeting just over...

((Crosstalk))

(Fatim): Did you hear me?

Bret Fausett: I'm sorry, (Fatim), I did hear you, thank you. Thinking about...

((Crosstalk))

Bret Fausett: ...our next meeting in Los Angeles in just over a week's time, I thought we would give a very brief overview of the purpose of the group and the work to date for those who will be in the room who have not been on our telephone calls and are not working on our mailing list. And I want to keep that, as I said, very brief, probably less than 10 minutes as an introduction to what we're doing.

And then I'd like to make it a working session. And I open it up to the group as to how best you would want to use that time. Would you like to break into small drafting teams? Would you like to have a microphone queue with Steve sort of live moving things around on the mind map? Open to suggestions as to how we use our time best next week if anyone has thoughts or comments on that.

Well, you know, seeing no comments please feel free to - well let's see, Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. Bearing in mind I think where we're at with this it might make sense just to kind of thrash out some of the points that

have been raised that might be a good use of time. But as for the actual format I suspect that's going to depend a lot on who turns up in person.

I'm not sure whether I'll be able to turn up in person because my schedule in LA is going to be a mess. Kristina can't and I'm sure there's plenty of other people who are very interested in following these discussions and participating as best they can but who are being dragged in four different directions at once. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: Yes, I think that's a fair point. I know that some - I see from the comments in the chat list that some people who have been - important members of the group so far will not be available for our live meeting. So as we've done in the past I do think that, you know, we'll try to keep most of our work online.

I would like to have a further conversation to the points that were raised on the call today about what are we going to do next. I'd like to spend some time going over the mind map and going over the issues but then there's a harder question I think as to what to do next; Jon hinted at it. And I think we should figure out once we've got this list and we think it's fairly fulsome.

And I think we're pretty close to that. I mean, we really got a lot of issues out in a very short amount of time. Maybe we've got 80% but if we've got 80% in a month and a half I think that's pretty good work. We'll collect the next 20% over the next month and have a pretty good set of issues. And then what are we going to do?

And I really would like to have people think about that between now and the ICANN meeting seeing - going to Donna's point about how our work fits in with ICANN staff's work, there's going to be a session on Monday afternoon - I believe it's Monday afternoon also on this and I think - it's going to have - I'm going to talk about our work, ICANN staff is going to talk about their work and I think we'll talk a little bit about how all this interrelates.

At the end of the day I think what we are trying to do is create a policy development process that trumps anything that's going on anywhere else. So if the GNSO creates a policy on new gTLDs, that's what gets implemented.

So that's my view of what our work is that we, you know, ultimately if it comes through the GNSO, if it gets a consensus of the GNSO, if it gets passed by the GNSO Council and we're talking now probably a year, a year and a half down the road, that - there's going to be a straight line between that policy and what gets implemented by ICANN or at least there should be, that's the way it's supposed to work. So that's the way I see our work.

Let's see, so I think that's everything I wanted to cover in advance of our meeting. If there's anything else I'll give a minute here for people to raise hands or type something into the chat otherwise we'll take everything offline.

Susan, I see your hand, go ahead.

Susan Payne: Just a quick point, I think it's been really helpful to get everyone's views in the manner that they have certainly as an initial point. But I think (unintelligible) we really need to take people's particular frames of reference out of the issue (unintelligible). I mean, I think (unintelligible) as anyone in doing this and some framing issues in the manner that I want to see them change. And some of the very much presupposing outcome which obviously not everyone would agree with. And we need to work on just how that's presented.

Bret Fausett: So, Susan, you were fairly faint. But I think you - I think your question was about the way that issues are phrased and some of them prejudice the outcome and you don't agree with the outcome. Was that the question?

Susan Payne: Yes, it was more of a comment. And what I was saying was in fact I think some of the issues that I raise myself I probably did the same thing in rather prejudging an outcome.

And I think that's fine for the issue capture but obviously as we work forward we would need to review that to make sure that we're not prejudging an outcome.

Bret Fausett: I completely agree. And I think that if we decide that an issue needs to go forward to the Council then I would hope that either the original person who submitted it or a small drafting team working behind and sort of cleaning up the issue spotting work that we've done and phrase it in a neutral manner so that, you know, sort of anybody on either side of that would recognize that as an issue that would be fair and something that's, you know, they would want to have answered in the policy development process. I do think that's part of the task.

Susan Payne: Right, thanks.

Bret Fausett: Anyone else? Well, listen, thank you everyone. I will - a recording of today's meeting will go to the list; we'll also have a summary of the chat. And, again, look for the mind map between now and the end of the week and we'll - I hope to see as many of you as possible at the sessions that we have on new gTLDs next week. And, again, you know, we'll keep most of the session on the list since I know some people are challenged by these times.

Anyway thank you all for participating and I look forward to seeing you next week. Bye-bye. Operator, you can end the recording.

END