

GNSO New gTLDs Subsequent Rounds Discussion Group

Monday 02 March 2015 at 15:00 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 02 March 2015 at 15:00 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-02mar15-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Brett Fausett - RySG
Stephanie Duchesneau - RySG
Jeff Neuman-RySG
Christopher Niemi- no soi
Michele Neylon-RrSG
Tijani Ben Jemaa - ALAC
Liz Williams - RySG
Dietmer Lenden – RySG
Will Ellis – RrSG
Christa Taylor – Individual
Susan Payne – IPC
Steven Coates – BC (no SOI)
Christopher Niemi,
Carlos Raul Gutierrez – GNSO Councilor
Rubens Kuhl- RySG
Evan Leibovitch – ALAC

Apologies:

Stuart Fuller

ICANN staff:

Steve Chan
Lars Hoffmann
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the new GTLD Subsequent Laws discussion group call on the second of March 2015. On the call today we have Liz Williams, Bret Fausett, (unintelligible), (Will Ellis), (Krista Taylor), Stephanie Duchesneau, Susan Payne, (Steven Coats), (Kristen Cinyemi), (Unintelligible), (Collis Ferrell), and Jeff Neuman. We've received no apologies within this call. From staff we have Steve Sheng, (Ross Hoften), and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Bret

Bret Fausett: Thank you very much. Well, thank you everyone for joining. I hope that this is going to start the first of a series of every other week calls, likely at this same time -- I think that's when they're scheduled -- as we try to wind up our work. I'll first ask if there are any updates to statements of interest that people have posted. I know that those are all available on the ICANN Web site, but to the extent that someone's updated it in the last little period since we've had a meeting, now might be a good time to call everyone's attention to it.

Okay. Well, hearing nothing let's go back to the first agenda item which is basically to bring everyone up to date on where we are right now. As you'll recall, this is a group to gather the issue set that will be forwarded to the GNSO council for the creation of an issue report and then a subsequent policy development process. We expect that that is the course that GNSO council will take.

And so we have -- over the last six months -- gathered input from our members and the constituency bodies that we all come from to try to come up with as complete an issue set of possible issues for discussion as possible.

I think we've got a fairly robust set of issues at this point; we'll hit those in a minute. And I know that some clarifications and modifications and even additions to the issue set continue to come in. And as they come in, they are

of course welcome and we'll put them in. We haven't had really a last call for issues. But I think at this point we've got an issue set that really captures the things that we want to focus on for possible subsequent rounds of new GTLDs.

The way home from here will be to prepare to finalize this issue set and to draft a draft charter for the policy development work. And all of this will be bundled together with the report of our work and sent to the GNSO council. And as we mentioned on list a few weeks ago, our goal is to have this - have our work finished on or before the Buenos Aires meeting in June. So with that as background, let me see if there are any hands raised or any questions that people want to ask. You can always raise your hand in the Adobe Chat. If you're not in the Adobe Chat, just feel free to pipe up. (Michele), I see your hand in the chat.

(Michele): Hi Bret. (Michele) for the record. How are you doing? Okay, is this group then going to be moving forward at a slightly more normal pace from now on? Or are we still in this kind of let's meet once a month type scenario? Or how is that going to change. I'm just trying to understand how this is going to work going forward, more than anything else. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: We want to meet every other week. And I think we've got - did - do we have (unintelligible) publicists scheduled to the list?

Steve Sheng: This is Steve from staff. I don't know that we necessarily published it, but what I communicated through one of the e-mails to the list is that going forward we would be meeting on an every two week basis at the same time. So what we can do is actually publish - or I guess send to the list the schedule so that everybody knows exactly what days we're intending to meet. And up to a point as needed, which should be just preceding the BA meeting. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: So consider it every other Monday from here until we're done.

(Michele): At this time, I assume.

Bret Fausett: At this time, at this time.

(Michele): Okay. And then my follow up query is - so if that's going to be kind of a more structured -- more kind of regular -- kind of quote, unquote normal kind of working group type scenario, then will then this group end up having vice chairs and everything else? Because I see at the moment you're the only person from the community who's kind of being lumbered with this, which might have been fine when it was only meeting once every month or so. But just wondering should the group have vice chairs if that's going to be the way things are moving in the future? Thanks.

Bret Fausett: Great question. I would certainly welcome assistance -- vice chairs, co-chairs, or replacement chairs -- however we want to call it. I think with only a little bit of work left, I worry that the nomination and election period would, you know, overwhelm the real work to be done. And maybe we can just do it by consensus and the kind of thing anyone who wants to join and volunteer for assistance, you know, can be a co-chair. I'd be happy with that sort of thing also. Maybe we'll get a sense of the room and see what people think about, you know, should we do it on a volunteer basis or should we actually have elections?

Jeff Neuman: Hey, Bret, this is Jeff. I'd be happy to volunteer to help out if that's something you guys want.

Bret Fausett: That would be great. That would be great.

(Michele): This is (Michele). I also think as well the volunteer type scenario makes a lot more sense to me than a formal election process. And Jeff has put himself forward, I'm - I'd second it. And I'm sure other people would be supportive of Jeff doing that, thanks.

Bret Fausett: Well, I certainly support Jeff and welcome his participation. And we won't necessarily need to close this here. If - and there's Liz offering to help too and I know that she had volunteered earlier as well. So why don't we take Jeff and Liz as co-chairs. If anyone on reflection thinks that they want to volunteer as well, just let me know, either on list or privately. And we'll get them in the mix as well. So thank you for volunteering and your contributions are very welcome and appreciated.

So let's move on now -- I see no other hands up right now -- let's move on now to a discussion of the materials that Steve circulated. Steve, do you want to take a minute and talk people through what you sent to the list last week?

Steve Sheng: Sure, thanks. This is Steve Sheng from staff. So -- as Bret teed that up -- materials are sent out for discussion last week. I think it probably is useful to talk about this executive summary first because it lays out the proposed deliverables that at least staff envisioned. You know, and if at any time the discussion group thinks that this is an inappropriate direction, please do feel free to speak up on that. But this is a vision - or at least one envisioned way that we saw that the work could progress.

So what we've -- I think we're all aware -- we've already done is prepare the mind map. And the subsequent step from that was to take those issues that were identified in the mind map and then apply them against the original recommendations. And what I'd like to call the matrix coming forward, just so we have some kind of short hand vernacular to talk about that. So the matrix - - as staff envisioned it -- is to help set the scope for what this group thinks needs to be worked on in future efforts, which -- as Bret said -- may be a PDP that the GNSO council request.

So what that matrix is intended to do is to look at these issues that we identified and to determine whether or not the original recommendations - whether they need clarification or if they need amendment. Or perhaps the

issues that the group identified are simply implementation guidance. And then there are other sets of issues where they don't follow or map to any of the recommendations in which case they could be potentially subjects for future policy development work.

So subsequent things that we envisioned could be worked on are also a work plan - a work plan for the future working group. And then also the draft charter that Bret has mentioned. And at least the way that we had envisioned it is that those are probably subsequent steps to the matrix.

I think the matrix -- at least in my head -- is kind of fundamental to what we want to do. Because it really sets the stage for what I think we need - or what the group thinks should be worked on. And in what fashion, whether it be policy guidance or policy clarifications -- or I guess recommendation -- clarifications or implementation guidance or new policy, as I mentioned.

So I thought - that's why I thought it would be useful to talk about the - this executive summary that's actually in the Adobe Connect window first. And I'm not going to bring it up at this point because it's probably really too hard to read. But I also sent to the list the work plan from our project management tool. And it just lays out all these deliverables that are described in this summary document.

And it provides a path forward for us to be able to deliver what we want to deliver prior to Buenos Aires and hopefully give the council enough time to consider before they actually arrive in Buenos Aires and hopefully take action while they're there to whatever they might do, which we would think is probably request an issue report. Not to put words in their mouth, but at least I think that's what we envision here. So I think that's what I want to say about that. Bret, would you like to add anything or anyone on the call?

Bret Fausett: No, I think it's - I think it's important that everyone -- probably between this call and our next call -- try to -- to the extent that you can or have people on

your teams who can -- look through the materials that we've got to date, particularly that matrix where we try to tie the issues that the group has identified to existing policy and tease out what may be a modification of existing GNSO policy from things that actually may be new policy. Those I think are going to really inform what the policy development group does next.

And I'll give you a little bit of background on why that's important. We had several meetings in Singapore about new GTLDs -- both in the council and separately -- and one of the questions I asked several times of ICANN staff was if the GNSO does nothing, what happens? And the answer I got repeatedly was that if the GNSO does nothing, there will be a second round of new GTLDs. It will be based on the previous - it will be based on the previous policy recommendations. It will look a lot like the last round.

So, you know, if you're happy with the last round and the way it went, then there will be another round that will look very close to it. But if we actually want to turn things a little bit, that is going to take the policy development process. And so looking both at how we modify the past policy and how we might shape new policy will be important. And I think that's probably one of the key documents to take a look at over the next couple of weeks. Jeff, you have your hand raised. Go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, so one of the questions I raised in Adobe -- which maybe we can get some guidance from ICANN not necessarily on this call but maybe on the next one to be more prepared -- is to what extent can we get guidance from the policy and implementation working group? I think a lot of this stuff - the policies may remain the same from the very broad statements we have back in the last round in 2008 that was approved. But I think a lot of the issues come down to implementation as - of those policies as opposed to new policies themselves.

And so maybe we can get some guidance on establishing groups other than formal PDP groups. I don't know, Steve - I know Marika could help us on that

if she comes in the next call. But Steve, does that sound like something that we can do? Get some guidance?

Steve Sheng: This is Steve from staff. I think we can look into that. I see some value in perhaps having everything - so at least what I'd heard from previous meetings -- I think it was actually in the Los Angeles meeting -- the group had expressed an interest in keeping everything perhaps into one working group.

So I see some benefit to what you're saying, Jeff. But what it might do is actually create additional overhead where you have, you know, parallel efforts. And you might end up having that in a single working group anyway where you have sub-groups. So I think it's something we can take back. I can talk to Marika about it and see if it might be a good way forward for us. And I can come back and talk about that on the next call.

Bret Fausett: Yeah, this is Bret. I haven't really focused too much on the policy implementation working group. I'd love to catch up there at some point. It's always been my view, though, that if we want to make ICANN do something, it has to come out of the policy process. So if there's a point that we insist makes it into the next guidebook and the review guidelines, it needs to come out of our GNSO policy process. I assume that in this next...

Jeff Neuman: (Unintelligible)...

Bret Fausett: Go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: There are certain limitations -- sorry, this is Jeff -- there are certain limitations of what consider policy that we could force ICANN into. And certain implementation issues -- even if we did a formal PDP -- ICANN would say, "Well, that's sort of outside the scope of policy anyway and we don't really have to follow it." That's kind of what they did in the last round and that's what they try to do with the trademark protections and some other things that - where they came up with additional items.

So I think, you know, you're right to one extent. If something goes through PDP then the board has to have a certain threshold in order to turn it down. But that's only if it was properly policy anyway.

Bret Fausett: I see a couple of hands in Adobe Chat now. (Michele) and then Liz.

(Michele): Yeah, thanks Bret. And - yeah, there is this interesting and awkward problem where you're trying to define lines around some of these things. Because, I mean, if you look at the contracts a large part of it is subject to consensus policy but other parts of it are contractual arrangements between two parties and obviously aren't open to that - you know, where you actually draw the line.

And then this, of course the bigger issue and I think the one that the policy and implementation working group has been looking at is what they - what policy you come up with within the GNSO or anywhere else - how that's translated into something actionable and operational, be that through the former contracts or the actual operation and implementation of that can be quite messy.

I mean, at the moment several of us are involved in one of the IRTF implementation groups and, you know, it - the policy work per se was done, finished, over like -- I don't know -- two years ago. And we're still trying to finalize the written parts of that that can be operationalized in a fashion that actually works. So it's not a clear cut and I don't see that getting any easier moving forward.

I mean -- having said that, though -- I mean, we need to have reviews of what didn't work and what caused problems. What caused unnecessary - what caused issues for the - both the applicants, the registrars, other parties with the - in the current round of new TLDs. And then based on that move forward and make changes to whatever kind of applicant guidebook is out there

where possible or at least make suggestions. I mean, whether something falls within the scope of policy or something else.

But, I mean, if there's been a serious issue that needs to be addressed, then people should be made aware that it should be changed. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: Liz, go ahead.

Liz Williams: I just wondered if the audio is working. Is that okay?

Bret Fausett: Sure. I can hear you.

Liz Williams: Oh, good. Good. Okay, perfect. So there's a couple of things that I think would be really helpful suggestions and I'm always in for minimizing our work where we can. I just wanted to pick up a couple of things that (Michele) has raised and Jeff has raised. I think it would be a helpful start point maybe for all of us is to use the existing -- not the existing -- the three year old applicant guide book and amend it. And say, redline, redline, redline, fix, fix, fix, fix, fix.

Because there is such significant operational issues around the technical - so for example today I was trying to use the passing service portal and it's down. Unacceptable. Unacceptable. And that's the kind of stuff around the application process that I think we resolve quite quickly because we have to set a service level agreement that says we're not paying you any money to participate in this part of this unless these kinds of issues are resolved.

So there's a bunch of stuff around existing applicant guidebook. There's a bunch of stuff around new and - new policy issues I think there's some significant ones around the use of the (unintelligible), the use of too many codes, the use of updated trademark protections, and so on that we could focus right down tightly any policy development process. Because I would like not to see the policy development process that we would actually asked the council to action be on anything other than two or three critical issues.

If we don't have two or three critical issues, then we end up doing another three year process. And as the person who relied on the previous three year process, I'd suggest that that's not the useful use of our time because we know much of this stuff. It's been done four times, not twice. It's been done a lot. And it needs to be much more simplified. And I think this group has a really good opportunity to identify also operational failings where we have - it's not okay for the GAC to reopen discussions about these particular issues.

We need - and that's what the policy implementation working group has been talking about and Susan has been on that group as well. And I think we can really clearly identify things where we would say it's not okay for everyone to have second chance at the cherry - whether they're the GAC or ICANN board or a registry operator or whatever. We have to have very clear ways of dealing with the process which becomes like a best practice tendering process. And that's well known, well documented, stable, sensible, and secure. And it addresses (Reuben's) point about the serious failures which we've identified time and time again. This must never happen again. Never, never, never.

So top line statement is do with the applicant guidebook as it currently stands and produce - this group should produce a best practice guidebook. Second thing is identify the policy and implementation working group stuff that says functionally these things should not happen in a tendering process, because that's all it is.

And then thirdly there might be some outlier issues which we need to do a bit more outreach and discussion with - particularly with the CCNSO on the use of too many codes which might look like country codes. And I think that's a highly political, interesting issue that we need to handle. But I don't think we should get hung up on this opening up a whole new can of worms from the very beginning.

Bret Fausett: Thanks Liz. Go ahead, Steve.

Steve Sheng: Thanks Bret, this is Steve from staff. So I wasn't - I'm not going to respond directly to that point, I just had a couple other points I wanted to make. The first is the policy and implementation work -- or the working group -- their work is currently out for public comment, so it's actually not approved by the GNSO council or the board yet. So I don't know that we can necessarily use their processes. (Lars) actually reminded me of that.

The other is that -- just to react to some of the points in the chat -- so staff does recognize that the - clearly that the round was not flawless. And so they're actually going through a robust review and -- they being the GDD staff -- they're going through a robust review of their internal processes because, you know, they're clearly closest to the operations of the program.

So they're - I think they're looking at taking a very frank look at the way that the program ran. And believe they've committed to publishing a number of reports in the middle of this year, I believe. And I think hopefully it'll be enlightening to the community that, you know, we are self-aware about what we can do better in this program. So I think that's all I want to say. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: Yeah. And just following on that -- I forget who mentioned it -- but I think it was Liz who said that, you know, one of the things that someone will want to do -- and I think it's probably not us but a policy development group -- is a redlined version of the existing guidebook.

I think that it is a great piece of work that I hope that whenever we actually do come up with the policy recommendations that we want to make that someone will go through and hopefully ICANN will give us an editable version of that document so that we can, you know, go through it and show where we think that improvements need to be made. Because I think, you know, that's the document that anyone who applied worked through and that's going to be

one of the key drivers in the subsequent rounds. Let's see. Liz, is that a new hand or an old hand?

Liz Williams: Oh, thank you. Pardon, old.

Bret Fausett: Okay, alright.

Liz Williams: Sorry.

Bret Fausett: Okay, Steve.

Steve Sheng: Thanks Bret. This is Steve from staff again. And I guess to - just a point of clarification that the way that at least I - and the way I see it is the applicant guidebook was the implementation of the original recommendations from the GNSO. And so I'm not entirely sure that the work of a PDP should be line - redlining a piece of implementation. I don't know exactly that it's the right approach. Just to throw a word of caution out there. So that - just a comment.

Liz Williams: Oh, Steve, it's Liz here. And that's not true. So so many - yes I appreciate your view that the applicant guidebook might have been an implementation invitation to proceed down the road or something, but it frankly wasn't. And there are numerous examples -- whether you want to take contingent set resolution, whether you want to talk about regulated industries, whether you want to talk about geographic code, whether you want to talk about a whole range of issues -- that were not at all related to application procedures which said, "We've understood the rules. We paid our money. We're applying. We're getting, we're doing. We're attracting."

And three years and we still haven't had resolution of those things. So the applicant guidebook is not a definitive way of approaching implementation process for applications. And for the next round, it must be.

Bret Fausett: Yeah, and on both of those points -- and then Jeff, I see your hand and I'll let you in the queue next -- looking in my crystal ball and knowing what we did in the last policy development process, I think it's - I think finding the areas of consensus is going to be very difficult once we come out the other side of the issue report and start the policy development work.

But if there was consensus of the working group on language that should go in the guidebook, I would think that we should tell staff where we have consensus on new language for the guidebook because, you know, again, that's the way we ensure that that language gets in the guidebook, is to make it part of the policy development process. So I would agree with you on that point. Jeff, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, mine -- this is Jeff -- is related to that really, in the sense that it may be a little too early to actually start redlining the guidebook for exact language. But certainly as Liz was saying, we can certainly look through that to point out which are the policy issues that need to be addressed in conjunction with the mind map that we've already done.

Certainly, Steve, I agree with you. The original guidebook that (Curt) did back in 2008 or, I think - yeah, the very end of 2008, was intended to purely be the implementation of the policies.

But then, as Liz was saying, too many things came into it to be just implementation -- things like, as Liz said, geographic names, and contention sets, and registry/registrar separation. All these things kind of were put into the guidebook outside of the policy process, and it became more than just implementation.

But certainly I think we can go through the guidebook and at least pick out the issues that may be just pure implementation -- things like what digital archery - or whatever, you know, the randomization we actually ended up doing; things like letters of credit. That kind of stuff may not need policy processes to

address, but may just need some implementation discussion. So I think we can engage in a fruitful exercise doing both.

Bret Fausett: Steve, go ahead.

Steve Sheng: Thank, Bret. This is Steve from staff. So I think what would be useful is, you know, if we were to go down the path of actually trying to redline the AGB in a future PDP effort, I think what would be useful to us at least at this stage is to think about what we'd want to carve out and tackle in that effort.\

So I think that's part of the scoping to determine what in the AGB was, you know, maybe developed on the fly by, you know, external factors or staff or whatever the case may be -- things that were not in the original recommendations.

Maybe one of the outputs in the PDP would eventually be a redline document. But I think at this stage we want to think about what those items are that we want to tackle, because I think that should be somewhere in the charter, for instance.

You know, right now we want to determine what we think should be worked on. At least that's the way I envisions it. And I don't know if the group disagrees, but I think it's really important to try to set the stage of what we think should be worked on.

Bret Fausett: This is Bret. I agree. I think that as we try to finish our issue matrix, our issue list, and work through the matrix of policy issues, I think it would be helpful for anyone who doesn't know the guidebook by hand to go through the guidebook and take a quick look at it.

I would hope that before we finish our work and pass it off to the GNSO that we sort of look back to the guidebook to make sure that we've caught all the

issues that we all saw in there, to make sure that they're in the bundle of issues that we're going to send to the GNSO. Go ahead, Steve.

Steve Sheng: Thanks, Bret. This is Steve again. And speaking of additional issues, I just wanted to bring up a couple documents that were shared with the group, and I don't believe have solicited any comment yet.

So there were two documents. One was the - sorry, not GNSO, but the Board resolution paper that laid out some of the items that they considered - that they thought might warrant policy development. I think it'd be good for the folks of this discussion group to maybe take a look at that and see if it might spur any additional thoughts or any additional things to add to our matrix of issues.

The other is the staff input doc from the (GDB) staff. Again I don't think I remember seeing any comments on that. I'm not passing any judgment on it, but I think it was probably a pretty useful document for us to take a look at. And, you know, maybe we can refine some of the things that we've talked about, or add additional things, or whatever the case may be.

So I think it'd be good for the group to maybe take a look at those and perhaps it can actually be an item that we talk about specifically in a future meeting, just to make sure we cover those two items.

Bret Fausett: Let's do that. And I was thinking - because I've watched the list membership and I know we've had some recent additions both during the Singapore meeting and since. I think we probably ought to send around - or maybe is it in the Web portal that we've got?

A list of all the sort of key documents that people should review to sort of understand the contributions that have been made to the group so far, so that everyone is coming from a common place of understanding? Do we have that?

Steve Sheng: Bret, this is Steve again from staff. It's on the wiki, and I can probably organize it in a little bit different way so they can maybe spell it out as these items are good items for review.

Bret Fausett: Yeah, why don't we do that, and send an email to the list and give people a link back to the wiki so that they see it. I think that would be helpful -- helpful for me certainly, too.

So of the documents that we're going to send to the GNSO, we've got drafts of everything except a draft charter. So we have - and let me just recount them. We've got a draft of the executive summary that Steve sent to the list. We've got the list of issues. We actually have the matrix, which is the list of issues tied to existing policy. And we still need a draft charter to send to the GNSO.

So perhaps Liz, Jeff and I can talk about that, you know, following this call. And maybe anyone else who wants to participate in preparing that draft charter, let us know and we'll try to get that last piece done here in the short term so that we have a chance for everyone to discuss it. Let's see. Jeff, is that a new hand or an old hand?

Jeff Neuman: It's a new one. Just a question. Do we need to - when we send something to the GNSO, do we also need an issue report from staff? And then include the charter as part of that issue report?

Steve Sheng: This is Steve from staff. So I think the outputs of this group are an input to the GNSO Council for them to determine whether or not they want to request an issue report. And one of the additional things that would be included in that - useful to that issue report is a draft charter.

So I don't know that we would necessarily need to create a draft charter. I think it's a very useful thing to create. And it'll make the subsequent steps a little bit easier.

But I believe what we're trying to do is provide a package of exploratory materials and, you know, agreed upon issues that the GNSO Council can consider and determine if they want to request an issue report.

Jeff Neuman: Let me ask just a follow-up to that. In addition to what we're doing, what else would be in an issue report? Because it seems to me that just going now with all this stuff to the Council just to get them to request an issue report, which we know they're going to request anyway, seems to just kind of be - we could be more efficient about it by just drafting that issue report now.

Or, Bret, alternatively, why can't we just go to the Council and just get them to draft the issue, or get them to request the issue report at the next meeting? Because the issue report doesn't guarantee that there's a PDP. It just guarantees that there's an issue report.

So it seems to me to just do all this work prior to - just to get the Council to do an issue report, in which case additional work will need to be done before you start any substantive work, seems to be kind of circular.

Bret Fausett: Well I think the people who are going to do the issue report -- and they're going to be, you know, some subset of if not all of Marika, Lars and Steve -- are on the call here. I have to think that the issue report is going to look very close to what we're doing. They certainly see this coming. So as far as timing, I'm going to let, you know, them talk about what would be best. But go ahead, Steve. Your thoughts?

Steve Sheng: This is Steve. I do have some thoughts in that, you know, there's formal process that we try to adhere to. So I appreciate the timing concerns, but I

think we can probably tighten some things up without, you know, making any early promises.

But if this group is producing these materials that help with the scope, help establish a draft charter, I think the drafting process of that issue report - I think it can probably be streamlined at least to some degree.

And then another component of the - at that stage it would be a preliminary issue report. But one of the important components of the issue report is that it goes out for public comment. So I think if we try to shortcut any of that, I don't know that it benefits the overall community, because we want to make sure we keep stuff like that within the process. Go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, this is Jeff. Yeah, I totally understand. Actually that's why I was sort of suggesting it. If we can work on the preliminary issue report now, or even, you know, not to bypass any formality but, Bret, it doesn't take much to get the Council just to go say, hey, let's just do a preliminary issue report. I think we can cut out several months' worth of just kind of sort of delay here. Let's get everything done properly, but let's like push it along a little bit.

Bret Fausett: The original thought was that the request an issue report on what? I mean saying it was almost to the point where, you know, asking for an issue report on subsequent rounds was too broad, and asked staff to consider too much. So what we're doing is trying to identify the issues for staff, so that when they go and look at all the issues that need to be considered for Round 2, it's not three people creating it. It's all of us.

So, you know, and what we are doing is trying to give them the universe of issues, rather than asking them to come up with the universe of issues in the very tight timelines of the issue report. What do they have, 30 days to come up with that? So that's really what - we're identifying the issues for the issue report. That's really the task of this group.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Bret Fausett: Go ahead.

Steve Sheng: This is Steve. Just a real quick follow-up to that. So I think what we could do to help facilitate the process is, as Bret said, staff is well aware that this is coming through the pipeline.

So what we could do, at least on our part, is to start framing some of the - or I guess establish the framework for the issue report, so that when we do have the scope of issues that this discussion group wants to put forth to the GNSO Council, it's kind of a plug and play.

We're able to drop the issues and scoped-out issues along with the draft charter into the issue report, so that the - I believe it's actually 45 days that staff is given to draft a preliminary issue report. So hopefully what we can do is keep that, you know, well below 45 days without actually giving a real number for that. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: Michele, I see your hand. Go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. One of my main concerns about this is in relation to the overall workload within the GNSO at the moment. We need to be very, very careful and conscious of triggering anything that's going to increase that workload.

There's several AOC-related reviews, from my understanding, that have to have happen or at least start within this calendar year, along with all the current ongoing and already scheduled various PDPs and cross-community groups, and IANA transition-related groups, and I think there's like seven or eight parallel Whois-related activities ongoing at the moment. And that's just the stuff I can think of off the top of my head.

So just wary of, you know, any extra workload being thrown onto the GNSO, because the number of people who are actively participating and actively engaging isn't exactly growing at an exponential rate. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: Yeah, it's a legitimate concern, and it was talked about in great deal at the Singapore meeting. There were many discussions in several different fora about workload. I think that everyone here certainly appreciates that what we are talking about is an enormous undertaking, probably a multi-year undertaking, to look at the policies on subsequent rounds.

So it is a huge work item and, you know, I don't know that that doesn't mean we shouldn't do it. But I think that will be a discussion that will certainly happen at the Council level, and I think everyone will probably need to go back through their Council reps to weigh in on, you know, sort of how and whether this should be done. Liz, I see your hand.

Liz Williams: Yeah, thanks, Bret. I just wanted to be clear about a couple things. First thing, I was just looking at the chat. I was asking questions, not proposing an outcome.

And I think that it's a really legitimate question to ask to the (OSG) and to the registrars what they would see, as the key service provider groups, the ideal outcome, because their businesses are most impacted by applicants which are the third - make up (unintelligible) stool. So the registries and registrars and then the applicants form a triangle of activity.

I wonder also if it's not necessary to identify some issues for ICANN with respect to outreach.

In my experience, a number of applicants withdrew from the process for all of the issues that Jeff has identified, many of them related to absolute incredulity about disastrous technical output, disastrous contracts, disastrous process, extremely expensive unclear nonsense, which I think is what we

need to get on top of in terms of the transparency and simplicity of the process.

This time around we need to be looking for simplicity and administrative surety that does not put people off.

But I think that one of the issues that we've got is to go back to ICANN and say we want to have different kinds of applicants to be applied for different kinds of TLDs, whatever they happen to look like, it doesn't matter. And that's an outreach (unintelligible), which I think is really, really important, but needs to be very carefully scoped.

So just to address Michele's point and Jeff's point, I wasn't at all suggesting that the registry stakeholder's group was the only group who we'd ask for input. But of course the registrars are part of that.

But I don't quite know how we would address those we don't know about. How do we tap into those that considered applying but didn't; those that applied but then withdrew; those that didn't even think it was within their remit to even consider it. And I think it's a significant competition issue to have as many potential applicants as possible in the mix of the next round.

Bret Fausett: I think that's very helpful. Steve, go ahead.

Steve Sheng: Thanks. This is Steve from staff. So a quick comment that I think what we want - maybe one of the things we want to concentrate within this group is to possibly carve out the items that we envision require policy work. At least in my head, I don't know that outreach, which certainly is noble, is - I don't know that it's necessarily policy work. Just a thought there, I guess. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: Okay, well look, I'm looking through - hold on. Let me look through the chat and get caught up here. Any other hands? Anyone want to weigh in on what we talked about today? Evan, I see your hand. Go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi, there. Evan Leibovitch from at-large. Sorry to come in late to this. I just wanted to - I've been mentioning it a bit in the chat, and I don't know if that's been coming up here much or not. I'd prefer that it was identified initially rather than simply come out of left field in the comments phase. There is a significant body of thought in at-large and elsewhere that we've come across that at least the next round should be one of catch-up.

And the first thing that's being mentioned is that there were a lot of community applications that did not legitimately get heard because of what was considered to be a really, really wonky community evaluation process -- wonky, unreliable, inconsistent, and not applied well at least into what a lot of people in the circles I travel consider to be communities.

And so while that may not be a very popular sentiment here, I would like to just ensure that that's in scope for whatever's put out, either to go to the GNSO or to go to the greater community. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: That's absolutely in scope, Evan. Thank you. I have heard - and Steve, maybe you can refresh my recollection as to whether this is currently in the issue matrix. But I have heard suggestions that either the next round or the first part of the next round be devoted solely to, you know, X, where X is brands or people from underdeveloped countries, emerging nations, you know, that something...

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, you're exactly right. Applicant support, of course, was an important issue within at-large that did, shall we say, not get incredibly good take-up. So that and, at least in the circles I've gone, applicant support and the community evaluation were the two hottest ones where you have groups that really think that they were wronged by the first round.

Bret Fausett: So that's definitely an issue. It's totally in scope. If it's not on the issue list, Steve, can you add it if it's not? I think it is, but if it's not, can you add it?

Steve Sheng: I believe it's already - this is Steve. It's already in the matrix. I don't know if it's necessarily called a remedial round, but it talks about the things that you're talking about. Yeah.

Bret Fausett: Thanks. Jeff, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I was just going to agree with you all. It's definitely in scope. It's not necessarily - not expressing an opinion one way or the other, but it's in scope. And I would just point out that the default, though, at this point, Evan, is that there's non-discrimination in the next round. So any kind of change would require the policy process to work through to modify that. So yeah, absolutely it's in scope.

Evan Leibovitch: Understood.

Bret Fausett: All right, we'll go ahead. Well let's see. Let me move toward the end here, as we're getting close to the top of the hour, and suggest that between today and the next time we meet, which is two weeks from today, that we'll have a list of things that hopefully everyone should have read to be caught up.

It'd be great to see some discussion of the Board and staff issue reports that they've put, and how those relate to what we've done here. I can certainly try to lead that, but there really hasn't been much response. I thought that (Caroline)'s put together a fairly thoughtful contribution to the group on Round 1 from staff's perspective. I thought it was quite helpful.

And then let's see. Liz, Jeff and I will talk. Let's talk first by email, but maybe we can talk in person between now and two Mondays from now to talk about maybe how to coordinate and finish the work that we've got before us. Let's see. Any last thoughts? Jeff, is that a new hand?

Jeff Neuman: No, sorry.

Bret Fausett: Okay. Steve, go ahead.

Steve Sheng: Thanks, Bret. This is Steve from staff again. Sorry to talk so much. One of the things I have on my to-do list is to make sure I get all of the materials in an organized fashion for the discussion group to review.

And I guess I just want to stress that staff actually develops most of these materials, and so if the discussion group does not agree with even the direction that these documents are taking us, or the composition of the documents, or in particular actually the sorting of the issues and putting them in various buckets, you know, I very much welcome the discussion group challenging what staff has produced, because this is clearly your work, not ours.

But, you know, we wanted to give you something to stare at and react against, and try to get the group moving in a positive way. But if the group thinks they want to take it in a different direction, or if they even want to take the matrix and start from scratch, that's clearly up to the discretion of the group. But staff wanted to put something forward and give you guys something to work with. So just a comment. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: Very helpful. Okay. Well let's see. Thank you all for participating. I think we'll wrap it up here. Of course we have an ongoing conversation all the time on the list, so if anything was left unsaid during this hour that we've had together, please drop it on the list and we'll carry the conversation over there. And I'll see everyone two weeks from now. Steve, wrap it up.

Steve Sheng: Sorry. This is Steve again. One last quick comment. Just to confirm the next meeting, it's going to be March 16. But what I actually wanted to stress is that the time is going to be 1400 UTC as opposed to 1500 UTC, just to take account of the time change that occurs in certain parts of the world. So you'll

get a confirmation from the GNSO secretary, but I just wanted to give you a heads up that the time is slightly different.

Bret Fausett: Okay, thanks everyone. Bye-bye.

Woman: Thank you, (Francesca). You may now stop the recordings. Have a good day.

END