

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO New gTLDs Subsequent Rounds Discussion Group
Monday 30 March 2015 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 30 March 2015 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-30mar15-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Attendees:

Bret Fausett - RySG
Stephanie Duchesneau - RySG
Jeff Neuman-RySG
Tijani Ben Jemaa - ALAC
Dietmer Lenden – RySG
Christa Taylor – Individual
Avri Doria – NCSG
Philip Sheppard – Individual
Stuart Fuller – RrSG
Donna Austin – RrSG
Christopher Niemi- no soi
Alan Greenberg - ALAC
Susan Payne – IPC
Phil Buckingham – Individual
Jean-François Vanden Eynde – RrSG
Cecilia Smith – no SOI
Ken Hansen – no SOI
Michael Palage – RySG
Alain Artero – no SOI

Apologies:

Kiran Malancharuvil – IPC
Tony Holmes - ISPCP

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Gery
Amy Bivins
Steve Chan
Lars Hoffmann
Yolanda Jimenez
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Good morning, good afternoon. You can go ahead. This call is now being recorded.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Rounds Discussion Group on the 30th of March, 2015.

On the call today we have Tijani Ben Jemaa, Alain Artero , Bret Fausett, Philip Sheppard, Jeff Neuman, J.F. Vanden Eynde, Cecilia Smith, Avri Doria, Stuart Fuller, Christopher Niemi, Stephanie Duchesneau, Alan Greenberg, Dietmer Lenden, Donna Austin, Christa Taylor, Ken Hansen, and Susan Payne. I show apologies from Kiran Malancharuvil.

From staff we have Glen de Saint G ery, Marika Konings, Steve Chan, Amy Bivins, Yolanda Jimenez, and myself, Terri Agnew.

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: Good morning everyone. It's Bret Fausett, here with Steve Chan in the ICANN offices. I see that Jeff Neuman, our cochair, is also on the call. Apologies from Liz Williams, our other cochair, she is in Australia on Australia time that Jeff and I have been keeping in touch with her by email.

I thought we would go through the deliverables that we have today, talk about sort of what we've got, what we still need and where and when we want to wind up our work. I know there's been some discussion on the list this last week. Thank you for all the comments. I'm hoping that we can spend a little bit of time today also trying to figure out how to integrate some of the comments that have come in, into the work we are doing.

So let me start off by going to the - the first item on the agenda, which is updated statements of interest and see if anyone wants to offer an update to their statement.

All right well seeing no hands let's go straight on to the final deliverables. I have, on my list, a - really four items, two of which are addenda to one of the items. The first item is what I'm calling for the I guess executive summary, a document that would talk about why we're doing what we're doing, how we started doing what we're doing and giving an overview of what we are delivering.

The screen now for those in Adobe chat. It is a - the most recent version I think Steve circulate it to the list last week. It has some red lines from Jeff Neuman. I have on my list of things to do a set of red lines to do to it also. Of course anyone can hold the pen here so if you would like to provide comments or edits to this document please do so.

We will try to integrate them into the final project and make sure that we have general agreement among the members of the group as to what is in this overview document and its contents. So that's one deliverable.

The second deliverable is a draft - a draft charter. And this will - this is still to be drafted. Steve Chan from ICANN staff has kindly offered to get that moved forward with the standard template for charters plus some color added for what we are doing.

And the addenda to that draft charter are really the core of what we've done so far, that is the issue matrix; the list of issues that we've developed as a group to guide the next policy development process when it gets kicked off later this summer, and then a separate addenda that sort of groups those issues by subject matter to provide guidance to the next policy development group as to maybe how they want to think about those issues and organize them.

So those are our four deliverables. I think we've got three of the four fairly well done and it's really just a draft charter that's going to require a lot of work. I think, again, anyone who wants to assist in that draft charter after Steve does the first draft, you know, please we welcome your comments. And again, it's one of those things where I think anyone can hold the pen. Anyone who wants to provide a draft we'll certainly integrate those comments into the final version.

With that let me pause and ask if anyone has questions on the list of the deliverables? Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, hi, this is Avri. I'm just wondering, is it okay to just send messages with changes to the list? I don't own Word, and I haven't decided whether I'm going to rent it again. And I notice that I have problems when passing things from Libre Office to Word in a document. So since we are doing it with Word document passing is it okay if I just send changes to the list in an email?

Bret Fausett: Yeah, I think that's fine. You know, if you want to say, you know, in the third paragraph between the second and third sentences, add a sentence that reads, you know, whatever, I think those kind of instructions I'm happy to take those and integrate it into document. So however you can make clear the changes you want to make, you can send to the list and we will make sure they're put in the next version.

Avri Doria: Okay cool. Yeah, it would have been easier in a Drive document, but, yeah, I just don't have Word, thanks.

Bret Fausett: Okay. Any other comments? Okay well let me move to the next item which is project timing. Steve do you want to - can you put that up on the screen there? I know you put it in your email to the list on March 27. Do you see it? I don't see it yet. Okay there we go, there it's popping up.

So our work is really the stuff that thin white, the stuff that comes after our work is in the light blue at the bottom. We are trying to move forward to get something, a draft to the Council in mid-May. There is a May 11 cut off for motions for the May GNSO Council meeting. The GNSO Council meeting in May is on May 21.

If we can get it to the Council with a motion for the, you know, for the creation of an issue report by the May meeting, you know, I think we should try to do that. I think this is the kind of thing that may require to Council meetings to get done.

I mean, I think our object is to get this done - get the Council to approve the creation of an issue report and move this off of our plates and into somebody else's project by Buenos Aires. I think if we give it to them by the May meeting it may be the kind of thing that people vote to defer into the June meeting so that people can discuss it a bit more. So that's my goal, and get it to them by the May meeting, expect that they will do it by the June meeting. Any questions about the timeline or that strategy of moving forward?

Avri, is that a new hand or an old hand?

Avri Doria: Oh it's a new one.

Bret Fausett: Okay, go ahead. And then, Susan, I see you too.

Avri Doria: Okay. I'm curious, I would think that having it by then is good but I wouldn't be surprised if we decided we needed (unintelligible) about in Buenos Aires as opposed to kicking off the issues report before Buenos Aires. That would just be my first inclination. You know, I could be wrong. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: Susan, go ahead.

Susan Payne: Yeah, I guess I just came to get some clarification of what exactly is it we need to do by May? Because my initial reaction is that seems quite a challenging timescale with my assumption being that I thought that we had a certain amount of work to do on these various issues and kind of sort of categorizing them better and so on.

And it seems to me that we're pushing to get this done for May which I think we all want to get this done as quickly as possible but that doesn't seem that much time given that we - where we are already in April effectively. It doesn't give much time I suppose for people to work on this and actually sort of debate and discuss I guess, that's my point. If we have to get something out by 11 of May and that's the cutoff date.

Bret Fausett: You know, it's our timeline so we can work on our own timeline. You know, the Council will take this whenever we're done. So we don't need to move on any timeline. I sort of set this timeline in consultation with the other chairs looking at the work we've done and what remained.

It doesn't seem to me, if you look at the list of issues and the, you know, the draft subject grouping, but there's a lot of work to do. And I haven't seen a lot of debate on it. There is an issue that Avri's raised on the list that I want to get to, you know, next.

But, I haven't seen a lot of additional commentary on the list of issues or the subject grouping so maybe I heard silence as people thinking that there was not a lot of work to do. But please, you know, definitely take a look at the list

of issues and the subject grouping and maybe as a follow-up to this meeting let me know on the list preferably how much work you think needs to be done here because maybe I'm misreading the sense of the room.

Does that help, Susan?

Susan Payne: Well, I don't know if it's a lot of work. I guess what I'm saying really is I don't know what I need to do so I don't know if it's a lot of work or not so I'm kind of hoping for a bit more guidance on what we're supposed to be doing.

Bret Fausett: Okay so there's - there is a list of issues that has - that we prepared in the fall really with minor revisions since then that purports to be a list of every issue that someone wants to examine in an evaluation as we prepare for subsequent rounds of new gTLDs.

It - again, it doesn't try to answer any policy issues, it just tries to say there's an issue here that people should look at. And so that is a rather long list of issues. And I think, you know, if you look at it it's hard to - it's really hard to find issues that haven't already been identified and put down on paper. Then there's a subject matter grouping which is sort of a newish document.

And, again, there are probably many ways to divide up project management for the next round working group. And ultimately it'll be for that group to decide what subject - how they want to organize this. But this is just one take on how to do that. So, you know, that should be examined as well.

And then there's the summary of our work that needs to be edited. So I think right now it's a - the task at hand for the members and for the members' constituencies that they come from is really to look at the list and say oh you missed this, please add this. So we're not - there's not a lot of writing from the ground up that needs to be done.

There's perhaps some correction, some addition that needs to be done. Again, I think anyone can catch up to the work in probably less than an hour's time so I don't think that there's a great amount of heavy lifting involved. With that said let me move to Alan and then to Jeff.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. If this is introduced formally at the May meeting then it can be deferred once and must be voted on in the June meeting in Buenos Aires. I think that's a bit aggressive because although we have had opportunity for people on the working group to bring it back to their constituencies, and some surely have and some probably haven't, the lead-up to the Buenos Aires meeting and at Buenos Aires is going to be the first time that this is really exposed in a really public way, at least from my perspective.

And I really think that although we may have been pretty inclusive in thinking of everything that could be considered, I think we need some more public exposure. I'm not asking for a formal public comment at this stage but just a opportunity to present it perhaps in public at an open session and we're starting to get close to deadlines for proposing that if we want to do it.

So I think it's too aggressive. I would suggest sending it to the Council in May for their information but not formally introducing a motion to vote on, doing that in June and then voting on it at the meeting in July having had an opportunity for a wider input. Thank you.

Bret Fausett: Thanks, Alan. I appreciate that. And I also think that the - getting it to the Council whether on the motion deadline or just as an advisory I think that that process will kick start debate in the discussions and hopefully in the At Large as well.

And I would expect that we will receive friendly amendments to everything we submit, including the issue matrix, and the subject division as we move forward to a vote. So I'm - my expectation is that once it hits the Council level

and hits the councilors' inboxes as a proposal that we will get a final set of comments.

Jeff, you hand your hand up, do you still have a hand?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, sorry, I don't know how it - I don't know why it went down. Yeah, so I wanted to put some things into perspective here. Number 1 is I don't think we should be discussing in this group when the Council should or shouldn't take it on. I think all we should be concerned about here is getting this stuff to the Council. And when we get it to the Council we get it to the Council when we're comfortable.

And then let's let the Council do what it's going to do. But let's not sit here and debate that, you know, we should get it to the Council so they can vote on it in June or July or, you know, we could spend a lot of time doing that and I don't think it's really worth our time to spend.

Second thing is, look, all this is is a list of issues that we've come up with that should be explored in the issue report. This is no more than that. This is not saying that more issues can't be looked at later on. It's not saying that these are the only issues that will be looked at.

All we are doing is saying this is a list of issues that we as a group have come up with. There will be a preliminary issue report once - or hopefully if the Council decides to move forward with a PDP or - sorry, to request an issue report. There will be a preliminary issue report.

Some of the information from the preliminary issue report will come from what we've done. Some will come from other sources. And then there'll be a comment period for that. People will make comments and then there will be a final issue report. So even if we do get this to a motion at the June meeting or whatever it is, there are still many months to actually - before we start a PDP

when there's a preliminary issue report, a comment period, a final issue report and then the Council decides to initiate a PDP.

So let's not put more weight on this than actually is. Otherwise we'll be the ones that are delaying this entire process as opposed to other external factors. Let's, you know, on the last call two weeks ago, and I'm not sure how many people in this call were there, but we all agreed that we would leave these documents open until tomorrow, the 31st, so that we could have a couple weeks to kind of do a final (unintelligible).

I'm not - haven't seen too many comments on the list about those documents. And I understand people are busy and have other things going on. But at some point we've been doing this group since, what, July of last year or August maybe of last year. At some point we've got to put a close to the group of these issues and then move it to the next step so that we can, you know, take it a step further. Otherwise, we'll be the cause of our own delay. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: Thanks, Jeff. I thought I saw a hand in the Adobe chat other than Avri's before Avri. Did someone have a hand up? Okay, then Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay Jeff just put a whole lot of things on the table. First of all, whether we discuss what we think the Council should do in terms of when it takes an issue up or how it takes an issue up, is a conversation anybody can have so I don't think it's all inappropriate for people to bring up those kinds of issues. Certainly the Council will make its decision about how it does things.

I think one of the things we might want to put into our timeline here is basically a presenting of the issues. Very often in the Council a group that's coming through with something fairly wide and fairly large comes through and does an initial presentation or the staff does an initial presentation, though in this case, it probably should be this group - before giving a motion.

So, yes, there is a way of trying to force this thing and to try and rush it by putting in a motion and sort of trying to force the Council's hand by making it vote within two meetings. But I would recommend that we take a more considered approach and that we, you know, suggest to the Council that, you know, come the May or perhaps later, if indeed it does take longer.

I have an apology to make. I have collected some comments from people. I asked those people to join the list and make the comments directly themselves. I don't know that they've succeeded in doing that. I haven't collected those comments and sent them in but I did have one more day so I apologize for not being there.

There is also the issue that was brought up that for some reason, though I believe it was discussed in the early part, and I do admit that my eye went off the ball for a while, that the issues of developing economy support and all that stuff that ended up an afterthought last time.

What I want to make sure doesn't happen this time is that in the rush to get another program going that we make the developing economies part, again, an afterthought and prove that, you know, this isn't the last chance to add something but at every step of the way we're going to get versions of the speech of, we already talked about this; we already decided this. And therefore, yes, you could put something on the table but really we've already discussed it.

So I think this being the first point we have to make sure that we get those issues in and we get those issues in from the beginning. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: Thanks, Avri. I have some thoughts on that. And - but, Jeff, go ahead, why don't you - I see your hand up.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I think so, Avri, I think we're not saying by submitting those brainstorming of issues we're not saying that here definitely needs to be

another round nor are we rushing to get another round in place. I think what we're trying to do is get a list of questions that should be considered in the PDP.

And I think the points that you raised on the list, and I think I had sent an email asking if you could kind of come up with some wording of questions or if you look at the existing list of questions if the points you've raised aren't already in there if you could just draft the list of questions to put it in there. I think that would be helpful.

But, again, I don't want it to seem that the chairs or anyone else is trying to rush another round. I think what we're trying to do is just keep this process moving in the sense of, you know, we started this six months ago, we're talking about not giving this to the Council for another two or three months which will be about - eight or nine months since we started brainstorming issues.

That's really all we're doing is brainstorming some issues to help the ICANN staff draft an issue report. So I don't think there's any - and I hope there's no preconceived conclusion in the list of questions. And if they're not objective enough then perhaps we can reword them to not make it sound like we are definitely pushing for another round as quickly as possible. So any help with the wording of questions would be greatly appreciated. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: Thanks, Jeff. Steve, you have a...

Steve Chan: Thanks. Thanks, Bret. This is Steve from staff. Just to echo Jeff's point that matrix of issues and questions that this group is raising is really going to serve as the basis for my first draft of the charter so really the more fully fleshed out and thought out these questions are the easier it is to really convert that into the form of a charter which, you know, is really supposed to lay out the scope and the mission for a future possible PDP.

So just echoing that thought that, you know, the more thought that we put into this the better we define the work in the future or suggest the structure of the work going forward.

Bret Fausett: And this is Bret. Avri, to your point about I don't want to hear in the future that we already talked about that and we can't come back to something important, what if we bake that concept into the draft charter and actually say that the attached list of issues is meant to - because this is the way I've always viewed it, is meant to inform the process and provide some guidance for going forward.

But of course if there is a policy issue that the policy development group comes up with that we didn't identify it should not be foreclosed to them to raise it then in the policy development process and add it to the scope of what they're doing. I wonder if that would sort of address that concern.

You know, also I guess hearing Alan and Avri's points about raising this at the May meeting, I very much like the idea of using the May meeting to present works in draft and maybe taking - usually we get 10 minutes at the Council meeting, maybe asking for half an hour to actually do a presentation of what we've done and have a more fulsome debate or a conversation based on what we've done.

And then presenting the motion in June with - as at that point, as Alan raised, if they want to defer they can kick it over to July. I think there are a lot of reasons the Council would want to do this at the public meeting in Buenos Aires and not defer it after that. But at least if there were issues that couldn't be resolved in person at that meeting it would give us the option of kicking it to July. And then we'll use the May meeting as a presentation.

I guess I like that idea very much and that's the way I'd be leaning but I'll leave it to the group as a whole to figure out our strategy. And probably the work that we do over the next couple of weeks will inform our strategy too. If

we can't get our work finished in time for that May deadline then that just sort of takes care of itself. Let's see, Steve.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Bret. This is Steve from staff again. So I think it's an important topic for us to be discussing the timing primarily because if we want to have a public session for this group in Buenos Aires we kind of need to understand the timing. So if we expect the Council to actually initiate or request initial report maybe it doesn't make sense for us to have a meeting together. But if they are intending - or if we expect them to be further than it possibly makes more sense for us to actually have a meeting - for this group to meet and continue debating issues.

So not advocating one way or the other. I think it's probably useful to at least have some kind of discussion so we understand whether or not we need to make a request for a face-to-face session in Buenos Aires. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: Jeff, I see your hand.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I would definitely make the request for a Buenos Aires meeting. No matter what happens I think we can make a good case for it. So if, for example, which I don't think this will happen but if the Council did vote in May to approve going forward with an issue report I think in June in BA, Steve, you guys could present an outline of that issue report and we can discuss that.

If we don't vote until June, or the Council doesn't vote until June, then I think we could still discuss quite work we've done, the issues, the groupings and give kind of a momentum in to start the PDP. So I think in any case we should ask for a Buenos Aires meeting. We should ask that we not have a 7 am or 8 am time, like a actual time where people can make it that doesn't conflict with other similarly - that doesn't conflict with a bunch of other meetings that would attract the same types of people.

So in any case even if we are not done, as Avri points out, even if we're not done there will still be work to do so I think we should request a meeting.

Bret Fausett: I'm all on board. So let's request a meeting and let's requested before the public Council meeting on the agenda. So I think if there is something on the Council agenda we can present it to the group and invite discussion from the community in advance of that. If there's nothing on the Council agenda then it will be a work session. So I like the idea very much of going ahead and reserving a spot now.

Let's see, Jeff, is that a new hand or old hands?

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, old hand.

Bret Fausett: Okay so, Avri, I wanted to move on to the item that you raised on the list over the last couple of weeks. There were some - I guess I didn't quite understand the issue and wanted to see if you could address it a little more completely and figure out what we need to do to accommodate it in the issue list or the issue organization.

Avri Doria: Sure. Okay, and this isn't the last issue that I just sent to the list which had to do with the executive reports. The issue that I think I'm missing, and perhaps, I mean, I keep reading through these looking for it being, you know, somewhere in there the whole - as I say, in developing economies support, that part of the program, that whole part where the program needs to serve comment you know, a global public interest and how we take into account.

This wasn't something we were talking about when the first program went by. There were people like GAC and ALAC, perhaps bringing it up as an issue but it wasn't one that we took in as a consideration.

And so it wasn't in the AGB and it's not reflected anywhere in the program but what sort of our, you know, ICANN strategic goals having moved on to

acknowledge that one of our roles is global public interest that we need to, however we end up understanding it, you know, and I believe we understand it by coming to consensus among our various views and that helps to identify when we've spoken of it seriously.

So that is something that needs to be in our initial request for an issues report is how does a - a new - yet another gTLD program, if one were to be held, how can it serve the public interest? How do we make sure that it does? You know, and certain elements of that are well known and that's, you know, the developing economy and so on which affects everything from our reach to pricing and so on.

So those things have to be fundamental I think in our request for an issues report. In some of the comments made those things were alluded to, you know if they were - said specifically enough, as I say, I apologize, I did lose track of this group for a couple months. And, you know, have had trouble getting back to it now given all that's going on but this is critically important.

So how (unintelligible) for that. And that's what I see is missing. Now maybe I'm just missing it. You know, I mean, IC we're taking specific issues of communities and other rights and that isn't specifically my point, it's the serving the larger global public interest, how are we doing that, how are we keeping that balance going forward into and other issues report? Thanks .

Bret Fausett: So, Avri, thank you for that. I understand the issue much better. And it you asked - or you raised, during that comment four or five "how" questions. I may have to go back and get the transcript or the recording from this meeting. But, you know, would it capture what you just said if we took those, you know, four or five "how" questions and put - and made sure that they were in the issue matrix?

Avri Doria: I had to unmute. I think that they might be base text knowing that I put in lots of ums and (unintelligible) while I'm talking sometime...

((Crosstalk))

Bret Fausett: You know, fully understood. Back in the days when I was...

((Crosstalk))

Bret Fausett: Sorry, Avri, I think maybe we lost you there.

Avri Doria: I'm still here but there's another, I think, Philip also has a microphone on and I wasn't sure I was being heard because I was hearing all kinds of weird buzzes and beeps.

Bret Fausett: Okay, do you want to finish and then we'll go to Philip.

Avri Doria: Yeah, what I was basically saying was that, you know, the wording was obviously messed up. And also there are others that have been speaking on these issues for a while that I'm sure have ways to improve what was said. But certainly it would be a place to start. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: Sure. So I will go back and - back from my days as a lawyer or as a litigator - I used to tell the court reports to please make sure that they cutout the "ums" so I will do the same for you and make sure that those are absent.

But - why don't we get those typed up and then compare them to what's already in the issue report and circulate that to the list, that's an easy action item that we can do in the next couple days here.

Philip, go ahead.

Philip Sheppard: Hi, thanks. Can you hear me now?

Bret Fausett: Yes.

Philip Sheppard: Very good. I think there seems to be potentially a wider issue from what Avri was saying. I mean, as I understand it the work that we've done on this group was - our starting point was the application guidebook, it's principles, it's implementation guidelines and further guidelines. And we also (unintelligible) those questions about, you know, were they done satisfactorily and what issued (rised) from that.

So by definition our starting point is only as good as the thinking that went into the application guidebook. And I think what Avri was raising is one point of a number of things that have arisen subsequently and we've seen how things can be different and worked - thought about an application guidebook. And those are equally important questions. So it's rather changing the basis of our work. So am I right in my understanding that what - how we started in this group and therefore the gap analysis that I have identified.

Bret Fausett: I don't - I certainly didn't approach this thinking that the guidebook was the starting point. It certainly informed the process but it was always, in my - speaking personally now - this is Bret - I always viewed that issues outside the scope of the guidebook were within the scope of what we were doing; that we were free to come up with something completely new and outside the bounds of what had been done before that we really had a blank slate for Round 2 if we wanted to.

And I don't know, you know, now as a practical matter I would expect that a substantial percentage of the issues that had been raised to date were already embraced by the guidebook. And I haven't looked back to see what's inside or outside. But it certainly was my view that everything was open. I don't know if other people share that view.

And, you know, also to say - and, Jeff, I see your hand, I'll get to you in a second - if that's news to anybody and you want to raise something that's completely outside the scope of the guidebook, as you're going through the

list of issues that we're going to add to - and present to the Council please feel free to take that perspective as you look through the next version.

Jeff, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I just want to clarify, the starting point was not the guidebook. And if you read the groupings and if you read the list of issues that have already been come up with the starting point was the GNSO approved consensus policy back in 2008 - well 2008 is when the board approved it. So that's the starting point for the groupings.

And if you read the document you'll see that. And so hopefully everything is within the scope of what that original policy was. And then there is a second tab in the Excel spreadsheet that are issues that have come up since the GNSO policy.

So I think we should kind of - the guidebook does exist, yes, and the guidebook is helpful and instructive and to thinking about certain issues. But the real starting point is the GNSO policy. And I think that' the appropriate starting point because that's the - that's the place where, you know, we had initially given our thoughts.

So - as Bret said, nothing is really out of scope. And do not consider the guidebook as your limitations as to the issues that we can come up with.
Thanks.

Bret Fausett: All right well this has been a very helpful meeting. I know that we have another meeting in two weeks. We're going to try to meet every Monday - every other Monday at this time to work through the various issues and what we have still to come. I see a lot of to-dos on the margin of the Adobe. I know that we'll work on those hopefully this week and get them out to the group so that we can have your input and follow up as we work toward our next meeting.

Steve, I see your hand up.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Bret. This is Steve. I just wanted to react to one of the comments that Philip had in the chat. And so he's saying that of course the GNSO policy had gaps. And, you know, I think one of the things that this - a future PDP working group could do is actually close those gaps.

So if there is the feeling that there's been interpretation in the, you know, in the outcome of the Applicant Guidebook or of the operational execution what could be done is actually solidify and - the policy behind that work if we think - if the community thinks that the implementation or execution is actually satisfactory then they could actually, you know, capture it as policy or if they think that it did not meet the expectations of the community then they could actually develop policy clarifications or if it's completely missed the mark then you actually develop new policy - completely new policy which is if you've looked at the matrix is actually the second tab, New Policy.

So I, you know, this is a great opportunity if - to really expand upon what can be - probably can be considered a broad policy recommendations in the original consensus policy. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: All right well I'll move it on to the all-important all other business item on the agenda. Is there anything else anyone would like to raise? Well hearing nothing and seeing no new hands let's call it a meeting here. Thank you, everyone, for your participation. I look forward to talking to you more on the list and seeing you all back here in two weeks. Thanks so much. Terri, you can end the recording.

Terri Agnew: Thank you very much. (Francesca), if you can please stop the recordings. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END