

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO New gTLDs Subsequent Rounds Discussion Group
Tuesday, 26 May 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 Tuesday, 26 May 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-26may15-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Bret Fausett - RySG
Dietmer Lenden – RySG
Avri Doria – NCSG
Philip Sheppard – BRG
Stuart Fuller – RrSG
Susan Payne – IPC
Phil Buckingham – Individual
Ken Hansen – no SOI
Kristina Rosette – RySG
Jeff Neuman-RySG
Volker Greimann –RrSG
Steve Coates – BC
Greg DiBiase-(status in progress)
Mason Cole-RySG
Cecilia Smith- no SOI
Stephanie Duchesneau-RySG

Apologies:

Tijani Ben Jemaa – ALAC
Alan Greenberg - ALAC

ICANN staff:
Glen de Saint Gery
Steve Chan
Lars Hoffmann
Nathalie Peregrine
Ozan Sahin

(Jewell): The recordings have (already) started. You may begin.

Ozan: Okay, thank you, (Jewell). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening.
This is the discussion group on New gTLDs Subsequent Rounds call
on the 26th of May 2015. On the call today we have Volker Greimann,
Steve Coates, Susan Payne, Greg DiBiase, Mason Cole, Avri Doria, Philip
Shepphard, Stuart Fuller, Bret Fausett, Kristina Rosette, Dietmer Lenden.

We have received apologies from Alan Greenberg and Tijani Ben Jemaa and
Lars Hoffman, Steve Chan, Nathalie Peregrine and myself, Ozan Sahin
as ICANN staff. I would like to remind you all to please state your names
before speaking for transmission purposes. Thank you endeavor to you, Bret.

Bret Fausett: Oh, thank you very much, (Hossan). This is Bret. Let me kick it off here and
now that we've had the roll call, ask if there are any updates to statements of
interest that anyone would like to point us to before we get moving.

Well, hearing on and seeing now the chat, let's move right onto business.
We're getting down to the end here of our work. I thought we would start off
by giving (Steve Chan) the chance to talk us through the latest set of
documents that we've got. And then we can get comments and contributions
from people online and here on the call.

And then I'd like to talk about next steps and talk about how we get from here
to Buenos Aires and what contributions we need from the members, the
discussion group, between now and then. So (Steve), I'll turn it over to you.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Bret. This is (Steve) from staff. So as Bret mentioned, I just want to walk through the changes that we made to the three documents, and let me go ahead and un-synch this.

So the first document that we have appear is the executive summary. The changes were relatively minimal and they start on, I believe, Page 4 is the first substantive change. And the essence of this change is - all right, one second. Looking at my notes here.

So the first paragraph that's added - or sorry, the first redline update on Page 4, it talks about the fact that the discussion would recommend a single (ish) report and subsequent PDP.

And so this would not preclude sequencing the work or creating subgroups within that single PDP or other methods to work an AC -- I can't even say it but -- so basically to keep it - the worker organizing together but it doesn't precluded being worked on separately.

And so the sentiment was first acknowledged and noticed, I believe, in the ICANN LA meeting. And so I think the benefit of keeping things together is it helps keep the topics together and sometimes interrelated in ways that we may not acknowledge at the outset.

But it gives the group a good chance to work and look at the issues holistically. The other big factor is that it's likely to be less resource intensive, both from a staff and also a community perspective with - I think it's important to consider with IANA and the accountability treks still moving forward.

With that all said, it's ultimately up to the council - I think (Jack Newman) had mentioned in an email, so that if they prefer to go with multiple-ish reports, they can do so, but this is our recommendation, at least as far as I understand it from the sentiment of this group. Before I move on to the next

update, just start out to the group to see there any questions or comments or concerns.

Bret Fausett: Yes, I watch the participant list as (Steve) is going through these and look for any raised hands. If you're not on the Adobe, then just go ahead and jump in.

Steve Chan: Thank you, Bret. This is (Steve) again, and it's a little harder to work on one screen. I'm used to having two, so thank you for monitoring the chat room for me.

The second change is, it talks about sort of the next steps a little bit, tries to give a little bit of a path forward. So basically if an (ish) report is requested, what happens afterwards?

And so at first notes that there is going to be a substantial amount of work from staff's perspective to be able to analyze all the issues that were raised and that are both available in the charter as well as in the matrix.

And so every one of those issues is going to need to be fleshed out and analyzed and written up into - and included into the (ish) report. And so I think another thing that we'll want to look at from a staff perspective is also to try to think about, the thing I had mentioned earlier, is how the work is organized and sequenced.

If there are issues that are more important than others, if some things need to be addressed before others, if things were - and so all the set of questions to determine if we think there's a path forward that makes more sense to work.

And you may end up being more than one recommendation of how we think of future PDP could operate. So those are the two major additions to the executive summary. Once again, if there any comments, please let me know.

Seeing none, I think we can move on to the - actually I'll just speak to - I'm not going to put in the matrix because it's not conducive to this form factor. It's enormous and doesn't that in (an AC room).

But very little has really changed in the matrix. What we did was just sort of clean it up and make sure all the formatting is consistent. And Jeff Neuman had mentioned that we were going to try to normalize the text but there wasn't really much of that that was needed and it's a pretty consistent voice.

It's generally presented in a pretty even headed manner. And so the co-chairs and staff really found very little to change in that. But he said, more than - other than really just cleaning up the documents.

What was added were a few things from - and so I'll jump ahead to the charter a little bit now. Philip Sheppard had made some changes to the document. And so what the co-chairs and staff had is some of those suggestions were more so to reaching conclusions and suggesting what the solution might be rather than providing the topic for a future PDP.

And so what we did was we tried to kind of keep the voice and the charter very consistent and make it more about topics that are for consideration. At the same time, those topics that - or the issues, I guess, that Philip brought forward were - those were actually added to the matrix and that's why I brought these two things up together.

We obviously don't want to lose track of the concerns he brought up but we want to put them in the proper form. I'm just going to leave that for now and see if there're any comments, and the meantime, I'm going to put up the charter in the Adobe room. And, Bret, if you have any comments or questions please...

Bret Fausett: No, I think that covers a well. So I - well those are going up, I did see Avri - I saw your contributions on the list this morning just before the call. I thought those were fine. I talked to Steve. He's going to put them in.

I think that's exactly what we need from the group. That kind of contribution is exactly what we need from the group as we wind up our work. You know, I would ask everyone to read through it again and see if there are things they need to be rephrase or additional bullet points added because I think we're really to the fine-tuning and polishing at this point. Go ahead.

Steve Chan: This is (Steve) from staff and just to try to highlight some of the things that changed in the charter, one of the things that we added - I don't remember exactly the text because I can't find it right now but there's a new sort of topic related to (ID variant) TLDs.

This is that at the request of the ICANN staff that's in charge of that project. I'm working on the exact wording but just - I want a group to know or be aware that that's actually been added as a topic for discussion.

There are still holes, actually, for compliance and the global public interest, and so is possibly a suggestion for clients, maybe could say something to the effect that no issues were identified but the topic could be considered in scope if concerns are raised or arise the future because as far as I understand, nothing was specifically raised.

It was just kind of a general question whether or not there were concerns are not and to consider them. But I don't think anyone had a specific issue they wanted included.

See no comments or questions, moving on to the next - so the public interest, we were hoping for a little more specifics related to this one. The ICANN board resolution had some text related to that and that could be included.

So basically they said that the existing policy advice does not define the application of public interest analysis as a guideline for evaluation determinations. So it basically says that public interest was not woven into the evaluation methodology.

And it also suggests that issue such as GAC advice, safeguards, PICs, or public interest commitments, and questions around contractual commitments and enforcements could be considered in this topic as well.

And we also had a suggestion from (Liz) to try to focus the discussion of that, it should be constrained to the context of ICANN's limited technical coordination role, mission and core values.

So I know that - and I mean to call out Avri directly but I know that this was near and dear to your heart so if you have suggestions on what might be included or what should be included here, we would love to hear them. If not, I can propose some language and maybe we can get your comments on proposed language instead. But once again, I'll turn this open to the group for discussion or comment.

Bret Fausett: Avri, do you want to elaborate on your comments in the chat? I didn't quite understand it.

Avri Doria: Right. Thanks. This is Avri speaking. First of all, yes, I'm willing to help with - I draft some language before, and all of a sudden, when you started talking about it, I had this horrible moment worth on I might've had an action item that I forgot about. So I may actually have already said yes I would do it once and not done it.

And if that's the case, apologies. But I'm willing to do it whether I write the first crack of language or the other. What I was basically saying is that we can take what the board wrote and put it in almost verbatim.

I mean, perhaps change a statement to a question and come you know, do a little bit of your neutralizing magic on it to make it an issue to be dealt into, but I think of that really (goes to) say what needs to be said. Thanks.

Bret Fausett: All right, thank you. Anything else?

Steve Chan: This is (Steve) from staff. So I believe that's really kind of the collection of changes that the co-chairs and staff have made. And having not seen any feedback, I really, really want to encourage you if you have questions or comments, please bring them up now. I think it's imperative that we get feedback from the group and hopefully acknowledgment that these documents are close to and hopefully very soon to be agreed to by the group and able to be moved forward in the next steps of the process.

Bret Fausett: Which is a nice segue into where we want to go from here. I've got a timeline for the group and then a question of the group. The timeline is that we wanted to present our work to the council at the Buenos Aires meeting. I believe the Council meeting is June 21st.

Man: Twenty-fourth.

Bret Fausett: Twenty-fourth, okay. Thank you for that. So that we have a ten day motion deadline in advance of that which would put us at June 14th. I think we should probably try to finish our work a few days before that just to make sure that there aren't any last-minute issues.

And I think the council would be appreciative if we can get our work done as soon as possible rather than if the motion deadline which most things do. But we can get it done before that, great.

So I think we ought to look at that first week of June to finish which gives us a couple of weeks here, maybe a week and a half, two weeks, to figure out how

do we - the process should we follow to say, yes, this is the consensus of the group, this is the work we want to put forward to the council.

We've had a - we can call vote. There must be a way of doing a vote online, Doodle Poll, something like that, that we could you just to get people to say yes, we support moving this forward to the council.

I'll open it up for a question there. That's my question - what process should we use to sort of get a sense of the room that this is what we want to move forward? Any thoughts on that?

So maybe will be how to do here is see if anyone has an objection, and then if there's no objection, we'll move it forward as a collective work of the group. They may be easiest. And then, of course, if they are any objections, just let us know what it is and we'll try to take a count of it so that we can get that objection turned into support. That would be my hope. So (Jeff), go ahead.

(Jeff): I was just going to ask - I know it's been a while since we were all - joined this group but did the constituency stakeholder groups, advisory committees, did they take one person to represent them?

And I can't remember so I'm going to have to go back to the registries, registrars to figure out if they appointed someone. But it would be good to make sure that at least one person from each of the respective groups response to that survey. We can have more people respond but at least one from each group would be great.

Bret Fausett: Yes, I will say that we never asked the constituencies to task an individual with participating. So it may have happened in individual constituencies. I don't believe it happened in the registry constituency.

Well, I know it didn't happen in the registry constituency, and I don't know whether other people are formally representing their constituencies or not as a liaison. But we never asked for that's take place.

(Jeff): Perhaps - yes, it would just be good. I'm all for the survey. I would love to see at least - I would love to see people from a good cross-section of the community that are on this group to respond and say yes, let's go forward. That would be stronger.

Bret Fausett: Yes, I agree. I agree. So I think what we ought to do here at the end of today's call is recirculate all of the documents back to the list and with the request that you both review it for or support or objection, both as you, the participant in the group but also please forward it to your constituency group if you come from one and ask them for any final contributions as we move forward.

Yes, Philip asked that clean documents be circulated. I agree with that. Let's circulate clean copies and then I believe the redlined versions will be in the media Wiki if people want to take a look at - we can provide a link to that if people want to go back and see, you know, the historical documents.

Steve Chan: This is (Steve) from staff. I see Avri has her hand raised but actually just wanted to interject real quickly, just to put little more context on that. So I think we can circulate documents very quickly.

There are couple changes I want to make, adding in the section about the compliance public interest that I'll work with Avri on directly. And will get those around to the group very quickly. And then, you know, so all the things that you guys mentioned, circulating to the groups.

And to put it in terms of a deadline, I'm not sure what you might have had in mind, Bret, but maybe sometime that first week of June, the - Wednesday is the first or somewhere around there or maybe the end of that week.

Bret Fausett: I'm looking at my calendar here so when you think we'll get the revised documents out, the clean version, get that out to the group?

Steve Chan: As quickly as I can work with Avri and I know Avri is a...

Bret Fausett: Okay, so then we'll get those out in the next couple of days and then looking forward to June, we want to finish this up by, say, June 10th. Maybe we ought to ask - maybe five Friday, June 5th, for statement of objection. And, of course, the statement of support would be very welcome to, but particularly were going to call for objections. And I'll send a formal email out to the group for that.

Steve Chan: I'm sorry, Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Oh, thanks. This is Avri (unintelligible) in this, especially (unintelligible) a group like mine that complains when there are two any attachments. It would also be useful if, in the (email), you included the URLs for all the documents that you had is attachments so that I can forward without attachments and without spending the time researching all the URLs. That would just be helpful. Thanks.

Man: Avri, you broke up a little bit but I think you want a link to where you can find the documents rather than the attachments because people in your interest group don't like attachments.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) with attachments or (unintelligible) with attachments is great. It's when I have to forward things on to the rest of the group I prefer that they had URLs in there and I'll drop off the attachments.

Man: Sure. We can do that. Yes.

Steve Chan: And this is (Steve). That she just gave me a - or reminded me of something that needs to be done. It's also that the matrix and the charter, they need to be added in - or I guess combined in a single document as an appendices so it's a little bit cleaner, too.

Bret Fausett: So I think that's it. We probably ought to have one more meeting here before we meet in Buenos Aires, so let's think about maybe Monday, June 8th as the last meeting between now and Buenos Aires.

That will be the Monday following that, you know, call for objections, statements of support but a couple of days in advance of what we want to get a motion to the council. So I think the goal of that Monday, May 8th meeting will be to review a draft motion for the council and hopefully it'll be short.

Probably a half hour, but I'll have the ICANN staff send around a notice on that one. Let's see, any further comments, questions, interjections before we went up for today?

Do you have anything, (Steve)? Okay, well, hearing on, seeing none, thank you all for your participation today. We'll send around the documents that we talked about here. And (Hossan) and Nathalie, you can wind up the call and stop the recording.

END