

**ICANN Transcription  
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group  
Monday 29 February 2016 at 1600 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on the Monday 29 February 2016 at 16:00 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-29feb16-en.mp3>

Michelle DeSmyter: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group Call on 29th of February 2016 at 1600 UTC.

In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken on the Adobe Connect Room. So if you're only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourself be known now?

Thank you. I would like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. You may begin.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks. I guess this is Jeff Neuman. I will I guess kick off the call. Everyone should see the agenda on the Adobe chat room. So we've already done the - well, skipped the roll call. Are there any updates to anyone's statements of interest? Then maybe Steve Chan if you could help me. Have most people filed their statements of interest or are we still missing a few?

Steve Chan: Thanks Jeff. This is Steve. For the most part people have been pretty good about completing their SOIs. But it's one of the very few requirements that is in place for participation in the working group. So for those that have not, the limited few, I would encourage you to please do that as soon as you can. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. And as I think we said on the last call, if you could please do so this week. Otherwise if you're listed as a member, we'll drop you into the observer category until such time that you do your statement of interest and then you can go back to being a member.

So what we thought we would do first is just introduce the Leadership Team and just tell you a little bit about ourselves and then if you guys have any questions about us.

I want to thank everyone for the nominations and for supporting us. The three co-Chairs are myself, Jeff Neuman; Steve Coates; and Avri Doria. And some of you are familiar with all of us. So just I'll do a little bit about myself and then I'll turn it over to Avri and then to Steve Coates.

So I've been around for a number of years now. I guess I'm considered one of the old timers. I've been around since prior to when ICANN was formed. And I've participated in some fashion in every single new round of gTLDs since they were first introduced. The new gTLDs were called in 2000.

I participated in the 2000 round when I was an employee at NeuStar where I was there for 15 years. And we applied for .biz and then subsequently was the backend operator for .travel and a couple other top-level domains.

So I also participated in the next new gTLD process that kicked off in 2005 or so where Bruce Tonkin was the initial Chair. And then Avri, who will introduce herself in a minute, was the - when Bruce went to the Board, Avri took over and was the Chair at that point.

I was not on the Council at the time so we were only allowed on some of the sub teams that was a working group of just the Council if I remember correctly.

So I left NeuStar last year in 2015 and joined a company called Valideus and Com Laude. We are a corporate registrar as well as a consultant company that consults with new TLD registries, mostly brand registries and registries that are open restricted.

So with that, let me turn it over - Avri, are you on the phone?

Avri Doria: Yes I am. Can I be heard?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Go on Avri. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay. Okay. Hi. Yes. So I'm Avri Doria. I'm a member of the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group and have been for a while. At the time that I was on the Council initially, I was a NonCom Appointee.

And basically what we had then was we did PDPs often by a taskforce, which was composed of the GNSO Council as a committee of the whole. And basically as I became Chair after Bruce left, I ended up basically chairing the end game as it were of the process. Most of the discussions had already gone on and we were down to coming to agreement on various issues. So that was that.

I served in the Council twice; once for five years and a NonCom Appointee and then once for two years since just ending last year as NCSG, a Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group representative.

I'm an independent research consultant; have my own little research - I don't know whether it's a business, an enterprise, a startup or what have you. I

have various clients that are both commercial clients and non-commercial clients for whom I do various research always having a clause in my contract that says when I function in working groups, I function as an independent entity.

And basically I say what I say, I do what I say and if they don't like it, they'll fire me. And mostly I haven't been fired. In fact I haven't been yet. But anyhow, that's who I am and I'm happy to be able to work on this. I'm not quite as much an old timer as Jeff. I basically got involved after 2005.  
Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Avri. And I actually forgot to mention which constituencies or stakeholder groups I'm in. Currently I'm a voting member of the Registrar Stakeholder Group. And then we represent some clients that vote in the Registry Stakeholder Group. So I'm a Contracted Parties House side. Steve Coates, if you want to introduce yourself please.

Steve Coates: Sure. My name - you guys can hear me, right?

Jeff Neuman: Great.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Steve Coates: Okay. Cool. I'm at home right now. So I often have technical difficulties that I wouldn't have otherwise. So apologies. Steve Coates. I'm currently at Twitter where I've served as Associate Director Legal for a few years now.

I am in charge of our intellectual property, marketing and the main practices as well as Internet policy. I've been a member of the Business Constituency for about two years now and that's about as long as I've been active on - at ICANN. So I am the newest member of this team.

Right now I am serving on the 2016 Nominating Committee and also active on the BC on various other subcommittees. Within the (new) gTLD space I'm obviously participating in this working group. I also participate on the Internet Committee at INTA, the International Trademark Association. And I've spoken widely on this particular topic.

I'm both passionate, personally and professionally, about the next round, whatever that may look like. So I'm very excited about it. Prior to in my work at Twitter, I worked at Amazon, Senior Counsel on the Trademark Team.

And while I was not directly responsible for the gTLD process there, I was - sat on the sidelines and watched it all happen. So not nearly as experience as my co-Chairs. I bring maybe a slightly different experience on the commercial side.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Steve. And as we noticed and I - we all have two Steve's that are working very heavily in this group. We have Steve Chan with ICANN staff who's our lead ICANN staff person on this and Steve Coates.

So both are Steve Cs. So if you missed the very beginning, we're going to call Steve Coates either Coates or at Twitter Steve. And Steve Chan will be Steve Chan I guess.

So as you can see, as Avri post, we have a pretty diverse Leadership Team. It's weird to refer to me as the old timer but I guess I'll get used to it. So with that said, are there any questions for any of us, the Leadership Team? I'll just give a minute - or not a minute but a few seconds for people to raise their hand. All right Khaled, you've got the floor.

Khaled Koubaa: Yes. Hi. I'm so happy to hear that (unintelligible) on leadership and that at least we have an old timer, new timer and new timer but I think - I'm sure that you guys will do great.

My question in fact is how do you imagine you three - three of you the purpose will be between the three of you to make sure that there is no - there is no blocker in - of the processes or decision making so the working group can (go fluently).

Jeff Neuman: Yes. That's a great question. And I guess I'll start and if one of the or both of the other co-Chairs want to jump in as well. I think, you know, what we're going to do is we're going to take turns leading and chairing the meetings.

So I guess I'm on board for chairing this first meeting. And then Avri will take the next one and Steve Coates will take the third one and we'll do a rotation as best we can at least initially.

And then, you know, we're planning on having leadership calls every week or at least before the main call so we can discuss division of work and discuss our ideas and then make sure that we're representing the working group.

And of course if anyone feels like they have any questions or if we're not doing the group justice and then feel free to raise that with any one of us. So Avri, you or Steve Coates, do you guys want to add anything to that?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. The only thing I would add is that once we have the team leads for the various (rings), then, you know, we'll be including them in those pre-call and to make sure that, you know, when we go after, you know, to the next meeting that we are all ready and such for that meeting.

And I think over time as issues develop, you know, we may find that among ourselves one or another of us will take a point on a particular issue or process; depends on works out. But we would always do it in cooperation with the rest of the Leadership Team. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Avri. And great points. Absolutely. Steve Coates, you want to add anything?

Steve Coates: Sure. This is Steve Coates. I've always taken the approach that, you know, when I'm in a leadership role and a process such as this that I view my role as shepherd. And so Khaled, as you made the point about making sure that there are no blockers, that's exactly how I view my role is to make sure that things are shepherding through the process as quickly and as efficiently as possible; still being proactive on making sure we are doing the work that is necessary.

When I do have to put on a hat, I will make it very clear that that hat is on behalf of Twitter or on behalf of, you know, the leadership role that I will fulfill here. And so there won't be any lack of clarity for whatever position that has to be. That's generally my approach.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Steve Coates. Does anybody - Khaled, you still have your hand up. Do you have a new question or is that an old hand? Okay. Does anybody else have any questions? Great.

So moving on to the next subject. It's talking about times for future calls. And we did a doodle poll. We had pretty good participation in the doodle poll. And two things came out of that poll. First thing is that Mondays seems like a better day than the other days of the week so that kind of came out on top.

And on time rotation, it seemed that most people preferred kind of a one-to-one rotation between this time, which is 1600 UTC and I think it's 2100 UTC. Let me just double-check that real quick. Or Steve - oh, sorry, 2200 UTC. Thank you Steve Chan.

So hopefully that is a good representation or at least it gets - everyone's got a good time or that we share the pain equally on the time. If that turns out not to be the case, then we can move things around.

We'll try to schedule out for a little bit and then see what we can do. Because we do have a good distribution of participants from all around the world, which I think for me is exciting because a lot of the groups I've chaired in the past had very much participation from maybe one or two regions and not that much from others. So I'm definitely happy that we have a good participation group.

So with that said, we are this week or yes, the end of this week a lot of us are heading to Marrakech; not all of us but a lot of us. And we will have a face-to-face meeting in Marrakech next week.

We figure that we'll take off the following week and then resume the next call of the working group on I believe it's Monday the 21st if I'm correct on my Mondays of March. So it is not the week after we get back but the week after that. So yes, Monday the 21st of March.

And then our initial thinking is that we will have calls weekly. But as I said on the last call, it's very possible that once we break out into sub teams on certain topics that we may have the larger call once every two weeks so that will give you time to meet with the smaller sub teams and work on individual items. So with that said, is there any questions on the schedule going ahead?

We'll spend - I'll talk a little bit about the Marrakech meeting towards the end of this call. So I'll discuss what's going on there. Okay. So - and oh, sorry, forgot to mention the - the length of the meetings we're going to start it out with I believe hour calls or sorry, hour and a half calls.

And if we need to shorten them, it's, you know, we can obviously shorten them up if we don't need as long. But it's good for people to block out that time. Any questions on that? Okay.

So with that, I'm going to turn the meeting over to Steve Chan because I think at the end of the - at the end of the meeting - last meeting Steve Chan went

over some items that I thought were pretty important to repeat because it seemed like people were dropping off the phone.

And it also seemed that, you know, I really want to give a good background on not just the work that we're going to do but some of the work that's also going on too currently and how we interact with those other groups whether it's the Consumer Choice and Trust Advisory, the review team or whether it's other PDPs.

I think I wanted Steve Chan to go over that a little bit more and then also discuss some ideas he had on the initial work plan and how to finalize that. So I see in the chat - yes, in 2200 on March 21 is when we'll resume the next official call of the group after the face-to-face next week. So Steve Chan, why don't you take it over and go from there.

Steve Chan: Thanks. Thanks Jeff. This is Steve Chan from staff. I just want to run through a few slides. And so this first one is actually just a repeat from last week. And I think it's probably worth showing again. As Jeff mentioned, we kind of ran through these slides with time being an issue last meeting.

So once again, these were the five groupings the discussion group defined. They also served as a basis for what was included in the issue report and also with the charter.

I don't really want to go into a ton of detail but, you know, underneath each of these five groupings is a number of different individual subjects. Some like overall process support and outreach issues have far more subjects than something like international domain names Group 4.

So just a brief reminder on the organization of the subjects; but what I want to spend a little more time on is the organization of work. This text is actually pulled directly from the final issue report. And so why it ended up being in the

issue report was it was a reaction to a number of comments from the public comment (stack).

So a number of readers of the preliminary issue report, that is they found it difficult to perhaps track issues or find where they are in the issue report. There seemed to be overlap between issues. And there's also not necessarily a logical progression from subject to subject.

And so this organization of work that was presented as a possibility for how this working group would organize its work - this was presented as a possible option within the final issue report. And so I did speak to this briefly during that first meeting but I'll go through it a little bit more in detail now.

So as you can see from each of these bullets, it suggests subjects or potential subjects that could fall within each of these groupings. And so Question 1, should there be new gTLDs subsequent procedures is kind of a foundational question that should be answered as quickly as possible.

And it might not be possible to get to a definitive answer because perhaps certain things like the outputs of the CCT Review or the Competition, Trust and Choice Review. The findings from that may actually impact the outcome of that discussion.

But the idea is to try to frontload the questions that this group considers with high level questions that may have downstream impact. And so that second one - so if yes if we want to have new gTLDs in the future, then what are the high level principles that should govern the program?

And so some of the questions that could be considered are should there be TLD types or should there be rounds or should be an ongoing program. We could look at how to enhance predictability for the process, whether or not the applicant guidebook is the right mechanism for the implementation, possibly accreditation programs.

And so the thought is that Number 1, these are kind of foundational questions but they're also possibly good questions to answer collectively as a group. And so once we ask some of those questions, it kind of trickles down into some of these more detailed questions that follow in Section 3.

So for instance, if you have TLD types, then that may affect the application process for different types of TLD types. It could impact the evaluation process. It could impact the base registry agreement. So there's a number of impacts that may result from that high level discussion in Section 2.

So this Section 3 where we're talking about the details, this was just a proposal that staff put forward. It could perhaps match what the discussion group divided the group; it could more follow that grouping. It could be something entirely different. There could be something missing. But again, this is just a proposal that staff put forward in the final issue report for discussion purposes.

And so moving down to Section 4 just to touch again on - so I could see things in this section being something like the base registry agreement, perhaps the application fees. And so a number of things that require a lot of the baseline work to be completed before you can actually address some of these items.

And then finally in operational and miscellaneous you could have things like systems and communications and things of that sort. And so staff saw some benefits to this approach in that it allows the working group to stay together for a little bit.

And we see that beneficial as it will probably integrate members, especially new members into the working group process better. It'll lead to some familiarity among the working group members and develop some cohesiveness perhaps.

And so the hope and the thought is that it wouldn't significantly slowdown the work of the group. And it would also not prevent the working group to split up into subgroups and some point, which logically could be Section 3 there.

And so this approach is also - it tried to narrow the focus on certain - of the high level subjects to avoid the overlap issue that I had mentioned that was identified in the preliminary issue report comments. I think that's all I had on this page.

And so again, this is a basic framework that could be altered for this working group's purposes if they disagree with this approach. Before I move on to the next slide, just want to see if there's any questions about this proposed approach. Seeing none, moving to the next page.

And so this is the topic that Jeff touched on in his previous comments. So there's a number of different efforts - new gTLD efforts in the community at this point. Chief among them is perhaps the Competition, Consumer Choice and Consumer Trust Reviews as mandated by the Affirmation of Commitments, Section 9.3.

And so proceeding - so this group actually just started their work. I think they are on their fourth - third or fourth meeting now. What preceded them actually beginning their meetings was a number of reviews that were conducted to - sorry to provide data for that group to consider.

So they - the existing reviews are around rights protection reviews, the TMCH or the Trademark Clearinghouse program implementation reviews, security and stability reviews and then a number of data and points around Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice and finally a DNS of these.

Staff is also aware of the SSAC having some efforts underway and (Julie) from staff would also probably have more detail on this than I would. But they're reviewing guidance that they've already provided to see that how it was integrated. And they're also considering how to develop perhaps new guidance. We're aware that the GAC has some new gTLD related efforts for community applications, underserved regions and geographic names.

There's a CWG on the use of country and territory names as TLDs so that's country and territory names at the top level. There's also a PDP that was recently initiated at the last council meeting on rights protection mechanisms that working groups or sorry, that PDP is still awaiting a charter so it hasn't actually begun its operation.

I'm not aware I guess I'm not exactly what the ALAC might do - ALAC might be doing but thankfully we have the ALAC chair on this call so (Alan) might be able to provide some detail there. And not to put (Alan) on the spot. And of course we'd be interested to identify other efforts that might be going on in the community.

So it's important to remember that the GNSOs are solely responsible for gTLD policy development. So it's this working group's responsibility to consider all these efforts in developing its recommendations. And so moving back to the CCT or the Competition Consumer Choice and Consumer Trust Reviews at this - they had a face to face in Los Angeles I believe it was last week and they identified a liaison to this group. And that's Carlos Raul Gutierrez. And so we might want to consider as a working group whether or not other liaisons might be warranted to help us keep our work coordinated, integrated and keep each other informed.

So as I mentioned that so we're able to as a working group to make sure we integrate the work of these other efforts. And so actually just to touch on the PDP on RPMs again, our Registered Protection Mechanisms it's spelled out

in our charter and I believe their charter as well that there should be a liaison between those two groups to again avoid overlapping work.

Some just to take - see if there's any questions again to pause for a moment. Seeing none moving on to the last slide. So there's - these are the possible next steps. There's obviously other ways we could go. But I think what we want to try to do is to agree on the work organization approach whether it's something similar or exactly like the way it's presented in the final issue report. I think it's good to have some conversation about how we want to proceed.

And then once we agree on that work organization approach I think it'd be up to staff and the co-chairs and perhaps other volunteers who might want to participate to basically try to assign the subjects, the approximately 38 subjects identified by the discussion group and to put them within that new work organization structure. And hopefully they have a logical home for each of the subjects. And if they don't then perhaps that's a good way to identify some holes in that framework.

And then so once we have the work organization I think it'd probably be which I think is probably a precursor to really being able to develop a work plan. And that work plan of course would take into account the things that I mentioned on the previous slide. We would want to be able to integrate these outside efforts and to make sure we have checkpoints identified to be able to make sure that we consider those outside efforts.

And one last point that in some conversations with the co-chairs they identified a good starting point for us might be to consider the existing recommendations from the 2007 final report because I think I'd mentioned this probably many a time in many meetings. But those existing recommendations are in place and perhaps if this group were not to come up with any recommendations those recommendations from 2007 would still be in effect.

And so I think it would be or I guess the co-chairs would also agree we think that those - starting with that as a basis to make sure that we understand the existing recommendations might be a good place to start. And so that's I think all the slides I had. I'll hand it back over to Jeff. And Jeff also his hand's up too.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks Steve Chan. And we will come up with a better nickname. So that's maybe one of the tasks of the working group, the first one. I just wanted to mention because there was some comments in the chat which I think we're good. And that is to the extent that when we normally kick off a PDP at least in the past couple of years or so we've sent out notices to the GAC to see if we can get participation from GAC members.

So we know has a call gone out to the GAC yet or is that something that we'll mention at the Marrakesh meeting? Do we have any participants yet in the working group from the GAC do you know? Steve Chan?

Steve Chan: Sorry, getting off mute. I don't believe we have any participants from the GAC. I'll have to take a look at the distribution again. Can you go ahead and move forward and I'll go ahead and take a look? Yes, it's part of the PDP process as you mentioned to reach out to the GAC and to other groups. So let me take a look and see if we have any participants at this time. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Great. So that's a good point. (Liz) has raised it on the chat. And if we don't have any yet we will coordinate with Mason Cole who's the GNSO liaison to the GAC, the GNSO Council Liaison. And so we'll coordinate with Mason. But I do know normally the GAC gets at least before every ICANN meeting if not on a more often basis gets kind of an update on the PDPs that are starting or in place and looking for a volunteer. So we were all trying to get some additional participation if we can. And so with that I want to turn it over to Alan's got his hand raise so Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Yes when I checked a few days ago there were several GAC observers on the group but no participants. I happen to feel really strongly that we need active people working on this. We know they cannot represent the GAC but similarly many of us do not formally represent our own groups. We just have some idea of what's important to our groups and that may satisfy them in the end when we go forward.

We just can't have a repeat of what happened last time where there was continual involvement with the GAC between the GAC and the GNSO and the GAC simply said we stated our principles, make sure to follow them and then everything blew up at the end.

We really need more active participation. And I for one have put it on the agenda for the ALAC GAC meeting to raise the issue with them because I just don't see how we're going to come out with something that won't blow up unless we have a lot of interaction. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Alan and thanks also for putting that on your agenda for your discussion with the board. Avri?

Alan Greenberg: Excuse me, with the GAC.

Jeff Neuman: I'm sorry, with the GAC, yes. Sorry, my words are getting mixed up here. Yes, with the GAC. The ALAC meeting with the GAC, thank you. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, this is Avri speaking. Somebody mentioned Mason in the chat. And that's the thing with what I wanted to mention is I know that the GNSO GAC group has some early procedures to follow specifically on getting notifications of issues and such to the GAC. I don't remember the details at the moment. I'll review them before the next meeting.

But certainly working with Mason in his role as liaison to the GAC to make sure that we're plugged in to that whole set of connection points that have

been established by the GNSO GAC group is something that we need to do.  
Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Avri and there's definitely support from a bunch of people in the chat for that or on the list. Carlos?

Carlos Gutierrez: No I don't - this is Carlos. Thank you Jeff. I don't want to repeat what Avri said. There is a formal procedure for early participation of the GAC on issues considered to be of public interest or they should be involved in this discussion of the different boxes Steve showed us. And that should proceed according.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Thank you Carlos. Is there anyone else that has got any questions on that? And I'm looking there's a good chat going on so I'm trying to read those. But it seems like everybody is on Adobe and not too many people just on a call. So just let me - give me a second here (Mary), great. Okay, yes.

So we will talk to Mason. I'll put that on my list to talk to Mason, make sure he's fully briefed on it and to start those early procedures right away so that we can, you know, as early as Marrakesh next week, see if we can get some interactions started. Great and on that and as we finish going through the slides one of the things I wanted to address during this call is - and it sort of was brought up by - indirectly by (Robin) a little bit earlier.

So, you know, just to remind everyone and one of the things that we're going to really spend some time in Marrakesh discussing is that this, you know, at least initially we're not starting from a blank slate. There is existing policy from the GNSO on the introduction of gTLDs. And while we're going to spend a bunch of time evaluating those what I thought we would do in Marrakesh is go over the principles and the guidelines that the GNSO had come up with in their final report in 2007. And I know that's a long time ago. It's nine years ago that it was presented to the board.

But I think because that's existing policy and that was approved by a consensus and approved eventually by the board and I will say used by the board in theory for all of the implementations in the application guidebook and beyond that policy is still good. So that policy at the time in 2007 which Avri's going to do an overview of at the face to face in Marrakesh really has a bunch of principles in there, things that still are pretty non-controversial. You know, that new gTLDs should be introduced in an orderly, timely and predictable way, that some gTLDs should be IDNs or internationalized domain names.

So there's a lot of just generic policy principles, recommendations and a little bit more specific implementation guidelines. But for those of us that were involved in 2007 or before know that we really didn't get into the implementation details as much as we should have. So on the base question of or the foundational question of should there be new gTLDs at this point the policy is that there will be new gTLDs. And we could - we'll go over the specific language in the approved policies in Marrakesh.

But, you know, unless this group by a consensus believes otherwise then the default answer of that is yes there will be new gTLDs. Now again there's nothing preventing this group from relooking at that issue. And if by consensus agrees that that's shouldn't be the case going forward then, you know, we can cross that bridge. But at this point all the principles for right now are considered still in effect.

So we try to operate I guess on a basis of precedent debt. And so the good news is we're not starting off on a blank slate. But, you know, if people do want changes to those high level principles and recommendations and implementation guidelines then that's something that a consensus of the group needs to agree to. So with that I just want to you know, see if there's any questions.

I don't know if someone can post a link to the 2007 final report in the chat or at least in the notes when we publish the notes from the meeting. But if we

can do that so people can before that face to face meeting can look at those policies. It's - you know, given the length of a lot of the final reports that we have and even this last final issue report on new gTLDs, the final report from the GNSO is actually not that long.

And principles, recommendations and implementation guidelines are fairly straight-forward though obviously with a lot of things that happened were subject to a lot of interpretation. So one of the goals I think is to with a lot of those principles I'm sure there'll be new principles. I'm sure there'll be new recommendations, implementation guidelines or at least modifications to those.

Hopefully we can do and hopefully we can be a lot more clear so that less things are subject to interpretation by staff or other you know, the GAC and other groups. Hopefully we can drill down on those. So I think that (Julie) has posted the link as Steve has as well. So is there any questions about that? I see Alan's got his hand raised. So Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you Jeff, just wanted to point out the implications of not getting it right. Last time well as we all know the quote implication, the designing the guidebook and then the follow-on activities - excuse me, after the release in response to GAC advice was painful for all of us. But with the new policy implementation rules that are in place it's going to become a lot more painful.

Things that the board did essentially on their own with community input last time will pretty much have to go back to the GNSO for discussion decision by the community. So the implications of if we don't get all the details right and satisfy all of the parties to at least some extent are far more onerous than they were last time. I think it's just important to keep that in mind as we go forward. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks Alan. And as (Robin) has pointed out, you know, some would argue that the principles, the some of the principles weren't implemented or

at least in the fashion that the GNSO had assumed they'd be implemented so that's something to discuss. And, you know, the silver lining on what Alan has said even though it's going to be a little bit more painful I think the silver lining is that we have experience now and know how some of those provisions were interpreted by others and have the opportunity to at least correct them if we think that they were not implemented correctly. So Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes I just - this is Avri speaking. Hopefully my microphone is a little louder. People did ask. I think one of the things to be considered - and I was going to talk about this a little when we meet next time is that the method that we use now in the GNSO for PDPs is different than it was. Then we basically have lots of discussions and only put high level statements in the PDP itself and the policy itself.

These days we've learned our lesson and we've gotten far more into explaining and going into the detail. And I think even if we were to keep the policy exactly the same which is not something I would bet on We would still find ourselves wanting to basically clarify what some of those very general statements from the last policy actually meant and their implications. So I think that's one thing that's very different in PDP processes within the last decade. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Avri. And I see there's a question from (Phil) on the chat that says co-chairs do we have a target date for completion? At this point we don't. We're just getting started. I think some of that is going to have to do with, you know, what this group feels like on the foundational questions and, you know, and how much discussion we need to get into on those subjects.

There was kind of an initial cut early on around the final issue report time of, you know, how long PDPs generally take. But I think one of the things that we're going to work on after we go over the foundational issues and see where we stand on those is to finalize that initial work plan that will have a target date for the release of different milestones including the what's

required in the - in all PDP which are at least initial reports and a final report we may find that we want to do additional types of reports out for public comment than just those two required which the policy development process allows for.

Plus we may find that we want to establish or get advice from expert groups or experts. And that's also allowed in the PDP as Steve Chan went over the last time. So at this point we're just getting started. I don't want to put any date in his hand at this because I don't think we can. And we also do need to consider the inputs of other groups like the Consumer Choice and Trust Review Team which I know has a goal of putting out I believe an initial report at the end of this year. So I think we're - I'm side-stepping the issue on timing because there's a lot of work ahead of us. And hopefully after we address the foundational questions and are able to get into some of the substance and the work plan we'll be able to come up with a date.

I see (John)'s on there with a good comment about a survey of 2012 applicants. I think that's a great idea if that's something that working group feels like it wasn't to do. I think there may be a time later on that we come up with some specific set of questions that we can ask the applicants. But I think also there may be questions that we want to ask not just the applicants but potentially those that filed objections, those that filed or those that were involved, I guess they're applicants were in the shrink contention obviously

But we may want to see if there's any comments by the providers, the dispute providers or contention providers, whatever we want to call them. So there may be a bunch of different questions we want to ask of a number of different groups. I think that's a great idea. Anyone else have any questions or comments? Just trying to read through the chat, see if we picked up everything.

And if people - you know, there's some really great comments in the chat if they want to bring them up, you know, on the call or want to talk about it lets -

we should get that out there. It's hard - there's a lot of people on this call chatting. So (Mary) just commented on the use of implementation teams which are - which there was a PDP previously that approved implementation teams in the GNSO. So if there's a question on a GNSO policy that involves question on implementation that is supposed to go back to the GNSO for resolution. So anything else in the chat that anyone else wants to cover?

Okay, so I mean I - there's, you know, there's really no reason to keep everyone on for longer than we have to. I just again want to say that in Marrakesh and if Steve Chan can just post the time. It's kind of early in the morning. So unfortunately if you're going to be remote dialing in from let's say North America it's going to be pretty early. If you're dialing in from Europe or Asia you're probably in a lot better time zone to dial in from.

But we're going to spend the bulk of that time going over the foundational principles, recommendations and the implementation guidelines line the 2007 final report, see where we kind of stand on those, what kind of clarifications if any need to be made on those and really move forward towards finalizing an initial implementation plan.

As Steve Chan has posted the next meeting is in Marrakesh on the 10th of March from 9:00 am until 10:30 am local time in Marrakesh which I believe is UTC. So again apologize for those that are going to participate from North America. It'll be quite early. So does anybody have any last questions or comments?

Man: All good.

Jeff Neuman: Great and see there's - is there an agenda for the Marrakesh meeting? We'll put out a specific agenda (unintelligible). But basically it's really going to be spending the bulk of the time going over the 2007 final report and you know, the - what - you know, what precedent's already been set and then talking

about the initial work plan. So it's really going to be that - doing that work.  
Great. So Steven Chan, do you have anything to add?

Steve Chan: Thanks Jeff. This is Steve Chan from staff. No, I don't think so. I think you covered it all. I - actually I guess one quick thing I would say is it seems like we coalesced around the more or less the approach that was described in the slides. So it seems like staff and the co-chairs can start working on developing the organization to work and then subsequently also the initial take on a work plan. So I just wanted to say that and confirm that and make sure I understand that correctly. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks Steve Chan. We will obviously put that out. The co-chairs will meet. We'll talk about it and we'll put it out for review obviously from the whole working group so that we have everyone on board. And we'll go over what we have in Marrakesh. So we did make it in an hour. And as Carlos has said everyone have a safe trip although sorry, let me ask, Avri or Steve Coates do you guys have anything you want to add?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I don't.

Steve Coates: No, I'm good. Thank you Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Great. All right thank you everyone and we'll see a lot of you in Marrakesh either remotely or in person. And if not we will talk to you on the 21st for our next call.

Woman: Thanks everyone. Bye.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thanks bye. Safe travels everyone.

Jeff Neuman: Bye.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you. Today's meeting has been adjourned.

END