
**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group
Monday, 08 July 2019 at 20:00 UTC**

Note: 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:

https://icann.zoom.us/recording/play/GcE4x3l0znZ4O9ZoFUnCnboxaqkvHq_7xgd-YO6N1U_njp-Qifb6fYwE1PqC33ryd

Zoom recording:

https://icann.zoom.us/recording/play/WpcuypSNAuTIXIS9puZJa1MW2qEsl3WDq-6HzmB9Bot2PjAnYSe9lOcp_yFDMwCq

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page:

<https://community.icann.org/x/a4qjBg>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

ANDREA GLANDON:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call, held on Monday the 8th July 2019. In the interest of time there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. If you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourselves be known now? Thank you. Hearing no names, I would like to remind all participants 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. With this, I will turn it over to Jeff Neuman. Please begin.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Thanks, Andrea. Hello, everyone. Welcome back. Hopefully, everyone that was in Marrakech had a safe journey back, and maybe some days off. I myself just got back into town yesterday, so if I sound a little tired, it's because I still have a little bit of jet lag. But, anyway, we're going to dive right into where we left off. We had some great meetings at ICANN 65, so we'll do a quick update on that, followed by getting right into one of the topics we had meant to cover, but we had a group discussion on other topics there, and did not quite get to this one in particular.

So, that's on the delegation rates. And then we'll get back to the global public interest, which is what we had started just before ICANN 65. So, is there any other business that anyone wants to add at this point in time, or shall we just wait until we get to that point? Okay, not seeing any. Are there any updates to any statements of interest? Okay, I don't think I'm seeing any. I know Jim is typing in a topic, I think. I think that's any other business, as Cheryl said. Jim, type that in and we will add it. I also just want to remind everyone, and I'll do it at the end of the call as well, that this is the first week we're starting twice a week calls.

So, we do have a call, it is not a mistake, and you should have an invite for a call that is on Thursday, in most parts of the world. I think it might be another day for other parts. But anyway, it's been posted up on ... Thank you, Julie. Thursday 11th July, at 03:00 UTC. Okay. So, with that, just a quick update from ICANN 65. So, we spent the bulk of the time talking about ... At least, I should separate this. There were several sessions on Work Track 5.

So, there were two sessions on Work Track 5. We're going to not talk about those on the call today, since Work Track 5 still has their separate calls. But then there were two sessions for the full Working Group that we had. One session followed the Work Track 5 sessions, and then one session was held on the next day. So, recordings are available to listen to. The first of the two sessions that the full Working Group had was a great discussion, I think, on ICANN Org. The GDD staff in particular had drafted what they called an assumptions document to begin their preliminary planning for the next round of new gTLDs.

And they published a copy of that assumptions document just prior to the meeting, and we spent the first full session at ICANN going over that document, getting a presentation from Trang, from ICANN Org, as well as discussing that assumptions document, the purpose of the document, and the fact that where we've had questions or comments on those assumptions. That assumptions document is not a Working Group document, that is an ICANN Org document. So, at this point, we are not planning on going through that document again as a Working Group, but they have invited comment on that document.

I guess I don't know if there's an official link to send comments to that document. Maybe Trang can just put into the chat, or someone can put into the chat, where comments can be delivered to. It is not a Working Group PDP comment period, because it's not a policy document. But, certainly, I believe that they are, according to what they said in Marrakech, taking comments this month, in July, and next month, in August, and their hope is to put a revised document together so that they can be presented to the board at their September retreat, in very early September.

And as Jim said, it was a great session. I think there was a lot of back and forth with ICANN staff, and I think it was probably the type of dialogue that we hope to have going forward, even in this policy group with ICANN Org as we get to the point of developing final recommendations, and certainly hearing ICANN Org's view on feasibility of any of our recommendations. So, I think from a couple different standpoints, number one, from a planning perspective, it was a great session, but also from the perspective of getting ICANN Org engagement in our discussions, and encouraging future engagement. I think it was very beneficial, and certainly something worth listening to, as Jim says. And Cheryl, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Jeff. I just wanted to add to what you've said there, noting that Cyrus and Trang also took the time to socialize this paper with the GAC and with the At-Large Advisory Committee. And we were in the room for those actions and interactions as well. And I think this sort of proactive work that's going on certainly is one to be recognised and recommended. Thanks.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Thanks, Cheryl. And I wanted to note that there's a question from Paul that says that there was some talk about the GNSO Council doing a response to the assumptions document. And a question of, will this Working Group also be responding to it? Maybe we can take a couple of minutes to just see if this is something the Working Group wants to do. Because it's not supposed to involve policy issues, it wasn't something

that leadership had talked about doing a formal response. The only things that have come up are potentially maybe some of the assumptions that were made.

We're talking about delegation rates, for example, today. If we come out with something very different than what the assumption was. But I think at this point we're still in the discussions. We haven't taken any consensus calls on any policy recommendation. So, the only real comment I think we could have is something to the effect of, these assumptions may be changed due to the outcomes of this Working Group, but they've already put that into the assumptions document anyway, and acknowledged that.

So, is this something the group feels like it should respond to? And if so, are there specific items that the Working Group feels like it would be appropriate for us to comment on? So, Paul put into the chat, and I'll read this until ... I'll read the chat, unless anyone wants to jump in as well. Paul says "Timelines would affect it too I suppose since staff won't want to ramp up until it has to. Maybe you and Cheryl can just send your thoughts to the council on whatever jumps out at you." And that Cheryl says, "I am unsure that the PDP Working Group needs to respond, but maybe the advisory committee supporting organizations may wish to." That's Cheryl's personal opinion, I think. Yes, that's what it says.

And Martin posts a question about what the council expects to say about that, which would be interesting to hear as well. Again, I want to remind ... From my understanding of what this document is, and I think Trang is on this call. At least I thought I saw. But, yes. The purpose of the document is just for preliminary planning. It's not to set things in

stone. It's not meant to override any policy recommendations. And so, while I certainly can foresee a bunch of comments, and I heard some during the Marrakech meetings, about jumping the gun and doing a bunch of things. I think one thing that is important to keep in mind is that ICANN started this preliminary planning process, ICANN Org, for the 2012 round, back in 2006, thinking that it was going to be in 2009. So, it's not like they intended the planning process to take six years. But still several years prior.

So, Paul has responded, saying "I'm fuzzy on the details. This is in regard to the council response." Oops, keeps jumping on me here. And Keith may have suggested that constituencies and ACs respond instead. He's going to check. And then Anne says the assumptions re: the dependencies are not sufficiently summarized in the staff document. These include GAC and SSAC advice already on record. We went over some of those in the Barcelona face-to-face. In addition, the assumption regarding a window opening annually does not have sufficient support as far as I know, and is significant.

Steve responds saying that I believe the council expects an update from GDD before determining if and on what they would respond. Okay, so Anne is correct that we have not gotten final, or even close to final, recommendations yet on some of these points, that assumptions are made. So, that is something that we'll be discussing in the next couple of weeks on windows and things like that. So, again, I'm not seeing, I'm just looking ... Okay, Jim, please. Jim, and then Alan.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Yes, thanks Jeff. So, the thing that's not really clear to me, and I'm not sure if it was really clear in Cyrus' mind and others, about what is the feedback mechanism for this document? I think this group maybe formally asking for more clarification around that may help further inform whether or not this group does need to respond, or whether, as some folks had mentioned, it's SO, and AC-led, or individuals weighing in. I don't have a firm sense on how that's going to work. The only thing I do know is that they are trying to wrap this up in August. So, getting that clarification from Cyrus and Trang would certainly be beneficial. Thanks.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yes, thanks, Jim. That's a great comment, and we'll take that as an action item. Leadership will send a note to Cyrus, and to Trang, who's on this call anyway, just asking what is the best way to get comments to them. And we'll post that out to the group. And of course, we can let our respective constituencies and advisory committees know. Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you. The only thing I think that we really have an obligation to get back to them on is if there is anything in their assumptions which is counter to where we believe the policy will be going. And/or if there's anything in it which just, to use the old expression, doesn't compute. The presumption of an annual round, and not knowing how long it is going to take because we don't know how many applications there'll be, is something that we could certainly call attention to.

But the only things I think we really need to say if there's anything in their assumptions which are just different from our current assumptions. We

also could give them warning that things might go in a different way, depending on how our discussions go. But the errors that they have, really, if we see any, we should note. Other than that, presumably they are paying attention to our policy discussions and will take note themselves as we start making decisions that are counter to what their assumptions were in the plan. Thank you.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Yes, thanks, Alan. And I think, as you've said, even though Trang's not on the call, as Steve just posted, they are monitoring our progress, and they will update their assumptions if they see that we are heading in another direction. You know what, I think leadership can take this back. And maybe just a statement saying that we're still in discussions on some of these topics that are within your assumptions, and include things like the annual window assumption, as well as the delegation rate assumption. And maybe there's a couple others.

And not stating anything about which way we're going to go, but just stating that there's still topics under discussion, and it may be premature to assume one way or the other in terms of those particular subjects. I think for the most part, most of the assumptions in there do not involve or touch on topics that we're really talking about. But there are a couple that were just mentioned, like as Alan said, the annual window, and the delegation rates, that are something that we're talking to.

So, I think that that's perhaps as far as we can or should go. Because I don't want ... And I think what I'm trying not to do is get this policy group too focused and wrapped around those assumptions because it'll just

distract us from finishing our work. So, I don't want to spend a huge amount of time on it. But let me go to Kavouss, and then I think we'll cut off this document. We'll go to Kavouss and read some chat comments, and then we'll go on to the next subject. Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, good morning, good afternoon, good evening. I put in the chat, I'm asking why ICANN Org is rushing. They talked about assumptions, they talk about borrowing money from here and there, giving back the money to other things. What is the reason behind that? They simply are not completed the situation. Why are they rushing, why they want to start something? What is the issue that from the time that Akram Atallah has left, and now everything is a rush? What is the situation? Could you please explain, or ask ICANN what is the reason behind this rush? Thank you.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Yes, thanks for the question, Kavouss, and I will give my answer from what I understand, and then I think I'm sure ICANN, if they disagree, could weigh in. But from what I understand, if we go back in history, for the 2012 round, which they had thought at the time was going to launch in 2009, these types of preplanning activities, making assumptions, going out and looking at outside vendors, planning budgets, looking up which things they would outsource, which ones they would do in-house, building systems, those types of things started to occur in 2006.

So, at that point is when, even though the policy wasn't quite done, it wasn't finished until 2008 ... Well, it wasn't approved by the board until

2008. ICANN staff knew that it had to start its planning activities several years prior, in order to have everything up and ready for when the community was ready to have TLDs. So, the great thing, and we mentioned this during the session in Marrakech, was that ICANN did this in a vacuum in 2006. They didn't publish any assumptions. They didn't let the community know how their planning activities were going.

And I think the great thing in this process, at least better than the last time, was that they are letting us know what they're thinking, and they're letting us see what is going into their planning process. So, from that perspective I think it's a great thing, that they're letting us see their thinking and planning activities. So, I don't think anyone here really thinks it's rushing, so long as they're not making these policy decisions and planning on launching before a lot of their dependencies are achieved. Including the work of this group, and the work of the community on a guidebook, and things like that. Let me just get back to Alan, and Kavouss in a second. Let me just read some chat things that we missed.

Let's see. Martin said the assumptions would be tested as we progress our work, and GDD can adjust these where needed. The important thing is to have some helpful exchanges and dialogue along the way. Then Anne asks a question. Did we talk to the GAC focal group on Subsequent Procedures? The answer is, sort of. Cheryl and I were invited only to give an update to the focal group as to where we were, and what our activities were going to be going forward, and on a timeline. At that point, they had asked Cheryl and I to leave, and I think they continued their meeting. The GAC focal group did.

So, I'm not sure what was discussed after we had left. Cheryl and I had certainly volunteered to keep them in the loop as much as they had wanted, but it's really up to that group to let us know if they want our assistance, or how they can best get involved. So, that was really the extent. I don't know. Cheryl, you want to add anything on the focal group? Nope, okay. Sorry. Going back to the chat, then. Oops, it's jumping on me again here. So, Katrin asks, I understand GDD will amend their assumptions once we advise them and move forwards in the process.

Yes, Katrin, they did say that, but the "we" in there, I just want to point out, is the community. It's not this Policy Development Process Working Group. So, it's not us, in this group, that needs to advise them. Although we could, if that's something the group wants to do. Heath says, on the assumptions that aren't settled, we can encourage them to layout conditional statements, such as if this is an assumption, then we'll need to do this, and the action. Paul agrees, so long as it doesn't turn out that we are bound by any unchallenged assumptions. I think that's right. Heather says that we have to hope that this doesn't equate to taking six years to get a final AGB guidebook.

Heather agrees it's not rushing. And, let's see. Jim then says, to the GAC focal group's credit, they already have a preliminary scorecard for advice on SubPro. We only saw a glimpse, but they are organized early. Yes, Jim, that's correct. That scorecard's been ... I believe the GAC has been drafting that scorecard for a number of months. And I know during one of the sessions in ... I want to say Kobe, the GAC had asked Cheryl and I during one of the sessions if the Working Group was heading in certain directions on some of those topics, and, of course, we can only discuss with them what was in the preliminary report on those subjects.

So, I do know that they are working on that scorecard, and hopefully will ... I would love for them to socialize the scorecard with us prior to it becoming GAC advice. This way we can work some of those things into our process, as opposed to waiting for something more formal. But that's up to the GAC and their processes. Sorry, Alan. Let me go back to you. Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I was just going to make a comment on Kavouss' question that I agree with the answer you gave, but I think the converse is the interesting one. If they weren't doing anything ahead of time, when we finally came up with a policy and it was approved, and then they started to think about it, they would be strongly berated for being caught by surprise, when this process had been going on for years. So, it's simply good business practice if they think there's a reasonable probability that we will eventually launch another round, to start thinking about how to do it. So, I think they're simply doing their job in this case. Thank you.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Yes, thanks, Alan. I have Kavouss in the queue, and let me see if there's anyone ... No, Kavouss. And then I'm really cutting this off and we'll go into the delegation rates, which is one of their assumptions.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, I have no problem with the preparation, but my question is that this preparation should be based on something yet to be finalized. So, if the preparation is independent of what we are doing, I have no difficulty. But

if this preparation is based on some assumption, but we may not reach that assumption, or we may not comply with the assumption, or their assumption may not comply with what we are doing, then I have problems. That is my question. I have no difficulty with any preparation. I know I have listened to Cyrus Namazi at the ICANN 65. It mentioned everything.

So, that is the situation, I think. Their assumptions should be compatible with what we may come up after, and should not say that yes, we have done these assumptions, and we have difficulty to what you come up. So, I think they have to adjust themselves to what we're finishing. Any assumptions they make should be reviewed and revised if necessary to comply with the outcome of our meeting. That is [inaudible] something. With respect to the GAC focal points, that was discussed, but still I don't know how these focal points will work, how many people there are there. I'll give you one example. Too many generals, but no soldiers. Thank you.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Yes, thanks, Kavouss. We'll certainly wait to hear about the focal group in the coming weeks and months. Anne has posted a question, and then I'm going to go onto the next topic. But Anne has reminded us that the GAC did have advice asking for a cost-benefit analysis, and asks how the board responded to that and did they delegate to the GNSO? And my understanding is that ... Well, actually, I don't know the answer to that question, in terms of what the board is doing with the GAC advice. I know that we, this policy group, has not been delegated with any of that. So, that's the only answer I really have at this point.

Okay, let's ... Sorry, the air conditioning turned on, so if that becomes too loud, just let me know. But let's move onto the next topic, which there's a link in the document. It's on delegation rates. And the reason I picked this one is because it was in the assumptions document, and so, I thought while we were talking about the assumptions document, it might be helpful to move onto that topic and then continue on with the regularly scheduled progress that we were making on the public interests section. So, this should be posted any second now. The link that Julie just put into the chat that everyone can click onto.

And Steve is now posting, thanks, Steve. So, this one subject is under root scaling, even though the assumption was called delegation rates. But the topic is called root scaling, and it's one subject in the overall subject of security and stability in the application evaluation section. That's where this delegation rate subject had first come up. And it was discussed originally way back when, in Work Track 4, that was led by Rubens and Cheryl if I remember correctly.

And so, we had a community comment number two on delegation rates, was one subject, or root scaling. And then we had some preliminary recommendations in the initial report. We also solicited specific comments from the SSAC, the RSSAC, and ICANN Org, in the form of both the OCTO, the Office of the Chief Technology Officer, as well as from GDD. And we got comments from all of those groups. And so, what you will see from the comments from those groups, and the few other comments that we received, I think from the registries. I'm not sure there were many other groups that had comments on this.

This is where we think ... Well, what we said in the initial report was that the 1000 delegations per annum was set by ICANN Org for the 2012 round, and the technical community determined that 1000 delegations per year would not pose a security and stability threat. But it's important to note that the technical community did not seek to determine a maximum delegation rate on the basis of security and stability. So, in other words, really what they said is that they couldn't come up with an exact number, but they really, in 2012, or before that round, said it was really up to ICANN and their operational ability to do not only the evaluations, but all the delegations.

And ICANN Org had come up with the 1000 gTLDs, and the technical community said fine, we think that that's not going to pose a security/stability risk. And there's a link to that paper. And that's why we had put that into the initial report. So, moving on then. Oops, let me just make sure there's no comments.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Jeff, I have a comment.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Okay, hold on. I see Kavouss' hand. Kavouss, is that an old hand?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I think we are going too fast. We are still talking about the cost and benefit analysis. I raised the point with the chair of the GAC [inaudible] ICANN GAC 65, and I said that whenever we raise a question, we should provide [ways and means how is that action] to be taken. No answer was

[given.] I asked the board whether they have reacted on the GAC Helsinki advice paragraph [inaudible], and there was no answer from the board. And that advice was many times before we come up.

So, some of those answers, cost and benefit analysis align with what we have come up. We have given what is the reasons we have the second round even. So, I think we should have either an answer from the board, what is their reaction with respect to GAC advice, paragraph [inaudible] Helsinki GAC advice. Or [inaudible] ask the GAC what sort of actions they expect to be done to have that cost and benefit analysis. It's a very complex issue. I don't know, what is the way that we do this cost-benefit analysis. Thank you.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Okay, thanks, Kavouss. And that relates to the last topic. We can pick an action item to see what has been done, if anything, on that, but that is really at this point a matter between the board and the GAC. So, we'll take it as an action item to see what has happened. On this topic, Kathy, please, you have the floor.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Thanks, Jeff. Our Working Group documents seem to be leaning towards more than 1000 delegations a year, despite that it says, based on ... And I'm looking the initial report section 2.7.6. Based on the SSAC analysis, the ICANN Org committed to delegate no more than 1000 gTLDs per year. So, while certainly, some groups would like to have more than 1000 per year, we're seeing this topic of rate pop up under many categories. And so we're seeing it under a concern from in the community, that we

discussed in an earlier meeting last month, or whenever, that there are groups that want to see limits on the number of applications because the idea of 20,000 at a time would be absolutely overwhelming for community participation, in terms of comments and objections.

Here, as a technical and operational question, there seems to be an underlying assumption. I'd like to talk about it with you in the group. That we could easily do more than 1000 delegations per year. And I don't see the basis for that. NCSG had a sit-down with SSAC in Marrakech, and we asked them this. And they were surprised that anyone was thinking of more than 1000 per year, and that they were being cited for the proposition that there would be, and could be, and should be, more than 1000 delegations per year.

Similarly, with ICANN operational staff, I went to both the presentation in our Working Group and the presentation before GAC, and there, too, we're looking at systems that were based on the concept of 1000 delegations per year. Not as an absolute cap. I understand from our senior vice-president of engineering it could go to 1,010. But the idea of going significantly beyond that apparently would make costs exponentially high. So, I was wondering if we brought those experts onto this call. And who's actually told the Working Group, or the ICANN community, that we can go beyond 1000 delegations per year? Thanks.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

So, thanks, Kathy. And that sets the basis for the rest of this discussion. So, if you would look further down. Excuse me. So, Work Track 4, which, had discussed this issue in great detail, I guess this was over a

year ago now, before the preliminary report came out. There were a number of discussions with technical people as well as policy people, just looking at the notion from a purely technical ... And that's not to say community review, or anything like that, but from a purely technical perspective, could the root handle additional delegations?

And the responses we got back from both the SSAC and the RSSAC are in the what we've listed now as high-level agreements. But before we get to that, I just want to make sure everyone is okay with the policy goals, and what we're seeking to accomplish. So, we do have a recommendation already that the gTLD program should be introduced in an ongoing, orderly, timely and predictable manner. That's nothing new, that's actually from 2008. Second policy goal is that the primary purposes of new TLDs are to foster diversity, encourage competition, and enhance the utility of the DNS. And the third policy goal is that new gTLDs should be delegated into the root zone in a manner that minimizes the risk of harming the operational stability, security, and global inoperability of the Internet. All three of these policy goals actually came from 2008, or the 2012 round, but the 2008 policy. I don't think those policy goals have changed at all. I think we still have to make sure that whatever we decide to do fits within those policy goals.

Now, on the high-level agreements, and this is where we really start getting into the meat of the 1000, and what it really means. So, when we were reviewing the comments, which includes both the SSAC paper and the RSSAC paper ... And I just want to emphasize that it's really the RSSAC that has concerns with, and primary oversight over the root. Not the SSAC. Although, the SSAC is, of course, made up of highly qualified

technical security personnel, really this comes ... If you were to look at the comments or give weight to the comments, really the RSSAC ...

Certainly, if the RSSAC had come back and said, yes, we can't do more than 1000, you would not second-guess that and that's pretty much the way it is. But if you look at the RSSAC paper, and what I think we would agree with, because it is the RSSAC that's making the statement, and the comments that came back to the initial report were in support of that. It said that in delegating new gTLDs, the Working Group agrees with the RSSAC, a trouble-free access to the root zone is one of the very few things that are critical for all Internet users, and therefore ICANN should honor the principle of conservatism when adding new gTLDs to the root.

I think that's not anything controversial. I can't imagine ... Although I'll ask if anyone disagrees with that notion. That quote was taken directly out of the RSSAC paper. That said, the Working Group generally supports raising the delegation limit from no more than 1000 TLDs per year, subject to the recommendations below. So, let's get to the recommendations below. As mentioned, or as recommended, by both the SSAC and the RSSAC, if you click on those links and go to their papers, ICANN should focus on the rate of change for the root zone, rather than the total number of delegated strings who are given per calendar year.

Instead, it would be better to think in terms of changes over smaller periods of time, for example monthly. Again, this all comes from the RSSAC paper, and the SSAC does agree with the RSSAC. ICANN should continue developing the monitoring and early warning capability with respect to root zone scaling. This investigation should be completed

prior to increasing the number of delegations in the root zone. So, this was a recommendation from SSAC 42. I think it's 42, someone can correct me if I'm wrong.

But it was also initially recommended by the RSSAC. And then, in this part we quote here, "the Working Group supports the following additional recommendations of the RSSAC, namely" ... And the first one is, "the rate of change is more important than absolute magnitude. Based on historical trends and our operational experiences ..." This is a quote from the RSSAC paper. "The RSSAC strongly recommends that the number of TLDs delegated in the root zone should not increase by more than about 5% per month, with the understanding that there may be minor variations from time to time." And then they say, "while there are many DNS zones larger than 10,000 and 20,000 records, the root zone is uniquely a shared resource upon which all Internet users rely. For this reason, the RSSAC believes it will continue to be important to limit the rate of the addition of new gTLDs."

Again, when they talk about rate, it's the rate of change, not necessarily a flat number of 1000 per year. So, Kathrin posted something on there. So, I have a chart. There is a chart at the end which we can go to, which you'll see. 5% each month. If you start with increasing ... In other words, if you start with 100 per month. If you started with 100 TLDs that you could delegate within a month, then, of course, that's just kind of taking 100. I suppose you could start at 80. Whatever you started at. And if you increase that 5%, you would see that in one year, a 12-month period, you could actually do 1,591. And by the end of the second year you could actually have cumulatively 4,449. And by the end of three years you could have, cumulatively, 9,582.

So, in theory, if there were 10,000 applications, you could do those in a little over three years. This all comes from the RSSAC chart itself, the formula that they had used. So, again, we're not making this up. This comes directly from the RSSAC comment. If you scroll back up to the high-level agreements. And then we'll start ... Just look at the queue. Sorry, I have not checked the queue. Sorry, Kathy. You're in the queue.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Jeff, so what I heard you do was set aside the SSAC in favor of the RSSAC, and I don't think we can do that here and get to the agreement that you say, because I don't think we have an agreement to go beyond 1000 delegations a year. Again, SSAC meeting with a good part of SSAC, they were shocked. They were surprised that they were being cited for the proposition that we could go significantly beyond that. ICANN Operational, in its presentation to us, talked about 1000 delegations a year being part of its assumption.

And again, then privately in discussions, that the costs would soar significantly if we go beyond that. You've heard from the community, from the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group, I believe from the GAC in the past, and others, that responding to more than 1000 a year, because we have built-in responses, and we have built-in comment periods, and we have this built-in oppositions, that 1000 a year is a huge amount. That will keep everyone busy.

So, I don't think we can dismiss this, and I don't think we have the agreement that you say we do, and I don't see why the priority is to go beyond 1000 a year. That's a lot. That's going to be an enormous amount

of work for the communities that are involved in working on it, and for those who are processing it. There's nothing from ICANN staff. And again, the SSAC prepositions, the SSAC papers, tell us that they're anticipating a fixed number as well. Where beyond RSSAC do you see that ability to go beyond, and what justifies going beyond 1000 delegations with all the other considerations involved? And how do we reflect that there is concern, and that we have heard, again, from ICANN Operations and others, that this is what they're building into their assumption? 1000. Thanks.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

So, Kathy. I have to ... And I'll state this again. Please go back and re-read the SSAC paper. They agree whole-heartedly with the RSSAC. I can't explain why you had a presentation from a couple of SSAC members that said anything otherwise, but if you read the RSSAC comment, and, Steve, if you can post the link, the SSAC does agree with the RSSAC and I can read you the language in the SSAC official comment that we got, which is an SSAC official statement that says, "ICANN should focus on the rate of change for the root zone, rather than the total number of delegated strings for a given calendar year." And then they quote the RSSAC report. And then they say, "the SSAC belief that it is wrong to talk about specific numbers was also pointed out in a letter from the SSAC to the ICANN board on July 2nd 2012."

And then they go on, and they talk more about the RSSAC statement. So, this is not against the SSAC statement at all, in fact, it is completely in line with the SSAC statement. Now, Kathy, if you have concerns about the community's ability to evaluate 1000 applications, that is a completely

different subject than technically the maximum number of delegations. And I'm not saying we shouldn't have that discussion, and I'm not saying that's not a legitimate discussion, but I think we need to stop citing purely technical concerns that the maximum number be 1000, when the technical community, the RSSAC, who's responsible for the root, and the SSAC, who agrees whole-heartedly with the RSSAC, according to their own comment, they are saying that that's not the case. That 1000 was kind of not ever their advice.

So, from a technical perspective that the root can't handle more than 1000 delegations, we need to move away from that. And if there are, as Paul says ... And maybe I did say it was completely different. I'm just saying that it is ... If there is a concern from the community that we shouldn't do more than 1000 because of a community's ability to evaluate, that's not the same things as saying that the root can't technically handle more than 1000. I think we need to be very clear as to, if we are going to set the limit, what that limit is based off. So, I have ...

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Jeff? Can I respond? This is Kathy. So, SSAC thinks they're on record with 1000, and certainly the materials under the initial report that we put out cite SSAC for delegation rates of 1000 a year would not pose a security and stability threat. And again, ICANN Operational believes that they are building systems for 1000 a year and that that's what they can handle. And the community has raised issues of the rate and number. So, can we bring somebody from SSAC here?

Why don't we bring someone from SSAC to talk with us about what appears to be somewhat conflicting views on their part, and some ... Not through interpretation of those of us here, but Again, non-commercial asked the question of SSAC directly, face-to-face, and got a different answer, and that was just in Marrakech. So, before we make this decision, how do we bring them here? Thanks.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Yes, thanks. So, two things. Number one is that we did pose this question to ICANN Org, and they did respond that they could handle more than that if they scaled up to it. So, I'll have to go back and find those, and we'll find the ICANN Org statements. So, let's not be reading things into what they said. Again, I want to deal with the things that we have specifically before us. And on the SSAC, the problem that we have is what Rubens posted in the chat. SSAC communicates through their official documents, not through any one individual person, not even through the Chair. So, we could certainly ask someone from SSAC, but they would have to stick to what is said in their comment. Again, I'm not sure why, Kathy, you got something different. And I'm not sure if that's recorded, so I'd love to listen to the recording of the NCSG discussion if that's available.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

I don't think it was recorded. I checked that earlier. But they referenced their own documents as well. So, can we bring someone in from SSAC to work with us on interpretation of their documents? And can we bring someone back in from ICANN? Because again, they're the ones that raised the limits. Before we second-guess these limits, which is what

we're in the process of doing, how do we A, document that there is divergence on this, and B, that there's possible great cost, and other implications? Thanks.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Again, the official ICANN documentation that we have, which we can ... Oh, sorry. Someone want to get in?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Can we mute the other lines, please? Okay. So, sorry there's some other people in the queue, but what I did want to say is, as GDD, OCTO did file a statement with us, I believe that is cited in here as well. I think it's in there in this document. If not ... Because I can't scroll through this. Please read the OCTO comment as well, as it does support the notion that the 1000 is not necessarily a hard and fast limit. But again, we'll take this offline as to whether the SSAC or someone from the SSAC could come in and handle questions.

But I think the important thing is to look at the words. We're not interpreting anything, those are actual quotes in there, from the RSSAC statement and the SSAC statement. So, what I'm trying not to do, Kathy, is interpret anyone's words, other than the actual literal words that are written on the paper. And we can then take it as an action item to run this paper by them, or run this by them. We can figure out something, but I don't think it's helpful to have individuals come in to give

their individual opinion, because it's the SSAC as a whole that made this statement. But we'll take this offline. Jim, please.

JIM PRENDERGAST:

Yes, Jeff, thanks. You know, I was a little surprised to hear what Kathy said about the SSAC comments. It's unfortunate the session wasn't recorded, but my suggestion I put into the chat, which has been overwhelmed since then, is when we get to 90%, 95% done with this portion of the report, let's just send it off to the RSSAC and to the SSAC and say, hey, are we heading in the right direction here? Are you comfortable with what we have in this paper?

So that we head off six months from now the SSAC coming back saying, "No, you've got this completely wrong. We are firm on 1000 delegations." Or we find out that they're okay. I exactly agree with you that one person can't speak for the SSAC, so it's going to be tough to have somebody come in and speak to us, but we can definitely send paper over to them, and get a sense from them if they're comfortable of where we're headed or not. Thanks.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Yes, thanks, Jim. I think that certainly is a great suggestion. And in fact, I'm not even saying when it's 95% done, I would say that once we review this and people are okay, we can forward things whenever we want, just for more timely feedback. Donna, please.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Jeff. Donna Austin from Neustar. So, if we go back to the policy goals, I think the policy goals are sound. But what I'm struggling to understand here is, what are we trying to do? Are we trying to agree that there shouldn't be any more delegations than 1000 a year? Or are we trying to agree that there could be more, but perhaps there's a limit to what that could be? So, I guess I'm just a little bit confused as to what we're trying to do here.

And I would say that, Kathy, I think it's important to take as guidance, at this point, the documentation that Jeff is referring to, and maybe move forward. As Cheryl said, or Jim said, once we get further down the track, we can have a discussion with RSSAC and SSAC about the delegation rate, and whether we're on the same page. But I'm concerned that we're really getting stuck on this for no real reason right now. So, if it's possible to move on, that would be great.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Yes, thanks, Donna. So, what we're trying to say, if we go back to the high-level agreements, is really just agreeing with the RSSAC and the SSAC, their official comments. If you go above one ... Steve, sorry. If you can scroll up a little. So, the first one is agreeing with the RSSAC that access to the root is critical, and we should be conservative. I'll put point two aside for the moment. Point three is, this is direct quotes from the SSAC and the RSSAC, that you should focus on the rate of change, rather than the total number of delegated strings.

And then the fourth bullet is that as the SSAC and RSSAC recommended, is developing and monitoring early warning capabilities with respect to

root zone scaling. The next bullet is to support the recommendations of the RSSAC, which again is on the rate of increase, as opposed to a maximum flat number. But ultimately there should be some upper limit, and for what that upper limit is, Rubens has said in the chat, it might be 100,000 TLDs, I'm not sure. But again, the RSSAC does say that there is some upper limit, they just don't know what that is.

And then the next one is that the Working Group supports the recommendations proposed by the SSAC, namely ... Steve, sorry. If you could scroll down. That ICANN should structure its obligations to new gTLD registries so that it can delay their addition to the root zone in case of DNS service instabilities. That seems to make a lot of sense. And that ICANN should investigate and catalogue the long-term obligations of maintaining a larger root zone.

And then the final recommendation is in accordance with the comments that we got from OCTO, that the Working Group recommends that OCTO consult with the PTI, Verisign, the root operators via RSSAC, and the larger DNS technical community on these recommendations. So, I think everything in here but recommendation number two ... Well, let me ask the question. Does anyone have any questions or concerns, putting aside the second bullet point on the 1000 number? Does anyone disagree with any of the other recommendations in there? Again, putting aside that second bullet point on the flat number. Kathy, please.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Which bullet point are you pointing to, Jeff? There are lots of bullet points.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yes, everything other than ... Steve, sorry, can you scroll up? It's kind of terrible, this splits between pages. Everything other than the second bullet. So, Steve, highlight that, if you could. Highlight that second point. Everything other than the highlighted one. Does anyone have any issues with any of the bullet points?

KATHY KLEIMAN: Yes, the third bullet point, that we confirm with SSAC. Because there seem to be different views coming from SSAC and from their papers. So, the third bullet point, in the agreement that we confirm with SSAC and [I assume] RSSAC afterwards. So, we'd modify the third bullet point as well, to go out to SSAC and RSSAC. And then somewhere in this high-level agreement, which is being reviewed really by the full Working Group for the first time, right? That we reflect that there are, in addition to whatever technical concerns there might be, about going beyond 1000, that there are operational concerns and that there are community concerns, and that we reflect that here in the high-level agreements so that we don't have to come back and re-argue it later. Is that fair?

JEFFREY NEUMAN: So, let me just check and see if there's comments on that from the chat. Sorry, lost my chat here. Okay, not on that. So, Rubens saying he doesn't support those changes. So, Rubens' point is very important, that when we did Work Track 4 ... And Kathy, I really encourage you to read those papers, and I can put quotation marks around it and put the exact wording in, if that makes it better. But I'm not sure what the utility is of

saying SSAC/RSSAC, you said this in your paper, the exact quote, [what did you really mean?] So let me –

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Because we're jumping, Jeff. We're jumping to a high-level agreement in the second bullet point, and you can't ignore it. That the Working Group is supporting raising the delegation limit, even though we're only talking about technical aspects, which are disputed here. So, that we need to put in a placeholder that talks about the operational issues, that talks about the community concerns about pace and speed of delegation. Because when people come back here, they're going to read it as we have read it, which is that there's an agreement to raise the delegation limit. And I don't think we've gotten there. I think there's dispute among RSSAC and SSAC. I don't think we're there yet. I don't think we have that high-level agreement. Thanks.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Okay, anyone else have comments on that? Okay. Maxim is saying we do not have to reach the agreement. We need to try. Okay. Anne says I would support ... Oops. Sorry, just jumped on me here. Lots of people making comments, which is good. Anne says, I would support Julie's suggested approach, since the public comment reflects concerns. We'd need to see language Kathy proposes. We need to check with IPC regarding general support. So, I'm not sure that the public comment ... It's not accurate to say that the public comment reflects concern, because the public comment did not.

We're now hearing concerns of some Working Group members, which is fine, but we need to be kind of specific and say that the concerns h come in from the Working Group members. Jim is asking Rubens, are you opposed to sending this doc to the RSSAC? Rubens says no dispute between RSSAC and SSAC, according to their own published views. And Donna says she supports the high-level agreements as they are.

Okay. So, Heather's asking ... I'm not sure. Wow, people posting quickly here. Oops. Heather says, "I thought we were asking RSSAC for confirmation. Not 100% clear to me why we're still on this point." Rubens says "I don't support asking the same question again and again. If they have concerns afterwards, they'll let us know about it." And Greg says it'd be helpful to have more information on the meeting where SSAC appeared to disagree. Who came from the SSAC? Who else attended? What are their slides? What did they say in their own words in that meeting?

So, apparently, Kathy said there was a meeting with the NCSG, but there's no recording, or ... I don't know if there are slides. Maybe Kathy can respond to that. And then Kathy says, ICANN's operational system based on 1000 per year. Kathy, that was just an assumption.

That assumptions document, as we discussed earlier, should not be taken as written in stone. That's just their assumption. They based it on last time's recommendations. I don't think that ICANN ... We can ask Cyrus for clarification, or Trang. But I don't think they were saying that that is an assumption that we need to override that fits into the category [inaudible]. It's like the application window. If we come back and say that

there shouldn't be applications [inaudible], we don't have to ... That is [inaudible].

KATHY KLEIMAN:

I asked them, Jeff. I asked, and their system is based, for cost reasons and operational reasons, on 1000 per year. Again, if we're going to significantly raise it, shouldn't we be asking them as well? And again, where do we go from this high-level agreement, that maybe, possibly, we can go technically above 1000, to that we are recommending that we go over 1000? And yes, other groups are on the public record as expressing concern over the rate of delegation, in the comments, and of the process of being involving comments and objections. So, where do we capture that here, so that we don't come away from this document thinking that we just approved raising delegation limits? Thanks.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Thanks, Kathy. Let me take on part of that first. And I think it is important. I think that may be a good tweak to the recommendation. So, let me ask the group. So, instead of saying we think the delegation rate should be raised, we could state that the Working Group supports the notion that there is no technical rationale for limiting the delegation rate to 1000 per year, subject to the recommendations below.

So, we're not saying you should raise it, we're just agreeing with the SSAC and RSSAC that a maximum number is not the way to go. And I think that that is a different way to state it. I think Kathy's right, that we are affirmatively saying here that you should raise it higher than 1000, but we actually could just go kind of the converse, which is that we have not

found a technical rationale to support limiting the delegation rate to no more than 1000 TLDs per year, and then go on to the rest of the recommendations. So, this way we're not advocating for more than 1000, which I think is fine.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Jeff, I'm good with that. Thank you for the recommendation.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Thanks. And then, also, we should put in that this section is only referring to the purely technical concerns, and not any other concerns that the community may have on the ability to evaluate and ... I'm not saying it well, but basically all the other things that go around, or other things other than the technical considerations.

So, we should make that clear. Okay, Jamie supports that. Cheryl, remove the current cap limit. Yes, so I think that's in support of what we've just said. Then Anne says, "I would support a statement for the Working Group agrees that the important factor is that the rate of delegation." Right. So, we're supporting the RSSAC and the SSAC view that we should be looking at the rate, as opposed to a flat 1000 maximum numbers. Alan, please, and then Anne.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you. I think what's missing in what we're talking about, and I think Kathy was skirting around it, is the fact that we do not have a reason to say 1000 is an absolute limit, does not imply it's unlimited. There may be a number that is 1,500 or 2,000 that is for technical

reasons something that we do not want to go past for any reason, based on our current knowledge. So, the fact that it's not 1000 does not imply unlimited.

And I think that needs to be captured somehow, and I don't know where it is. I don't know how to put it. I'm not trying to propose words. But just looking at the chat, there seems to be an implication that if it's not 1000, it's unlimited. And there, more than likely ... I'm certainly not an expert on these things. But there more than likely is a number that the technical people and the operational people would feel uncomfortable going above, even though it's not 1000. I don't know how you capture that, but I think it's an important issue.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Yes, thanks, Alan. So, the first way we try to capture that is the fifth main bullet, the second sub-bullet. So, it says, while there are many zones larger than 5,000-25,000 records ... I'm just going to go to the second sentence. For this reason, the RSSAC believes it will continue to be important to limit the rate of addition of new gTLDs. And then if you scroll down a little bit more ... Sorry, Steve. It says ICANN should investigate ...

So, this is the next main bullet point, but the second sub-bullet. ICANN should investigate and catalog the long-term obligations of maintaining a larger root zone. And then finally the last bullet point, which says that the office of the Chief Technology Officer, this is their recommendation, that they should consult with PTI, Verisign, and the root server operators, and the larger DNS community, on these recommendations. So, I think those

three were meant to cover the point that it's not unlimited. But if we need to say something other than that, let's come up with something.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Jeff, I think the issue is if the 1000 is not to appear next time, how do we come up with the number that replaces it? And your last bullet on OCTO and various friends sort of implies that. But I think that's the part that gives me a little unease. Thank you.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Steve, Julie, Emily, let's capture that point and see if ... Let's agree to a number to replace it, Donna. I think we just need to maybe have something explicit saying that we're not saying that it's unlimited, but that we may need more feedback on what that upper limit would be, or if there is an upper limit. Rubens seems to think that there is some document that says 100,000. I don't know what that is, but maybe there is something out there that's got that in there. Anne, please. Anne, are you on?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE:

Sorry, can you hear me now?

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Yes, thanks.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Okay, great. I'll try to be brief. I do agree with Alan that ... I think what was bothering me, Jeff, was just your wording when you said that we would have high-level agreement that there was no technical reason for capping the total number. And that's just a language thing, I think. I'm not sure that we, as a working group, can draw that from the RSSAC and the SSAC advice. I think that we want to say that what we do recommend about, you know ...

It's the rate of delegation that matters. I'm not sure that we, personally, in our group, know what rate of delegation is actually recommended as safe. But I don't think we want to use those words, no technical reason to cap, because I don't think that's what we're really trying to say. I think we're really trying to affirm the advice that it's the rate of delegation that matters. Thank you.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yes, thanks, Anne. I think what I said was that we don't see that there is a technical limit to have 1000 be the upper ... I'm saying this really badly, but basically the upper limit. But I understand what you're saying. If you maybe, Anne, could you send something, since the concept is [inaudible].

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Sure.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: If you could [inaudible].

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: I'd be happy to. Thanks, yes.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Okay. Any other thoughts, comments, questions on this? Some discussion on the 100,000. So, I know that ... Jim, I know you had any other business. I know that we do have 15 minutes left, but I think starting public interest now would not be very productive. So, we'll definitely cover that in the next call. We don't want to cut off that conversation too shorts and not give it the full attention. Kathy has her hand raised, too. Let me go to Kathy, and then I'll go to Jim's any other business.

KATHY KLEIMAN: I'm happy to wait until after. Here's the question. Has the global public interest document been updated? In which case, can I suggest that we go back to the record in that step to further update it? Because the current version doesn't seem to reflect the very robust discussions we had when we talked about this initially.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Okay, thanks, Kathy. Yes. So, to answer your question, it has not been updated, and so staff has that on their plate. That's another reason why I kind of want to wait until Thursday, so we can get it updated, and we can be working off the more recent draft. We're going to start, though, on the section that is entitled verified TLDs. That's where we'll start on Thursday. So, hopefully, Kathy, that answers your question.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay, so when do we go back? Or when do we go back to the areas that had a lot of diverse opinions earlier in that document?

JEFFREY NEUMAN: So, we'll spend the first couple of minutes recapping, and then, just to get everyone in the frame of mind, and that'll include some of the materials for the earlier sessions. And then we're going to go start on the verified. I'm sure a number of those topics will get covered again, since a lot of it is related to things like voluntary PICs and so on. So I'm sure we'll hit it as we go through the rest of the document, too.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay, but we're going to see an updated document before that? Thanks.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yes. Okay. Jim. I missed what you wrote down, so if someone could present what Jim's item was for any other business?

JIM PRENDERGAST: Yes, Jeff. It's just more clerical than anything else. I'm just wondering, when are we going to see the calendar items for the additional calls that we're having in July and August? Just so we can, you know ... It's falling on a different day, and there may be other conflicts. Just to help people manage their schedules with these additional calls.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yes. So, the schedule is out there, the work plan. And I'll leave it for staff to publish it. We do need to make the change because we didn't get to the public interest thing today. So, we'll update it. But it'll always be at that same link. And I'll ask staff to send it around with the notes from this meeting. Okay, so, let's see. Steve, can you capture what Anne just sent? And we'll send it around with the notes. She just sent it. I want to make sure we don't lose it. And then, are there any other questions or comments? Okay, if that's the case, Cheryl, do you have anything that you want to add?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let me unmute. No.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Thanks, Cheryl. Alright. So, I will talk to everyone on Thursday, and we'll start immediately on Thursday on the public interest section. Thanks, everyone.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bye for now.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you, this concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines, and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]