
ICANN Transcription

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group

Monday, 15 April 2019 at 1500 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://audio.icann.org/gnso/audio-gnso-newgtdwg-15apr19.mp3>

Adobe Connect Recording:

<https://icann.zoom.us/recording/play/wUsaP1TUKEbjtf9COyF5L7QhBrPrKmKzBuCB5ANR8-P2AoYHavsD4I8-3IAguqYJ?continueMode=true>

Attendance is on the wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/8hVIBg>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:

<https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Okay. Well, I would like to welcome everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on the 15th of April, 2019. In the interest of time today, there will be no roll call, as we have quite a few participants today.

As a reminder to all participants, if you would please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and please

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.

keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

We are also going to be using different documents at the same time, in which you will be enabled between two different screens. So if you go to the top of your screen, once we start sharing different documents, you'll have View Options. There's a little dropdown arrow. Then you can share between different screens.

So I'd like to turn the meeting over to Cheryl Langdon-Orr at this time. Please begin, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Michelle. We note [Jeff's] apologies for today, so you'll just have to put up as many of my perhaps relatively poor audio with the variability of bandwidth here in Australia. My apologies. [I hope] someone will ping me and chat if [the audio] becomes an issue.

The first thing, as usual, is for us to ask whether or not anyone has any update to their statement of interest. If so, let us know now. Just reminding you all of course that we do work under continuous disclosure with our statements of interest. Should you have a change in circumstance that needs reflecting in your SOI [inaudible] as soon as possible. You also need to let us know in the following call. If you have difficulty doing [inaudible], staff can always assist.

On today's agenda, we will have a very brief introduction to the thrill-packed and exciting world of yet another piece of technology for some of us, and we'll look at Zoom very briefly and make sure

we're up to speed as to how we're going to do the toggling, etc. We will have a very brief update on Work Track 5, and then we'll jump into the substantive work for today, which is to move through the review of summary documents, starting with the topic of communication, which, if memory serves, I think is Section 2.4.2. Thank you, Steve, for having the link.

Now, I thank Julie [for] noting hands up in chat. I will not be able to go up and down. Why I'm not seeing the hands at the top I'm not sure – oh, other than the small amount of real estate that I've devoted to participants if I may [inaudible] introduce Greg's hand. But please do pop it into chat as well because I've devoted more of my screen real estate to [inaudible] I have to [inaudible].

Greg, over to you.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you. Just a brief update to my statement of interest, which I will also update on the website. I've become an officer, Treasurer, of a newly-formed accessibility special interest group, which is a chapter of the Internet Society, just established. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Excellent. And, obviously, my bias is towards that particular sig as well, Greg. So I look forward to working with you at a personal level on that important topic within the wonderful world of the Internet Society. Thanks for that update.

With that, I'll remind you to manually put your hand back down again, of course, while we get used to our [rather] clunky new bits of stuff.

With that, I'm going to ask if there's anybody who has any other business they'd like to foreshadow now. If not, we will be asking again at the end of the call.

CHRISTA TAYLOR: [Cheryl, it's] Christa.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not seeing anyone, hearing anybody, at the moment – was that someone wanting to raise an issue on the agenda?

CHRISTA TAYLOR: Cheryl, it's Crista. Sorry, I can't figure out how to raise my hand quick enough. But I also updated my SOI a while back and became CEO of MMX.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Fantastic. Thanks, Krista. Just to draw our attention to it, it is important. I'm quite sure all of us don't actually spend every spare moment in our weeks reading each other's SOIs, which is why we do ours; for people to draw attention to these changes, just as you have as well.

And welcome to Vanda, who I noticed is driving, so I assume she's also only going to be on audio for a little while. And, yes,

Greg notes in the chat that Krista's acronyms are as exciting as the [inaudible].

Okay. Without any further ado then, and noting I am actually in two calls at once – so my brain is split but I've given you my right brain today, people, while ISOC chapter advisory [duty] has my left brain; I'm not sure what that says about me – if there's no changes to the agenda, I'm going to assume that it will be Michelle who's going – [inaudible] the question going up in my voice? – make sure we're all okay with the care and feeding of Zoom.

MICHELLE:

Yes. Thank you, Cheryl. Just a quick reminder for the Zoom this morning, this afternoon, this evening. When you first enter the Zoom room, to bring up the chat and participant windows, if you hover your mouse over the bottom portion of your screen – the Zoom room – until the menu bar appears, you will need to click on the Participant icon – that will be needed in order to raise your hand to ask any question throughout the meeting – and the Chat icon. Note the chat will only appear once you log in. You will not see the chats that occurred prior to you joining the Zoom room. But you will get the entire chat from the point you join.

There are three ways to mute your mic. Hover the mouse of the bottom of the screen and click the Mute icon to the far-left side. That is the most common way. If you have any questions in the chat, please feel free to chat me privately or on the chat screen.

Back to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, Michelle. Just watching how you were showing us with the little toggle-y bit, I honestly have no idea, when we've got more than one document up, how we're going to be finding that.

MICHELLE: Okay. So—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Personally, I would appreciate someone showing me that.

MICHELLE: Yes. At the top of your screen, Julie is currently sharing her screen, her desktop. So at the top of your screen you'll see a black button that says View Options. If you take your mouse and hover over to the top part of your Zoom room, you'll see View Options. You click that little dropdown arrow. If you go down towards the bottom, it says Shared Screens. You will see Julie Hedlund's name checked. She's sharing the agenda and taking action items. Then, if you want to go to Steve's screen, you can click on Steve Chan. And you can toggle between those two documents.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Michelle. I appreciate that. I have learned my something-or-other for the day now, which, at 1:10 in the morning, is something to be said. I appreciate that. I have no idea, Donna, why your name came up that way, but I do know you can change your name. So if you select yourself in the Participants list,

there's a Rename button next to the Mute button. So you can call anything you so desire, my friend. I'm not quite sure. Staff could change this as well.

So, with that, I'm currently looking at the shared screen, which is showing the agenda, but I'm going to suggest we now move to the updates to Work Track 5. I'm looking at [inaudible] interesting [inaudible] [and I think he's] [inaudible]. I'm looking for someone in the Work Track 5 leadership, and I'm really trying—

ANNABETH LANGE: Hi, Cheryl. It's Annabeth here. I'm here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Perfect, Annabeth. Thank you.

ANNABETH LANGE: Yeah, but I cannot see myself in the Participants list. So there's something wrong there. But I'm here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: In fact, Annabeth, I can't find you, either. But I'm glad you're here, and you're still here. We can hear you perfectly. If you can give us a very brief update. Thank you.

ANNABETH LANGE: Yes, of course. We had a meeting on the 10th. That was our last meeting. And we continued to go through the comments from the

report we had had out for comments. We went through the law basis. We went through translations, language, country and territory names, delegation of three-letter codes, and translation language of capital city names.

So it was quite a good discussion last time, and we got some input that showed that some of the things that we had tried to extract the comments coming in wasn't exactly what the person who sent it in had meant.

So this was a good comment, and we will try to correct that in the document. So we go on next time on the 17th, actually. We are now online. I think it was 144. So in my view, I think we need two more meetings to go through it. Steve attended as well, so he might have something to say.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Annabeth. Steve, do you have anything you want to add into the Work Track 5 update?

STEVE CHAN: Hi, Cheryl. I just put a note into the chat. No, nothing to add. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Fantastic. Can I ask a question which can be treated as rhetorical? With the two more weeks running through the input from public comments, are we going to still be tracking closely, if not exactly, to the work plan? Jeff and I obviously [inaudible] Work

Track 5 from a next-phase start to come back to integrate with our work. [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] [maybe].

ANNABETH LANGE: Yeah. I think that, after the meeting on the 17th, we will know where we are. It should be possible, when we get all the comments into the document. So it will be correct. Perhaps Steve could say something about that: where we are at that moment when we have gone through all the comments and the document.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Thanks, Annabeth.

ANNABETH LANGE: He's raised his hand. Good.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Steve's virtually raising his hand. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Cheryl. Thanks, Annabeth. This is Steven Chan from staff. This is a quirk in Zoom, that the host and co-host cannot

raise their hands, which is, I think, a little odd. So, yeah, you'll see me say that now and then from this point forward.

Actually, just to clarify, for the next couple of meetings I think what we're going to be able to do is cover a certain part of the public comments. Right now, we're looking at the questions that were put out for response from the community. So I think that, at a minimum, we'll be able to cover in the next two meetings.

There's actually quite a few more additional sections beyond that, which will hopefully go a little quicker. Those are dedicated to 38, actually, proposals. But the feedback received is generally more straightforward rather than the open-ended question section we're on currently.

So I guess my hope is that, while there is quite a bit more content to review, the nature of it will make it a little more efficient to go through. So, to Annabeth's point and Cheryl's point, we'll need to take another look at the schedule and try to reconfigure it based on our current thinking and share that with you all. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, Steve. Two things. First of all, all of us are learning an awful lot about Zoom, even those of us who have passively been engaged with over many utilizations. I'm still going to have to get used to toggling between shared documents in different people's spaces. That'll take yet another bit of practice from us all.

But I would also respectfully request that Krista's SOI under the brief notes if staff – Julie – could just do a private chat with Krista

so we get the correct nomenclature of MXX, etc., and her appointment there. I think that would be a more complete record. So that's just a little tiny bit of housekeeping that can go through at any point during our meeting today.

So, with that, let's move onto our substantive work for today. Now, I believe we all get to go to Shared Screens under View Options and we stop looking at Julie Hedlund's screen and we select Steve's screen. Ah, look at that! It's almost like magic. Or, like me, you can have the Google doc open in another tab. But, actually, the vision here is, I think, superior to what we had in the Adobe Connect. So that's a positive out of Zoom. That's not going to stop me, however, from using the Google doc because I'm able to have it even larger.

So with that, we're looking at 2.4[.2:] Communications. We're going to be taking, if we may – I know you've all had at least another week to read through all of this documentation – a fairly brief run through all of this. If you don't mind bearing with me, I don't believe you need to listen to me read the document to the record. I sincerely hope you don't. So what I'll do is I'll go down paragraph by paragraph and open a queue and put a call out for any comments that any of you want to make as we go through.

Please remember we're not trying to draft too finely at this point. If you've got some impressable concerns and general comments, we will discuss them on this call and input them to the list and again look at them for the next call.

To that end, I believe that any of the changes that occurred as a result of last week's deliberations in the earlier section – we had a

few edits made on the fly last week at we looked at the Applicant Guidebook. But I don't think any of those were particularly, once we actually got to agreeing on [inaudible] [fixed], substantial things, like changing from "must" to "should." If anyone has any concerns about what we did last week, obviously, please bring it up now and we will go back and discuss further. But I'm sincerely hoping you don't want me to do that.

So let's now look at communications, which starts off with the community comment to Section 1.9, the couple of links to that in the initial report section, 2.4.2. So we have our underpinning of the resources there. [inaudible] need to discuss that, but if you do, let me know.

So I'm going to assume, unless somebody screams loudly, that we can move down to the policy goals. Here we do have some suggestions, which I'll open a queue to get any feedback on. There is some To Be Determineds that Jeff has fleshed out that some of you may wish to do [inaudible] further. And there is also some metrics that Jeff [inaudible] have also been suggested. That's the section that is now open for comment, open for discussion, and we'll open a queue now. If you haven't had enough time to go through this document between last week and this week and you need more time for this section, that is also fine because anything we do today we will also remind the list about and come back and double-check that at our opening of next week's meeting to see if there are any issues.

So let's see. I'm not seeing any hands up. Am I correct in that? Do tell me if I'm not. So – yes, Donna, please. Thank you for saving

me. Otherwise, I was going to have to ask, “Does that mean silence means consent?” [inaudible]. Over to you, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Cheryl. So just a question about how we’re going to work through this. I think it makes sense not to go through Jeff’s questions right now but to go through the public comment summary and make sure we’re on the same page and then maybe come back to Jeff’s question. So I don’t know if that’s what you have planned, but I just wanted to work out how you’re going to manage this going forward. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Donna. I was drawing attention to these questions, which do need to be considered and discussed. I was suggesting that, if you’ve got any points you want to bring up now, then please do so. But then we would be referring this block, this section here in pink – on my screen, at least – to the list and for further discussion. So I think that is actually in keeping with what you were suggesting, which was moving onto the public comments summary post-haste.

I am concerned that people are doing their homework. I’d love to think everybody [was], but I guess I’m cynical enough to also believe that I need to spend a couple of minutes in the meeting to encourage that. So no further discussion on the section here now. So that is your homework assignment, ladies and gentlemen. We will be coming back to this at next week’s call, if not the one after. Please look at these notes and suggested metrics in this section

on the list because they are parts of our ongoing discussion that we'll need to finalize before we go public with any such document from what we're going through.

In that case, we'll be able to now move to Section 2.4.2C1, which is the beginning of the public comments summary. Again, I'm going to be so bold as to assume that you are all pre-reading all of this, but I'll be a little generous today compared to future [works] and just slowly enough to see whether any of you have some comments. So I'll give you a little tiny bit of reading time to [inaudible] here at the outset, at a minimum of four months, that that should be continued and that the final Applicant Guidebook is released at a time which will allow that block of at least four months between the next round of gTLDs – pardon me; I'm losing my voice – and the Applicant Guidebook release.

The notes trends and themes of what we're seeing in the comments was that this was supported by most comments. There was a couple of specific issues brought out by a couple of commenters. They are listed there. And there was no new ideas or concepts proposed in this section. I simply want to ask, is there any, now, points of contention raised by this? This is one of those where we had a sea of green, generalized support. We had the suggestion from one or two that there may be a variability in the length of the time, that the four months minimum seemed to be the [rule] forward. This is a first reading, again. This is not a final, but can we open a small queue on that now before we note those things and trends and take it up for next [inaudible]?

So a quick hand up for clarifying point. Okay, Steve. Thanks for doing that. Go ahead, but do remember that, when I look up to chat now, your hand up is just one of those lines in a long diatribe.

Over to you, Steve.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Cheryl. Yeah, I'm not really sure what else to do since I can't raise my hand. So we'll figure it out and learn along the way.

So the point I just wanted to raise is that you can see that the [valid days] in ALAC concept, which is a new idea, is instead captured under Themes in this case. [There] you'll see the new ideas and concepts for deliberations – basically, the new things that the working group may want to consider. Those are generally found under that second header of New Ideas and Concepts for Deliberations.

So the thought here was that, because there was more than, I guess, two people or two groups that brought up the same concept, the thinking was instead that this sort of constituted a theme instead. So, while it is a new idea that would generally fall under the second header, we captured it under the theme because there are multiple parties that support it.

So hopefully that made sense. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Steve, and thanks for making that much, much clearer than I was. Yes, indeed, a theme or a trend would be something

that is obviously seen as a space [inaudible] number that even a significant number of commenters have put in for us to consider.

So with that, the queue is still open. I note that [Oliver] has joined the call. Welcome.

Susan's noting in chat that that does make sense, but she's concerned that not having it listed under new ideas may be an issue. So, from that, can we take it from that, Susan? That, in this document, the pre-launch activities document, we should make a comment here that we need to look at [inaudible] The Anonymous Dingo is suggesting that they do that, that we look at a better way of listing things here? Steve is making that note now so that, in the future, we will be a little clearer for the non-fully-immersed reader to get to understand what's going on. Thanks for that, Susan.

Any other interactions on this? If not, then let's move to the next section, which was about program information, education, and outreach, talking about the period of time prior to the opening of any application submission period being long enough to allow for appropriate outreach if it's related to – pardon me – applicant support and that it should be an important element of an execution of a communication plan.

To that end, I expect most people won't be surprised that the things in trends was support from most commenters, which is a good thing. However, there were some matters for deliberation, and this is one that came in [inaudible] Neustar. I believe we might have some spelling error. Thanks, Donna, [for picking] that one up. Donna, do you wish to speak to this at all? Yes, [inaudible]. Do you wish to speak to this at all or just let me open the queue?

You're obviously here if there's anything that needs discussion or justification.

I see [Jaime] [inaudible]. Go ahead, [Jaime].

Not hearing you, [Jaime].

Michelle, I'm not hearing [Jaime]. Is that just me?

MICHELLE DESMYTER: No. I am not able to hear [Jaime], either. I just offered [Jaime] a dial-out.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Great. Okay. All right. Well, we'll get [Jaime] shortly. I see his microphone is open but we're all getting used to a new system here. So let's see how we go after Michelle does her miracles with dial-out.

The queue is open if anyone else would like to step up to the queue. Or we're waiting for [Jaime]?

Okay. [Jaime], are we able to get an audio out to you or not?

Okay. All right. [Jaime], we're just not hearing you. So if you could organize a dial-out from Michelle, that might be the best way forward.

Fantastic. Thanks for that, Michelle. Good to know. So, if they're dialing out now, I will filibust for a tiny bit longer and ask if there's

anyone else who wishes to step forward in the queue while I scan up and down.

I see Susan. Susan, over to you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yes. Hi, Cheryl. Can you hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can indeed.

SUSAN PAYNE: Oh, good. Excellent. It works. I'm saving you from filibustering for a bit, really. Just to say that the Neustar proposal. [I'm] assuming that their proposal itself is something that ends up being supported, and the idea of targeted communications plan seems a good one.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, Susan. I suspect we got [Jaime's] dial-out sorted in the middle of your invention, but what I heard is that the targeted communications idea was a good one.

Donna, I noticed your hand was up, but if we've got [Jaime] now on audio, would you mind if I went to him and then came back to you? [Jaime], let's see how we go.

[JAIME]: Can you hear me now okay, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can. Thank heavens for that. Over to you.

[JAIME]: Thank you. There's some issue that is saying it's privacy, that I need to change something on security and privacy, but I can't quite figure out how to do that. So maybe somebody from staff could send me information on how to do that so that I can connect directly from the computer.

But, again, thank you for the call out. What I wanted to just circle back on here was the issue around the outreach and education. In some of the comments that I provided around this, I highlighted the fact that there didn't seem to be a whole lot of information available on how long it may have taken some folks to put together applications because what I obviously am part of this group to do is to remember that there are community applicants that have a slightly different experience. Part of the process for community applicants is to build support and endorsement to their application. And four months is obviously a very short time to do that. In some of the notes that I provided I indicated quite clearly that four months never would have been enough time for us to build the level of support that we had within our community for our application.

I did suggest that maybe there be some outreach to community applicants to try to understand how long it took them to build the support and the endorsement, especially community applications like ours that really engage the community in the process of building the applications – policies, procedures, oversight, etc.

So I don't know if anything was ever done on that, but I just want to make sure we're not putting together a timeline that is inconsistent or unattainable for community applicants. So I just wanted to bring that back into the conversation because it doesn't seem to be reflected here. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, [Jaime]. Just before I go to Donna, I think it behooves me to also remind everybody that, when we look at these inputs from public comment and what trends and things we can roll out of them, with things like communication and communication plans we need to be cautious about dissecting them up and only looking at the nerve or the muscle or the bone of that because, if we look at 2.4.2C, 2.1, and 2.2, they also talk about [periods] within communication plans and proposed lengths of time that should be provided for certain aspects. So a full-blown communication plan should indeed, I suspect, take into account the multi-factors, the different types of applicants.

It seems that what we can draw from what we have in front of us, at least by my humble reckoning, is a support for efficiency, effectiveness, and overall predictability in any such plan and that such a communication plan give adequate time for appropriate

outreach and engagement, as well as the actual process of putting together community support as you've raised.

So that's my overarching – where I think it's heading. May not be the case, but I'm kind of how I'm reading the tea leaves.

[Jaime], you've now got to work out how to put your hand back down, unless that's a new hand for a follow-up.

[Great]. Donna, over to you?

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Cheryl. Donna Austin from Neustar. I was, like Susan, going to help you out while there was a little bit of a lull in the conversation. For anyone who's not familiar with the Neustar proposal that's being referenced here, what we had suggested – and there's been some chatter on the list over the weekend about this – is it would have basically four phases or three phases to an application round. We would do brands first, geos, generics, and community.

One of the things that strikes me with the conversation we're having now is that brands, we expect – when I say “we,” I mean Neustar – would be relatively straightforward. There wouldn't be too many requirements with the brands. The geos are a little bit like communities. They are going to need support from, or they may need support, from government or other authorities. So that may take a longer time. Then, as [Jaime] has spoken to with communities, that may take longer still because you have to build the case for community.

So, based on that, what would see is that, if you did a communication round that ran the four months and you open the application window, then brands would go first. You would then have a further three months that you could potentially do communication associated with geos until that windows open. And then the same: another three months or so until the generics and community are opened. So that gives you a little bit more time between the different phases to allow for targeted communications, depending on the phase of the program.

Thanks, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much for that, Donna. I think it's a timely opportunity for you to help some of us understand some of the nuances in how a staged process that was being suggested as an aid [inaudible] [I saw as] a useful thing for us to be discussing in a way to try and help our thinking [in going] to the next level.

It seems to me, again, that what I'm hearing is that a communications strategy and timelines that are associated with key milestones for putting in [these] applications need to be fit for purpose. So, to that end, it would appear that we should be able to say something about [fitness] for different types of applicants as well in what we're going to be talking about from program information, education, and outreach.

Annabeth, I'm just noting your intervention [inaudible]. I'm quite sure there's nothing else [inaudible] from Work Track 5. So thanks [inaudible] so long.

Did I hear somebody wanting the microphone? Please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Hello? Hello?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, we can hear you. Go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Hello? Have you called me? You called my number. Who is that, please?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, Michelle, perhaps you could help—

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Kavouss, this is Michelle from staff. We have dialed you into the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures meeting.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: [Okay].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So the answer is yes, sir, we have called you. Feel free to disconnect if you don't want to continue to join our call. But you've been dialed into. I base that on the assumption that Michelle has a request, a standing or recent request, to do so. And, yes, we have called you. If you don't want to stay on the call, please feel free to

disconnect. But you are connected to the audio channel of the Subsequent Procedures for New gTLDs Plenary. You're welcome to stay, but we would also appreciate it if you can let us know who you are next time you make an intervention.

So, with that, and not seeing anyone else's hands in the room, I want to ask you now, looking down through the themes and trends [inaudible] that we see in Section 2.4.2 and all its sub-parts to 1223, etc. – there was no disagreement with the principles that we put forward in the public comments. There were, however, a number of refinements and suggestions on metrics, proposals on fitness for purpose for time, and, indeed, a few new ideas.

As plenary, we need you to consider how you will be making recommendations. It would appear that we could, should, and probably will be able to structure some overarching statements based on the general things and trends that you have in front of you in the documentation. How you want to go through that, I guess, is the challenge question I'd like to give you now. I am happy to continue going through as we are now, a little bit piecemeal, by the individual lumps. Or we can try and start putting some threads together.

I would suggest we don't try and wordsmith on a call but rather we create some draft text at the next level in terms of any recommendations out of it. I suspect that that might be best done in shared-document approach. But that's a new idea that I haven't even discussed with the leadership team, Jeff, or staff yet. So I'm happy to get a bit of feedback on that in the chat if you want to put your thoughts together on that and, for now, continue through as we have been. But I am aware of the amount of time here, where

some of it might be seen to be [inaudible], and I prefer to minimize the duplications.

So, with that, I don't see anyone still in the queue. I noted from Justine in the queue that she was pointing out and therefore being supportive with the fitness for purpose on the timing and the fact that the ALAC suggestion that even more than six months may be needed when we look at the question posed – pardon me – that the communication period could perhaps have been shortened to three months. The ALAC was definitely of a view that it may need to be longer.

So, with that, I'm looking to see if there's anything in chat – oh, boy. Some of these bits of chat seem to be long – germane to my questions posed.

Not seeing that. Okay. Well, then let's move down to Section 2.4.2C22, which is the point that seemed to always be the opposite question to the one that was raised earlier. You've got, under Section C2.1, that at least six months should be the communication period, and the ALAC suggested that that could even be longer.

Then, here in Section 2.2, the question was posed that, in the event that, following the next of new gTLDs, application opportunities are organized as a series of application windows – notice that; a series of application windows – the communication period may be shortened to three months. The trends here were for some support, noting here again that the critical term here is “may.” There still seems to be a lot of concerns from ICANN org, as certainly ALAC.

It would appear from interventions on this call that what has to happen is it needs to be fit for purpose and that geos, non-brands, and communities may need a little longer. And, as Donna outlined, a staged planning may allow for that to happen.

Scrolling down to see the new message, that's all right, [Flip]. Thank you for joining us as long as you were able. So this, I think, we can take as read, unless someone wants to make an intervention on that. It just gets [inaudible] with the rest of our education community and outreach.

The next session is 2.4.2C3. Here the question is about the publication of program information on the ICANN website [inaudible] noting, as opposed to the URL given, which was the NewgTLDs.ICANN.org space, this was seeking, if memory serves, to ensure that there was a wider net of more saturation of information to more public-facing spaces as we publish program information and undertake education and outreach for any new gTLD round. That did get general support from most commenters in terms of things and trends, but there was [inaudible] from the ALAC here, where the ALAC did not believe the program information must be on the ICANN org site. However, there should be a prominent [entry]—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] Hi. It's the operator. I'm calling for the [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, fine. Thank you. Put me on. Sorry. That's my next call from another ... I'm just going to [inaudible] anyway. Too many buttons to choose from. Apologies.

So with that, the divergence that we note here was saying there should be a prominent entry directing the attention to programs. So it wasn't, in my view – and Justine can clarify – the way I read that it wasn't saying that the outreach shouldn't be widely dispersed but rather than it didn't have to be fully duplicated but it could be referred to.

Justine, is that correct or not?

Correct. Excellent. Thanks very much.

Okay, good. So, to that end, if we can possibly now just move on – sorry. I know you can hear me husband trying to move a Great Dane off the bed as well. Look, you're getting a full insight into my 2 A.M. life. More ICANN calls and things happening.

So the next section here is the matter of how we leverage Global Stakeholder Engagement staff to facilitate interaction between regional ICANN org teams and potential applicants from the regional. This is Section 2.4.2C4. There was not overwhelming support but support from some commenters and a list of concepts and deliberations as listed here. The BC, ICANN org and, again, the ALAC [inaudible]. I think, if we can paraphrase what was being said, there was little concern about GSE's focus and where their focus would be and how much time would be required if we were going to be asking them to change their focus. I guess that's, to some extent, a support about the comment that ALAC was making

about the effectiveness in the past. We're going to plan for effectiveness in the future. Things would have to change, by the look of it. And, of course, that links into BC's concept of the need to track such effectiveness; in other words, to have some measurability and awareness, of course, of not only local business cycles but utilization of local business partners.

[inaudible] a queue on that now.

Good heavens, you're a quiet lot. It is quite a monologue from me. Oh, dear, that's now how I [inaudible]. Never mind. Best laid plans of mice and men.

Moving through on our first read on the next part of communications – this is communications with applicants, Section 2.4.2C5 – here the proposal was – again, it goes to the effectiveness, timeliness, efficiency [inaudible] say opt-in notification service that allows applicants to receive updates about the program in real or near-real time. This was something that was, in general, supported by all [colleges]. However, there was a comment with a new idea in from ICANN org where the suggestion was to identify policy goals and they didn't know that what we were suggesting was consistent with how the [practice] went on in the 2012 round.

I don't see anything particularly inflammatory there, but let's open a brief queue and note that I am now in yet another ICANN call [inaudible]. So you all [inaudible].

Not seeing any comments there, let's move on then to more on the communication [inaudible] with applicants. Here we have, not

dissimilar from the section we just briefly reviewed, that we should providing updates in a timely manner on expected response times on the website so that applicants have a great deal more predictability than they did in the last round, and also that the information on how applicants can escalate inquiries that remain unresolved [inaudible] support from more commenters. [I'm really surprised] on that. However, there was an input from ICANN.org which noted that practice of having GSE centrally managing inquiries and to ensure that the service-level targets are published.

I'm opening a queue on that.

STEVE CHAN: Hi, Cheryl. This is Steve. I can't raise my hand. [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, just jump in, Steve. You're working under great difficulties. I [inaudible] an opportunity to mute briefly.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks. Yeah, I figure you might want a break anyway. So, again, this is Steve Chan from staff. Something Cheryl said earlier just triggered something in my head, and I thought it might be a good reminder.

So she said this is the first readthrough of these summary documents. But I think what might be helpful to remind everyone is we've gone through – well, at least the sub-groups have gone

through the sorting and understanding exercise of the public comments. So I guess just a reminder now is the time, in fact, to have some of that substantive discussions about these new ideas and concepts. This is the time to voice whether or not you agree with these ideas, disagree, think they should be integrated. Of that sort.

So, please, if you have thoughts on the new ideas and concepts and trends identified here, it'd be very useful if you guys can bring that up and discuss it now. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Steve. You tried. We cannot try. Okay, so I can get you to watch the chat for me, Steve, because I'm now in two rooms at once, so I'm Zooming and Adobe Connecting. That could be very exciting. And thanks for expanding the short form of GSE to the full [inaudible]. I would suggest we probably should do that in the reverse. We should have it written as Global Support [inaudible] and then put GSE in brackets. But we'll tidy that up later.

So, with that, let's see if we can move through to the next section here, which is 2.4.2C[7]: More on communication with applicants. Here the question was about using a telephone, online chat, or similarly other online communication tools [inaudible] build a robot for a helpline. That was generally supported from all commenters, but we certainly have the BC saying that there is a limit to real-time support to those who demonstrated willingness to submit an application rather than those contemplating doing so. So the suggestion there is that such a service was more of a matter for applicants who had proceeded to some extent through to the

application or commitment to application phase, rather than just shoppers. Also, ICANN [org] not unreasonably noted the cost – in their view, a high cost – of such chat support and some concerns about turnaround time, etc.

To that end, of course, we have used the terms “efficient” and “effective” in our work to date. I’m quite sure that any recommendation that the Subsequent Procedures Working Group makes would also be looking at the costs benefit analysis associated with such a thing.

The reason it’s still holding at that particular section is that the screen – whoever’s screen it is. I think it is Steve’s screen. He hasn’t moved it. You’re actually looking at Steve’s screen. So you don’t have scroll control.

In response to your second question, now is the time for substantive discussion. Yes, indeed. If you’ve got a particular concern or issue, please do bring it forward now. I would suggest that we may not complete a substantive discussion, but we can certainly start a substantive discussion and take it to the list on a first readthrough here.

So I certainly am up to 2.4.2C7, but if you happen to have something back on C6, we’ve only just moved past it.

[Anne], the floor is yours.

Oh, sorry. I had to get off mute. Thanks, [Anne]. I thought you may have wanted to – because you’re raising whether it was time to bring a comment forward. Yeah, the screen is held to wherever Steve has it. Steve has ultimate control now. It’s all very scary. I

certainly am using the Google Doc to avoid him controlling me at all costs. It's only partly a joke, people. No, it's a larger font. Makes it easier for me to read.

So, with that, let's go to opening a queue on the interest in helpline, online chat functionalities, other communication tools. We note that cost concerns. To some extent, the costs may be balanced if we look at the Business Constituency's new idea of limiting such support to those people who'd actually committed to the application process.

Not seeing any comments germane to [inaudible] input, and I would ask if Michelle or someone can have a private chat with that and make sure she works out what's going on with her screen. That would be great indeed.

That means that, from my perspective, we are now on 2.4.2E1, and that is the question which is sort of a catch-all one, which is any suggestions from input from public comments on the criteria or metrics groups [determining] success for the new gTLD communications strategy. You can't—

DONNA AUSTIN: Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes?

DONNA AUSTIN: Cheryl, it's Donna. I'm sorry. Can we back up to the last one? Both myself and Kristine Dorrain had our hands up. I'm not sure—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I am very sorry about that. Let me deal with you first, and then [Kristine]. I will try and manage my screen real estate more effectively in the future. Go ahead, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: No problem, Cheryl. Thanks. Just on C7 and the BC new idea to limit real-time support to those that have demonstrated willingness application rather than those contemplating doing so, that's a difficult judgement call to make because somebody might have legitimate questions. But until they understand the scope of the work, it's going to be hard to know whether to go forward with it.

I note that ICANN says that the cost of online chat support may not be conducive to the turnaround necessary for complex questions. So I think that's a reasonable point.

But the question that it strikes in me – I think you're going to have prospective applicants that will want some kind of support, and that should be timely. If not immediate, it should be within a 24-hour window.

The other thing that strikes me about this is that you probably have – this talks about communication with applicants, but I'm not sure whether it covers – what's the word I'm looking for? – potential applicants. So is this about communications once you've

submitted your application, or is this about communications when you're thinking about your application?

Thanks, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. If I can respond from my personal point of view to that, Donna, I read it, when something says, "communication with applicants," that these are people who are in the application process. So they are more than just "I wonder if should"s. They are "I'm filling out my form and"s. So they're not potential. They're perhaps still prospective, but certainly, people who've begun the application process. So that's how I read it, and that's why my reaction to those ideas might be slightly different to others. It's a really important clarification point. So thanks for making it.

Can anyone who perhaps has a clearer memory and straighter thinking than I do, right now in two calls at once, counter what I've said or clarify what I've said or take an entirely different view for Donna? If so, please pop it into chat while we move to Kristine.

Kristine? And I do apologize for missing you earlier. And, Krista, I see you because I'm looking at the hands in a big space. Kristine first.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Hi. Thanks. This is Kristine, my first intervention on Zoom. Can you hear me?

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR: Yes, we can.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Oh, great. Okay, beautiful. Thanks. So I actually had a comment in the same vein. I agree with everything Donna said, but I also was wondering about what you just said, Cheryl. So this doc is called Pre-Launch Activities, so I wasn't exactly sure how we were defining launch. I was defining launch to mean that this before the time when the application window opened and the actual technical pieces were on.

So I'm wondering a little bit more about this one, and maybe I need to go back into the full comments. I should dig out my paper copy. But I'm a little bit worried. Are we asking ICANN to offer substantive applicant support, or is this just sort of technical "What do I click? I'm having a bug"? Because I think we might be talking about two different things, and I am not sure that we can be providing 24/7 substantive support to be people who might want to be applicants at any point in the future as far as how to ask questions about applications.

But I do think that there could be some opportunity for some pretty robust technical support for the actual uploading process. So I think the fact that we all – I'm not sure that we have a meeting of the minds as to what it is we're talking about here, and we might want to dig into that a bit before we conclusively decide what sort of report we're asking ICANN to provide. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, Kristine. We'll make a note, as you see here, in the document, to that effect. And we will definitely come back to that. Certainly, if we were to recommend going down any sort of pathway that was going to be offering this type of be it phone or online support, we could either take a very general "Dear ICANN, You should look at this"-type approach, or we could be making more particular and perhaps directive or suggestive recommendations. If we were to do that, we certainly would want to dig much deeply and think much more critically of the whole matter.

So let's look at that. Thanks for raising it. Kristine, your hand is still up. Did you want to follow up, or ...

Okay. Krista, over to you.

KRISTA PAPAC: Just a quick comment. One of the items that came up on some other areas was the metrics on people not actually applying. For instance, the applicant support always had a big issue on that of they might ask questions. They still might not apply, but we still should measure those questions that came in to, I guess, have better insight in the level of engagement and whether or not they had enough information then to proceed [or] deciding not to proceed.

Then, going back, in case it helps a little bit, when we discussed this in Work Track 1, it was more surrounding, I think, real applicants having a delayed reply or two or three days later. There was some kind of online chat functionality where somebody could

quickly ask something easy or late on their application and not have to wait a whole period of time to get somebody to come back with the intent that, during Monday to Friday, there should be somewhat of a quick response time within working hours. It was typically with their application, but if it was something that applied to everyone, some kind of sharing methodology was also going to be applied.

So I'm not sure if that helps, but for what it's worth.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Krista, it helps enormously, at least me. Thank you very much for that because I was thinking I'm sure I remember hearing, for things that are common or simple, some sort of FAQ-style thing would be an ideal setup as well. So, yes, that definitely does assist.

I notice the comment from Maxime in chat, where he notes that applicants are paid [by] ICANN, should it be customer relations after that. Thanks, Maxime. That's a very valid differentiation point as well.

Kristine, your hand is still up. I'm going to assume that's an old hand and go to Vivek. Vivek, over to you.

VIVEK SENGUPTA: Thank you. Just a point that the extent of support should also be in relation to the duration of the application window and the amount of communication that has gone before that. If the application window is going to be, say, six months, then you can

expect that a person or an applicant has the time to maybe wait for an answer for a day and then expect a reply. But if the application window is going to be short, then the person is in a hurry, the applicant is in a hurry, to get an answer to complete.

So, depending on how long the application window will be, we need to decide how extensive the support should be. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Vivek. Again, another important refinement. One thing certainly would affect the other, and, with a short application period, one would suggest to make it as much facilitation as possible for the applicants to get almost real-time turnaround on inquiries and questions. That would be a more-than-reasonable expectation, but it would also avoid later complaint. So thanks for that, Vivek. I appreciate that, and I'm sure everyone else does as well. And I'm going to assume your hand is going to go down shortly.

Is there anyone else who wants to jump in on this? We've got a few interesting extra points and revisions on this, which is exactly why we're going through this exercise. So thank you. This is most helpful. I would like to think that some more thoughts could come through to you [on] the list between this week's call and next.

I see Donna. Over to you, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Cheryl. Just o Vivek's point, it's an important one, and there's also a balance that you need to provide, too, because I

think it's unreasonable for 48 hours from the close of the application window to expect – your expectation should be a little bit different about the turnaround time because it could be a crunch. So you may need more people during that time, but I think it's also reasonable that there should be an understanding at the beginning that there should be a 24-hour one. Not “should,” but if you put a 24-hour turnaround in place, then ICANN needs to be – or GDD or whoever it is – held accountable to that if that isn't met.

So one of the – I can say the contracted party – challenges that we have always had is that there are SLAs in our contract, but we have no way to hold GDD accountable if there's a slip from their side on an agreed SLA. So I think that's probably as important, if we start defining metrics, that the accountability piece be there as well because I could see that, if applications are getting squeezed in that last week or so and people aren't getting responses within that 24-hour period, that could potentially cost an applicant the ability to submit in time.

So there's a number of variables, I think, as you start to work through the application window and things get to crunch time. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Donna. I think this is an excellent additional point, and it's building on things that I've heard you all saying in this discussion, which I think is an extremely useful discussion. I was wondering when the matter of contracted parties having SLAs but ICANN org doesn't seem to was going to come up because we did hear that in the early discussions in the work tracks as well.

So I think, to some extent, what Justine has put in to chat, where she said it seems to be a short response time – “Is short response time already one of the metrics for communication strategy? If not, it should be?” In fact, if the Subsequent Procedures Working Group recommends some specifics for communication strategy, it appears to me that you are saying that metrics are important, that the complexity and the different [phases] during the application period need to be considered, as well as, obviously, the costings here, and that it may very well be that a different set of resourcing is require to meet the timeliness and efficiency of any such response to an inquiries system that is offered at a later point.

So, just like any other manufacturing or project system, there’s often a situation where, as you get towards the launch or the release date, [inaudible] have to be thrown at something. So, to that extent, we may want to make some recommendations regarding how we suggest that’s approached.

We’re going to be coming back this one, ladies and gentlemen, and I would suggest, based on what I think is very contributory and positive refinements and discussions, we are actually in a better position to consider making some recommendations based on both public comments and your reactions to those public comments and further thinking than we were when we started out, even at the beginning of this call. Crunch time comments, of course, are ones that definitely need more discussion and thinking about.

I would very much like to, in the time we have left, see if we can get through to the end of the communications as a first readthrough. So, if you can be with me, let’s see if we can get

some reactions to 2.4.2E1. Again, this is one of those catch-alls, so we're not expecting trends and themes. It was [inaudible] have you got anything you'd like to tell us about determining the success of any aspects of the communication strategy? There was a couple suggestions in from ALAC and ICANN org there. They asked for [inaudible] ways of measuring things. We have questions, of course, at the beginning at the outset regarding metrics in this section, so we will be coming back to this question of metrics later on.

If possible, I, unless you want to make an intervention on this now, would leave further deliberations on the metrics and measurables [until] we dig in a little deeper. But I [would like] a queue briefly.

[Seeing how] none of you put your hands up, hee-hee-hee [inaudible] has to have some fun, [at least at the end of the day]. Not seeing anybody put their hands up, I'm going to move us to 2.4.2E2. Here a statement asking for reaction. It said the communication period prior to the 2012 round of new gTLDs was approximately six months. Was that period optimal, too long, too short, or whatever?

There was a general trend of theme that said six months may indeed not be enough, even if awareness of the program was increased. Here we have some very particular interventions from both [inaudible], which I think we also would expect based on what he has said earlier today: six months not being enough to for a community-based application to go [inaudible] the necessary data points to support, etc. So we certainly heard that and [inaudible] that. And also that ICANN org was saying a way to map out the steps a potential applicant would need to take and then do a

timeline prediction on how long an applicant would need to have maybe one way forward.

Now, again, just taking that as read, that's a good idea, but of course, as Donna has mentioned with the proposal from Neustar for our consideration, different types of applicants – brands, geos, communities, etc. – may indeed, if we go down that way, have different time courses associated with them.

I'll open a very short queue on that if need be. I think it's pretty much self-explanatory.

I note at least some people have tried to log in now, almost at the end of our call, which is unfortunate. We might have to have a conversation with some of our members by e-mail to see if we can help them join the Zoom meetings better in the future.

Justine says, “[How does the themes or trends of six months may not be enough reconciled] with the earlier comment that a three-month period [inaudible] questions?” I think the three-month period was linked to different types of applicants. And, yes, it could be read that they are in conflict. I see that as well. And, as Maxime points out, governments for geos just don't work in those sorts of timelines. So six months meant very much not being long enough. But for a brand, it could very well be. So I think the difference there would be minimums and maximums, so we'd be looking at no-less-thans as opposed to no-mores.

Okay. If I can now just get you to just take those as read and we'll come back to those, we'll move to 2.4.2E3, where it asked the following question, which is kind of a motherhood statement in my

view. But anyway, it says, if ICANN were to launch new application windows in regular, predictable windows, would a communication period prior to launch of each window be necessary? And, if so, would each communication period need to be the same length? Or, if the application windows were truly predictable, could those communication periods be shorter for subsequent windows?

I always get nervous when you ask four questions in a single paragraph because the answers you get [inaudible]. There were some themes or trends. In general, all the commenters agreed that communication periods would still be needed. Some were happy to shorten the length of communication, and some were supporters of maintaining the same lengths. If you are going to make a recommendation in this, you're going to have to take that into consideration in your deliberations. You're not getting clear and unambiguous signaling here.

There were also some new ideas, talking about four months for sort of a sliding scale, four months for the first communication period, and then three months following that. The other one was that [there] was no reason [that] communication regarding subsequent rounds would have to wait until the end of the other round. In other words, you could have outreach and engagement and publicity, for want of a better word, as a more long-term communication strategy.

Donna, I'd like you to, if possible, note for the record what you've put in chat because that's extremely important at this point. Or I'll read it to chat if you like. Donna points out the fact that there's been seven years between now and the 2012 application window,

that there has been a considerable communication in terms of awareness and education about new gTLDs. This suggestion was from Donna was, does the communication period even need to be as long?

All good questions, but of course the point mentioned she's already getting pushback on from [Jaime]. We're speaking about it, so we're talking to – those of us who are in the know – the insiders. Of course, the outsiders – the ones who perhaps are the puddle or prospective applicants – blissfully are going on in, dare I say, ignorance, not really caring about new gTLDs until someone reaches out to them and tells them why it's important, assuming that it is. So, to that end, you're going to have a little more discussion on that.

There was some spaces for parking lot other things, and you'll notice it was nothing of any potential there.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank all of you for managing to [inaudible] minutes here of the 90 minutes for today's call, getting through the communications section. Please, please: further discussions on chat. If you would like to continue a debate, that's going to be the ideal place to do it. We will be looping back onto all of this later. This is also a [inaudible] document, so please use the comment mode. If you don't want to do something in chat or you want to do something in addition to chat, do so in the Google Doc that you've got the link for anyway.

I'm going to ask if there is any other business and ask staff if they can put out the date and time in UTC of the next call before we close.

I'm not hearing anybody with any other business – oh, Susan. Over to you. That might have even been a hand I ignored earlier. If so, please feel free to [inaudible]. Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, it was. I put it in the chat instead. I was just saying I think we're making an assumption that, until the AGB is completely finalized and everything is pinned down, there's no communication period. But that doesn't seem to me to be the case. I think there can be a ton of general awareness and outreach and engagement in communities before everything in the AGB is completely finalized.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Susan. Excellent point, and I think, by putting it in the chat, it'll also get captured in the document. Just make sure that Steve does grab that as well. I note that our next call is on the Monday, the 22nd of April, at 20:00 UTC for 90 minutes. I'm not sure whether I'll be running that one or Jeff. I don't know. Maybe you should vote. No, I'm joking.

Thank you, one and all. With that, I want to say we can only get better at this Zoom [hands] business. I promise I'll practice. Thanks for your time. Thanks to staff, and bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]