Transcription ICANN Dublin
Wednesday 21 October 2015
GNSO Preliminary Issue Report – New gTLD Subsequent Procedures
Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.
On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#oct
The transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Marika Konings: Okay, so let's kick this off then. So this is a session on the preliminary issue report and on the potential policy development process on new gTLD subsequent procedures.

And I'm actually presenting this in the absence of my colleague, (Steve Chen), who unfortunately couldn't be here for personal reasons. So I'm just the substitute, so any difficult questions I'll just pass on to him.

And so this is just to give you an update on where things currently stand. I think several of you are aware, but some of you may not be, the issue report itself was created in the response - or in response to a request from the GNSO council to analyze subjects that may lead to change adjustments for subsequent new gTLD procedures.

I think, as many of you are aware, the original new gTLD policy recommendations (foresaw) subsequent rounds and I think the assumption is that, and if no changes are made, there is still support for those policy recommendations as those were originally developed in those would be the basis for any subsequent rounds or procedures.

So the objective is really to look at what experience with the last round are the policy recommendations that were made. Are they still relevant? Do any modifications need to be made? And as well, looking at, you know, some of the implementation issues as for the implementation guidance that should be provided to some of the topics that have been identified.

So in able to facilitate this work, as I kind of prefaced, the council decided to create a discussion group that was really tasked to come up with, you know, what are all those issues that we've found and is there a way to categorize or group those in a kind of natural way that may make the policy development process easier?

So they provided their work to the council and it really informed to them as well, and they preliminary issue report. So as I said, the issue report itself is really intended to help establish a baseline scope of subjects and, you know, to provide a further analysis of - on the subjects to help inform the deliberations of a subsequent PDP working group, should the GNSO council decide to initiate the policy development process.

So the issue report itself, and again it's, I think, an important point for the public comment period, is really not intended to ask at this stage for solutions or changes but really to focus on, you know, were - are all the issues identified that should be addressed here and other groupings done in a logical way?

Are there other groupings that should be done in any way - any suggestion on how subsequent work they need to be informed by other initiatives as well as how that work should or could be organized? And that's what we're currently specifically looking for.

So as I mentioned, the discussion group itself identified a set of subjects for future PDP to be considered. I think it's quite a lengthy list of items. And they

noted as well, of course, and I mentioned before that there are different ways in which these different topics could be addressed.

And again, it's something for the PDP working group to factor in. And, you know, are these issues - should there be a clarification or amendment or overwriting existing policy principles, recommendations or implementation guidelines?

Because, as you all may know as well, the new gTLD policy recommendations consisted of a package of different documents, principals, recommendations and implementation guidelines, so all of those should be factored in as the GNSO and the broader community considers these issues.

Should new policy recommendations be developed or there are elements that were addressed that should be actually covered, and if there is a supplementing for different implementation guidance that should be provided, of course, we know now a lot more on how those original recommendations are implemented, and maybe there's specific items that the GNSO council and the broader community would like to provide as we look at subsequent procedures on this topic.

So the groupings that were created by the discussion group, and again, that will, that come back in the preliminary issue report itself are subject to - or identified to fall in the category of overall process supports and outreach issues.

Second, a category of legal regulatory issues. Three, a (string) contention, objections and disputes. Four, internationalized domain names. And five, technical and operations. And of course, I think there's an understanding, as well, that some of these issues may across these borders or may have links to each other.

And again, that is one of the questions that will need to be considered and - by the council as well as the PDP working group, how to deal with these issues. Is it something that should be done sequentially in parallel? Are there certain issues that need to be discussed and addressed before you can look at other issues because, of course, some of these are also connected to each other?

If you're recommending something maybe in the legal or regulatory space, that may have an effect on how, you know, string contention or objections are done. So again, that's something that needs to be factored in and thought through how to best organize that work and make sure that the PDP is set up for success.

And I think I already covered most of this. So we're currently at - the preliminary issue report is out for public comment and, as mentioned, includes the five provisional groupings. Again, these are provisional, so if there are any comments on if there's anything missing, should these be differently organized. Please submit that.

And a total of (38) subject have been identified, and as well, it include some preliminary thoughts on how the work could be organized, and again, these are just suggestions at this stage and any input on that is very much welcomed.

So public comments can be submitted, if I'm not mistaken, until the 30th of October. Following that, staff will review the comments that have been received and develop a comment analysis report.

They will also update the final issue reports with any changes that are the result of those public comments. And again, the changes we'll make will really focus on, you know, what did we miss? Are there specific suggestions on the categories or the subjects, any specific objections on how the work

should be organized, in any input on we think this is how things should change for this is what should be recommended?

We'll definitely summarize those but those will just be passed on to the GNSO council and presumably a subsequent PDP working group if it is decided that PDP should be initiated, so as they are responsible for dealing with the substance of the issue.

So then once we have completed that work, we intend to submit the final issue reports to the GNSO council. I think our current planning is - and of course, that is subject to the number of comments received and number of changes that will need to be made - but we're hopeful that we will be able to then submit the final issue report and in the November timeframe which would allow to consider - which would allow the GNSO council to consider the final issue report as well as the question on whether or not to initiate a policy development process during their December meeting.

And I think that's all I had. I said here's the link so you're all encouraged to provide any input you may have on this issue report in response to the public comment forum. There's a summary available as well of the discussion group activities and some of the materials that they have provided as background information. With that, I think I'd like to open it up to any questions or comments people may have.

Susan Payne: Hi. Susan Payne for the record. I've got no idea which hat I'm wearing so I'm just going to speak. Thank you very much and thank you for all the work that has been done to date.

I was on the discussion group, and therefore, I'm sort of - I'm at a distinct advantage I think compared to some people, but even I have found the document really hard to grapple with because it's so huge and I think it's been, for people, quite off-putting.

I don't know how that gets addressed. I really don't, but it's, you know, sort of a 154 page or whatever it is - 200 page document, is overwhelming for many people. And I don't know - so there's the general comment of is there a way for background or stuff that people maybe don't need to wade through if they know that?

You know, can more use be made of annexes and things? So that was just a general comment. And then, were specifically, I'm - thank you very much for the recognition that a lot of these issues kind of cross borders and so on, because as I've been going through it, one of my concerns has been that if the work was then sort of broken up into the five boxes, sort of independently, it doesn't offer a lot of overlap between them.

And so I think perhaps one of the first tasks for the working group would be to really just sit down and work out which ones defend - you know, have either overlap or cross-dependencies and make sure they get dealt with together, because otherwise there's a risk of either duplication or no one doing something because they think someone else is dealing with that.

Marika Konings: Yes, so this is Marika. And thank you very much on your feedback and, yes, we're aware that that report is very lengthy and, indeed, there's a lot of information on this topic and, you know, we really tried to really focus on the main aspects and the executive summary, but I'll definitely take your point that we should maybe consider for many the final issue reports, whether to move some of that to the annex and to make it easier for people to find what they're really looking for.

And on your second point, yes, that is something that is foreseen and typically done by any - or a requirement for any PDP working group. That is one of the first tasks. They need to produce a work plan. And that is really intended to - a need for discussion around, okay, so how are we going to organize our work?

How do we ensure that there - indeed, if we decided there are sub-teams that may work in parallel, that there is coordination between those or, again, are there some that need to go first and we can only work on some of the other topics once those have completed because they will actually inform the others?

So that is really something where, indeed, we're hoping, and I think we do - have provided some suggestions on how that might be done but, again, if there's any input on that, as part of the public comment forum, that would be really helpful because I think that may facilitate, as well, the PDP working group's work on its work plan.

And - but again, that is something one of the first point of action and, you know, when - if when the council decides to initiate a PDP informal working group, that that will need to go in through how to organize the work best in ensure as well that any related activities - because I think we also know that, you know, there are reviews going on.

Is all that information, all the groups that are working on this - I mean, we for that the GAC talked this week as well, that they're very interested in may have their specific working group, you know, how to bring them in or at least their input and make them as well aware of this activity. So those are all things that definitely will need to go into that thinking process.

Woman: This is just a minor suggestion to follow up on Susan's point. One thing that I think would be useful for folks that don't necessarily have time to read the whole report is to make a URL where people can just look at the issues matrix and how that's been classified.

I think it's a pretty useful summary of it, if folks can go through the whole document. And I had a hard time because you can't actually copy it out of the PDF, so that might be a small way to go about it.

Marika Konings: Yes, so this is Marika. That's a great suggestion and (I'll definitely) take that back to Steve so we can create a separate page for that so it's easier for people to look up. So no further hands or comments? And I would just like to encourage everyone to take, then, those 15 minutes that I give you back, to look at the report, go to the public comment forum and submit your comments.

And, of course, you know, for those that are very new to this, like, you know, should the council in December decide to initiate the PDP and potentially, as well, adopt that's a meeting, a charter for a PDP working group, you know, very shortly thereafter we will be launching a call for volunteers.

And GNSO working groups are open for anyone interested in the topic. So look out, you know, on the GNSO Web site or the policy update if you're interested in this topic and you want to get engaged and participate in these activities. Thank you very much.

END