ICANN Transcription - Marrakech
GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Meeting
Thursday, 10 March 2016 0900 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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.

Also found on page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Jeff Neuman: Welcome, everyone. This is the face to face meeting of the Policy Development Process Group on New Top Level Domains Subsequent Procedures. I think we need to come up with a new name as one of our first items but not today but everyone on the group, please think of a much more snappy name because that's one's hard for me to say. And I think I would like to adopt a practice of the CCT group, which I found yesterday, which is anyone saying the "rounds" to describe the future of new gTLDs, needs to place, what is it, a quarter in a jar. A dollar into the jar.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, so we'll start that one next time, we'll give everyone a practice round. And the reason is, you know, just because we don't know the future, we don't know that it will be in rounds or whether, you know, how it will be. But people are just so used to saying rounds.

My name is Jeff Neuman. I am one of the cochairs of the subsequent procedures PDP. On my left is Avri Doria, who is another chair - cochair of the PDP working group. And hopefully we have remote participation - I'm just looking towards the back because I don't see - no we don't. Okay. We don't have an Adobe room for this? Oh but nobody is on. Okay so we have an Adobe room but nobody is on. The third cochair was not able to come to this meeting is - oh he is on.

Man: But dialed in only.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Oh okay good. So Steve Coates from Twitter is the third cochair of the working group. There are currently, at least as of yesterday, there were 100 members - full-fledged members of the working group signed up. And over 30 - I think 35 or more observers. So it's a good sized group. We have been around encouraging participation throughout the week so I fully expect more people to join in the next week or two weeks or - and continually.

So with that we have several parts of this agenda. And we are lucky to have the number of members of the CCT review team with us for this - at least this part of the conversation where we will cover the history of the gTLD - of the introduction of generic top level domains within the ICANN world. And some high level - or the high level principles, recommendations and implementation guidelines from the 2007 round really to give us all a base of how we got here and to start thinking about how we move forward.

After we do the history we will go over our initial work plan but also discuss - I had some interaction with the CCT review team yesterday. And we noticed that there is a high overlap of subjects and so we need to just, as a working group, discuss how we move forward with that and how we coordinate and collaborate, work together with the CCT review team moving forward. And I

don't have the agenda up in front of me but it believe that's really the main items that we hope to cover.

I guess as we start every meeting, if anyone's got any updates to the statements of interest that they want to make at this point in time let us know. I'll just look around the room. Anyone? No. okay also want to just say, how many people in this room are members or observers of the working group? Raise your hand. Okay good so there is a good fair...

Avri Doria: Those who are also in the CCT? Okay so we've got a fair amount of overlap between the two groups also.

Jeff Neuman: Which is great. I think that'll really help us work together. So and again there are seats up here at the table so don't feel like you have to be in the back. And with that I will turn it over to Avri who was the chair of the 2005 - I guess it started 2005 PDP which culminated in final recommendations in 2007. So Avri has probably the best handle of the history of all of us. So I'm pleased to turn it over to Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri Doria speaking. So first of all I do this with some trepidation because I know that there are those of you in the room that know the history better than I and especially the first slide I guess we're halfway there to the first slide.

So I'm going to quickly go through - and I'm going to start with ancient history just so we start history of where it starts. And when I was looking at this slide I realized that perhaps I didn't even have this one absolutely correct. But in the beginning there were only country codes and the eight gTLDs. Now four of these were clearly under and in fact the later version of these slide sets that I never sent to Steve sort of said, inside and outside. But they were the ones that were definitely within ICANN authority though one could argue that perhaps dotARPA wasn't. And certainly Com, Net and Org were.

Then sort of outside of ICANN's authority, and that doesn't mean outside of IANA, but it means outside of who made decisions on who would have, you know, second levels and who made policy on these things, there was Edu, Gov, Int and Mil. Now Int is kind of a question because well it's still here but it's not really here so I'm not going to go into the detail but just to point out that even this clear definition at the beginning is not as clear as it would.

Moving on from ancient history. So there was a round of 2000 - see, I'm using the word "round" but I'm using "round" for the past.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Avri Doria: Right, okay I just - I just wanted to make sure, you know. And basically in quoting from July 2000 the board adopted a policy on introducing new top level domains in a measured and responsible manner, something that we're still all very dedicated to. It's anticipated this policy will lead to new TLDs coming not operation in the early year 2001. I think it took a little bit longer than that.

The policy involves a process in which those interested in operating or sponsoring may apply to ICANN after reviewing the application. So in this case there was very much a board-centric process. People applied, and the board decided. This round later came to be called during the round of 2012, as I call it, I always have trouble calling that new gTLDs because it was the third time. But anyway this was sort of a trial round.

It had a certain amount of - it was called the beauty contest round by many because basically people applied for them and you had to be the most beautiful for the board to pick you.

And so this was also before I got involved. I'm giving history now as a historian. This was before I got involved with ICANN. At this point I was an IETF watcher from afar.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: He was here. So he could tell you more on these. So anyhow that included dotArrow, dotBiz, Coop, Info, Museum, Name and Pro. And those are still all with us to some extent, some more than others. And that now one of the things I've tried to include in this historical presentation is I've tried to include places to go to read about these. All of these have great gobs of documentation, great amounts that people can read. I think that it will be worthwhile for those in the - in this group to actually take a look at some of those documents.

If, as you start to read through them, which I've been doing over the last couple of weeks in preparation of this, you find that we repeat some of these same phrases over and over again. That our intents, remain the same over and over again. And our level of achieving them remains similar over and over again. Okay if I can have the next one please.

So then there was the support round or the - that's actually the sponsored TLD round, I got it wrong on the title but correct in the text. Where these were all - this was another test around, in a sense. These were, can we introduce new gTLDs without the world falling apart on us, without losing the root, without confusing people too much, very similar I think it some of the work that those of you in the CCT will be looking it is how are we doing at that.

So these were - that must address needs and interests of a clearly defined community which can benefit from the establishment of a TLD operating in a policy formulation environment in which the community would participate. Applicants had to demonstrate that they had a supporting community. And that was part of the criteria made in decision.

They had to be precisely defined so it could be readily determined which persons or entities made up that community. And it had to be comprised of

persons that have needs and interests in common but which are differentiated by those of the general global Internet community.

So there was a list of these, dotAsia, dotCat, dotJobs, dotMobi, dotPost, dotTel, dotTravel and the very famous dotXXX. These have all, at this point, been delegated and are all, to some extent or other, all in operation. DotPost did go through a certain amount of anguish in becoming fully delegated and in practice. And again, in these within the archives of ICANN you can really find a lot of useful information and a lot of this information was information that was used in the next round to understand community to a certain extent.

Okay if I can have the next one. So then the round of 2012 it was also - in fact it was mostly called new gTLDs but at this point referring to that round as new gTLDs sort of - seems sort of lost. So I've decided that we really should be calling it the round of 2012.

The recommendations for that come in two parts. Very often when people see these you only basically look at Part A. Part A has principles, recommendations, and implementation guidelines. The S was extra, I should have deleted it.

There was also background information. There was the question of whether to introduce, there was selection criteria, allocation criteria, and contractual conditions. There had been a whole - and let me drop back a second and describe the environment at the time. This was before the restructuring of GNSO. This was at a time when GNSO would do PDPs, and it would choose whether it did it as a committee of the whole, a taskforce or whether it would have a group working on it. In this case, this one was done as a committee of the whole, a taskforce of the GNSO Council.

Sub groups were kind of like working groups now in that they contained other members of the GNSO community but by and large they were just GNSO community; they weren't as working groups are now. Part of the restructuring

that GNSO went through after this process, it was basically the one that opened it up and said the GNSO Council will no longer be the taskforce legislating body but there'll be working groups doing all the work and change that relationship and those working groups will be open to the whole community.

At this point though in this TLD, and this PDP, it was largely an effort of the GNSO Council and the subgroups, as they were called then, were composed of GNSO members from all of the various constituencies. We did not have stakeholder groups then.

Then Part B is also an interesting document, and it is usually forgotten because it doesn't contain the principal's recommendations and implementation guidelines basically defined the process that we went through in detail. It also had a report from the subgroups. And there were two predominantly. There was the IDN subgroup and there was a reserve names subgroup. I believe the reserve names subgroup was chaired by Chuck if I remember correctly. He was certainly very prominent in that group.

One other thing I wanted to mention in Part A we discussed contractual conditions. Just before this PDP there had been another PDP, another GNSO Council task force on contractual conditions where we had spent several years basically discussing under what conditions contracts would be made. And a lot of the presumptions that one sees in the round of 2012 on contracts were born in that PDP.

I was the chair of the contractual conditions PDP. At that time when this PDP started actually Bruce was the first chair of it as the chair of the GNSO Council at that time. He then got elected to the board and I got elected to the chair of the GNSO Council and therefore became the chair of the task force. It was sort of an automatic relationship on that one.

Okay next slide please. Okay, and I've cut these out of - except for under the later implementation guidelines, I've cut these out of the document so that they were pretty much in the implementation guidelines I shortened them somewhat so they fit on the slides. So there were these seven principles. Now the first principle is one that I love to quote when I'm writing about this round and if that they will be introduced in an orderly, timely and predictable way.

I am curious, I will be happy to see whether the CCT decides that that principle was adhered to in any sense. Excuse me. I really am being neutral.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Hey, you know, you might say it was. You could have predicted it. Sorry, needed to. Okay, B, that there would be IDNs. C, that the reasons for introducing new top-level domains include that there is a demand from potential applicants. That seems to have been borne out for new top-level domains in both ASCII and IDN formats.

In addition, the introduction of new top-level domain application process has the potential to promote competition in the provision of registry services to add to consumer choice, market differentiation and geographical and service provider diversity. I suppose that C is very much a key to what the CCT is looking at.

D, a set of technical criteria must be used for accessing a new gTLD registry applicant to minimize the risk of harming the operational stability, security and global interoperability.

Now one thing I should mention on all of these is that the text that goes with these does explain in some detail, you know, what we mean by technical criteria, to what extent do technical criteria have to be expansive or small, for example.

E, a set of capability criteria for new gTLD registry applicant must be used to provide an assurance that an applicant has the capability to meet its obligations under terms of ICANN's registry agreement. And you can see that this becomes the source of some of the things that we've seen in the AGB that sort of looks that, you know, the applicants and to what degree they are capable.

A set of operational criteria must be set out in contractual conditions in the Registry agreement to ensure compliance with ICANN policies. And the string evaluation process must not infringe on the applicant's freedom of expression rights that are protected under internationally recognized principles of law. That was a very important issue and many times along the way there were various subgroups, there were various discussions that this was something that was discussed frequently.

Next one please. So then we went into the 19 recommendations. You'll see them numbered to 20 but one of them was stricken. So ICANN must implement a process that allows the introduction, valuation and selection procedure for new gTLDs should respect principles of fairness, transparency and nondiscrimination.

All applicants for new gTLD registries should therefore be evaluated against transparent and predictable criteria. Again, that word "predictable" that we saw in the principles. Fully applicable to the applicants prior to the initiation of the process. Normally therefore no subsequent additional selection criteria should be used in the selection process. I will be interested to hear how that is evaluated.

Strings must not be confusingly similar to an existing top-level domain or reserved name. Strings must not infringe the existing legal rights of others that are recognized or enforceable under generally accepted and internationally recognized principles of law.

Examples of these legal rights that are internationally recognized include that not limited to, Paris Convention for the protection of industry property, the universal declaration of human rights, the international covenant on civil and political rights and in particular, of freedom of expression rights. Strings must not cause technical instability. Strings must not be a reserved word.

Next please. And, I mean, people can question but then the conversation does get much longer but, you know, will open the questions. Strings must not be contrary to generally accepted legal norms relating to morality and public order that are recognized under international principles of law. There was a very exciting subgroup that went on during the period when the application guidebook was being worked on on morality and public order and trying to define what that meant to this application to this round. I recommend that as reading to people. That group was really quite an exciting group to be part of.

You were part of that, right? I think many of us -- how many people were part of the morality and public order group better here? Oh, gee, only three survivors. So again, you know, the examples here are the UDHR, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the covenant on civil and political rights, the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women, the international covenant on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, intellectual property treaties administered by WIPO and the WTO agreement on trade related aspects of intellectual property, commonly called TRIPs.

So basically there was really a very strong body of international law, international treaties that we basically said you have to adhere to those. And, you know, by and large I have not heard that we have broken any international treaties and what we've done. But again, that's something that remains to be evaluated. Applicants must be able to demonstrate their technical capability to run the registry operation for the purpose that the application sets out.

That was a very long conversation in there because there was a certain concern at the time with every registry have to be as built out as VeriSign or was there a smaller notion of a technical capability that would be adequate. We did not define that. In fact, one of the things you'll find throughout our recommendations is we did not set down specific prescriptions on what things went, on what things should be part of things.

We had conversations all the way through with the operational staff at the time. Each time we'd write one of these they would go away, and they would think for a while, they'd come back with started a prototype of what they, you know, this is how we can solve that one and then very often part of what happened is we go back and forth in our cycle saying that doesn't really work, well that that's what you said. And so we did a fair amount of give and take there.

Unfortunately while those things can be found in some of the perhaps recordings and other records, we did not document all of those details. That wasn't the practice in PDPs at the time. In fact I think this PDP was one of the ones that instructed us in how to change PDPs and how to start writing all of these details down.

The new trend in PDPs to dot every I and cross every T and get down to really specifics partially comes out of the fact that in this PDP we did have those conversations, we didn't write it down and it really became an issue of, you know, I remember this, you remember that etcetera. Then when you change staff it sort of gets lost in the wash.

So that's -this is something that did not have been here. Those discussions I actually don't remember. I don't know if you remember. I was trying to remember it the degree to which we recorded everything back then, all the meetings. I think we did. We didn't do transcriptions for sure. But I don't even remember if we were recording everything then.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, we didn't have anything like Adobe Connect. And so I think we just had like MP3s, I think we have some of those.

Avri Doria: Yeah, so we may have MP3s around of issues. I don't know. It's one of the things that I planned to do a little bit more research on in its history, just did not have time to go searching for MP3s. Did not find a quick archive of all be MP3s so, you know, it's something that I think would be worth finding and perhaps even having some of them transcribed, but that's not work that's been done. Somebody would need to decide that it needed to be done, that request that it need to be done and deal with the budget issues of having it done.

So where was I? Applicants, right, we talked about technical capability. Applicants must be able to demonstrate their financial and organizational operational capability and later in the AGB, once all of that did have a significant role. There must be clear and pre-published application process using objective and measurable criteria. Another issue that the CCT may wish to look at, I don't know. Certainly something that I think this group will need to look at the relationship between the criteria at the beginning and the criteria at the end.

There must be a base contract provided to applicants at the beginning of the application process. It was. It does not say intend that that contract cannot be changed. Perhaps it should have but it didn't. So one can argue that while there was a base contract provided at the beginning. Again, noticing that in this one I guess it was more of an attitude of trust and believe that all would be okay and that a simple statement would do.

And we tried very hard to state things down in simple sentences without getting into all of the buts, wherefores and therefores. As one has seen, we have sort of change the practice going forward. We are much more specific in PDPs these days.

Eleven was replaced with 20 so but at the time it happened, just to explain why that happened, that was the time we were in the end of the process and going through the revisions and everybody had learned to refer to Recommendation 7, Recommendation 10. And the idea of renumbering was very confusing so we just left it blank.

Going on. Dispute resolution and challenge processes must be established prior to the start of the process. Okay. Applications must initially be assessed in rounds until the scale on demand is clear. Now that was an indication that at this point when this policy was being put together the assumption was that there would be round after round after round, that the rounds would not be necessarily -- I don't think any of us and imagined the size of the round that was coming, perhaps some did. I certainly didn't imagine that we were talking about thousands, I thought we were talking about hundreds at the time. You know, it was big but it was not necessarily at the scale or taking as long.

There had sort of been a notion that rounds would go quickly, they would be smaller and there would be a sequence of them. And we didn't know what the demand was at the time. We knew there was a demand but there was no clear indication that the demand was what the demand turned out to be.

Now sometimes, you know, you could suppose that perhaps the amount of time it took us from when we started talking about new gTLDs to the time we actually had a final application guidebook that that demand grew with anticipation, that's for other historians to figure out at some point.

Initial registry agreement term be are surely reasonable length. This was a guideline that pretty much came out of the contractual conditions which, where we had spent a lot of time talking about how long contract should be, should there be presumptions of renewal and issues like that. So this was sort of left over.

The next one, there must be renewal expectancy. That again was one of the results of the previous PDP where there had been quite a bit of discussion on that notion and it had been resolved that yes, indeed there should be expectancy of renewal.

Registries must apply certain consensus policies and adopts new consensus policies as they are approved. That is the standard GNSO, that there are consensus policies, that PDPs, consensus policy PDPs can basically change those material conditions that are specifically outlined. This is one of those discussions that often gets down to talking about fences and picket fences.

A clear compliance and sanctioned process must be set in the base contract, which could lead to contract termination. If an applicant offers an IDN service than ICANN's IDN guidelines must be followed. And at this time there was a lot of discussion of what those IDN guidelines would be.

They haven't been formally set yet. And also the IETF was still working on some of the new IDN updates at the time so there was a lot of uncertainty about what they would be but there was a statement that once it was determined what they were everybody had to comply with them.

How am I doing on time? (Unintelligible) I'm getting there. I really wanted to go through these so people could hear them. Registries must use only ICANN accredited registrars in registering domain names and may not discriminate among such accredited registrars. That one was very much an item of discussion. Then it was one that was still under discussion at the time that we were finalizing it. And it very much fed into the whole vertical integration issue that was eventually resolved by the board when the GNSO was not able to come up with a definitive answer in a timely manner on its own. And a lot of stories are told about VI and vertical integration.

And then 20, an application will be rejected if an expert panel determines that there is substantial opposition to it from a significant portion of the community

to which the string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted. Okay so that was the recommendations.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: So just one thing that we should have said - sorry, this is Jeff Neuman for the transcript - is that these principles, recommendations and then Avri will go into the guidelines, they all still exist as policy. This is currently the GNSO policy on new gTLDs. So if there were subsequent TLDs introduced, whether in rounds or going forward in another way, these policies would still apply unless we as a group, as the PDP, decide by consensus to change any of those, modify those, take some out, add some. So the reason why we're spending a lot of time on this is because this is still the policy unless we all decide to change it.

Avri Doria: Yeah, and that's one of the reasons why I'm putting them up verbatim and actually semi-reading and semi-explaining because - yeah.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Avri, Jeff. Heather Forrest. I'm going to ask a controversial question. Given the fact that these recommendations, guidelines and principles are all still policy, to the extent that we determine that any one of these has not been let's say manifested in the Applicant Guidebook, where does that leave us and is that something that the PDP will take on? Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. I do believe it is something that the PDP has to take on. The application guidebook, while it's an existing operational piece of documentation material, it does not have, I believe, the force of the policy and therefore, you know, would require us to discuss amendments. Yes.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. Thank you, Avri. We have a question from the chat room. Amr Elsadr has asked, "Is Recommendation 19 still a current policy in light of Specification," excuse me, "Specification 13 of the," I think he means RAA.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Right, the registry agreement. So this is Jeff Neuman, I'll provide my thoughts on that, and others may wish to jump in. This recommendation was heavily discussed at the time that Specification 13 and the Brand Registry Group had raised these issues. And, yes, it is still existing policy but what happened was that the ICANN staff had gotten community input and initiated a process to discuss whether an exemption should be granted in Specification 13.

And the community came together and said yes. Not through a PDP but through other mechanisms. We may need to, as the PDP group, formalize that in an official policy in moving forward. But at this point there's still currently is the policy that applies to all TLDs unless we decide to change it, add to it, create exceptions but this is still the policy.

Avri Doria: And later - in one of the later slides I actually do point out two things that have happened since these policies that we're going to have to take into account similar to that. Can I have the - okay, so then the implementation guidelines and these were guidelines. At that point we did not believe -- okay I'll get to it. We did not believe that we had implementation responsibility. We did not, you know, we offered guidelines. We had discussions with staff. We thought we had understandings that we were just giving guidelines.

I saw hand.

(Michael):   Yes, (Michael) from (GMO). I just wanted to ask for my own understanding so for the Specification 13 that was granted for some brand applicants, in this sense although it is in a way an exemption to current policy, once they contracted party actually establishes a contract with ICANN that contract will in no way overrule that policy? And for us to look at subsequent procedures we have to look at the current existing policy, not what is actually already contracted out.

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff Neuman. So yes, obviously what policies we come up with cannot override existing contracts unless it's a new consensus policy and it's within what's called the picket fence and there are certain rules on approval of those. But we as a group should be working off of these policies but looking to amend the policies to the extent that it was implemented in a way that we believe was appropriate and is appropriate moving forward. If that makes sense.

Avri Doria: Okay getting back to these. And I'm sure that, you know, over time we're going to have many conversations and many questions but thank you for the question. So the application process will provide a predefined roadmap that will encourage the submission of applications for new top-level domains. While certainly, it did not discourage applications.

                 Application fees will be designed to ensure the adequate resources exist to cover total cost to administer the new gTLD process. Application fees may differ for applicants. So there had been, you know, this had to be self-funding but that the differentials were permitted, not that they were necessarily done but they were permitted.

                 ICANN will provide frequent communications with applicants and the public including comment forums. A first-come first-served processing schedule within the application round will be implemented and will continue for an ongoing process if necessary. Applications will be time and date stamped on receipt. Now we all know about how that turned out. Basically that was not eventually how the program was defined.

Jeff Neuman: So this is Jeff Neuman. Just to add to that, these implementation guidelines were not interpreted as consensus policy. These were just, as it says, guidelines that we provided to staff but it wasn't binding on them. And yes, while the GNSO Council got up in arms occasionally when they weren't followed, the rationale staff just basically, and the board said look, these are

guidelines and we've come up with reasons why these guidelines shouldn't necessarily be followed.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Avri. This is Julie Hedlund. I have a question in the chat. This is from Paul. It says, "Will the 1000 new TLDs per annum limit still apply? Or has new limits been set? - have new limits been set?"

Avri Doria: That was not part of the policy, that was part of the implementation and the policy doesn't speak to that.

Jeff Neuman: So that's just to add - this is Jeff Neuman. That was a study that was commissioned by the board of an independent organization. And also I think it had input from some of the other advisory committees on whether -- it was like a root stability study. They've done an additional one since. They're doing other studies. And so we assume that those reviews will guide future policy development or implementation.

Avri Doria: Okay. Okay yes, I'm up to E. The application submission date will be at least four months. It was. If there is contention for strings, implementation guidelines F, if there is a contention for strings applicants may resolve contention between them within a preestablished timeframe. If there is no mutual agreement a claim to support a community by one party may be a reason to award priority to that application. If there is no such claim and no mutual agreement a process will be put in place to enable efficient resolution of contention.

And, the board may be used to make final decisions using advice from staff and extra panels. This -- there was a lot of discussion on this. There was also a different understanding in this recommendation at the time that ended up in the application guidebook.

In terms of Point A, the notion of actually been that at the time of application, or shortly thereafter, was when there could be - and if you get to these MP3s

you will find there were extensive discussions of people sitting down and saying three people applied for dotBear but then they found out that one wanted to grizzly bear, one wanted gummy bear and one wanted just bear. And they were able to decide to go for dotGrizzly, dotGummy and dotBear and such. And you will actually find that conversation in there. I remember it well.

So but that kind of discussion - and at the time it seemed like it would be practical but once the AGB was being formed the staff decided that with the process that were being put back to be able to do that in their cycle wasn't practical and so that guideline was not followed.

You know, in terms of communities that speaks to them, that's where, you know, various community priority evaluations did show up. And then we had a lot of discussion about how to resolve contention. We could not come to agreement on contention and therefore the auction process was eventually -- we did talk about auctions, we did talk about the board going back to the beauty contest model and such.

And could not, within the GNSO at the time, and if you go to the document you'll see some of this discussion is actually reflected in the document. And basically we could not make the decision so we basically dumped it on the board and dumped it on the staff and let them make that decision.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, this is Jeff Neuman. One thing that's interesting too, to this report there were minority reports or -- I don't know if they were called minority reports that they were statements by individual constituencies, I think they were still constituencies at the time, so you'll see statements from the registries or from the non-commercial constituency or from the IP constituency on each of these.

The whole thing, as a package, was approved by a consensus of the Council but some of these individual guidelines or even the recommendations you'll

see statements from those groups. And it would be interesting to go back and see whether some of those came to fruition or not.

Avri Doria: Okay next please. When an applicant lays claim to that TLD is intended to support a particular community such as a sponsored TLD, we were using the previous sponsored TLD as an example, or any other TLD intended for a specified community that claim will be taken on trust with the following exceptions.

If the claim relates to a string that is also subject to another application and the claim to support a community is being used to gain priority for the application, and a formal objection process is initiated. Under these exceptions staff evaluators will devise criteria and procedures to investigate the claim.

Under Exception 2, an expert panel will apply the process guidelines definitions as set forth in IGP, in Implementation Guideline P. external dispute providers will give decisions on objections.

An applicant granted a TLD string must use it within a fixed timeframe which will be specified in the application process. The base contract should balance market certainty and flexibility for ICANN to accommodate a rapidly changing marketplace.

Next please. ICANN should take a consistent approach to the establishment of registry fees. The use of personal data must be limited to the purposes for which it is collected. ICANN may establish a capacity building and support mechanism aiming at facilitating effective communication on important and technical Internet governance functions in a way that no longer requires all participants in the conversation to be able to read and write English.

A note, at the time there were no translators, there was no translation. English was the one and only language used in ICANN at that time. A lot has

changed in these years. ICANN may put in place a fee reduction scheme for gTLD applicants from economies classified by the UN as least developed. One was put together called be applicant support program.

ICANN may put in place systems that could provide information about the gTLD process in major languages other than English, for example in the six working languages of the United Nations. So this was one of the beginnings of the multilingualism of ICANN.

Next please. The following processes -- this is one where I've cut some of the content from, PDP goes on for a very long time. The following processes, definitions and guidelines referred to Recommendation 20 which had to do with objections and community.

Opposition must be objection based. Determination will be made by dispute resolution panel constituted for the purpose. The objector must provide verifiable evidence that it is an established institution of the community, perhaps like the RCEP pool of panelists from which a small panel would be constituted for each objection, but that was just a recommendation.

Guidelines, the task of the panel is the determination of substantial opposition. And then we had definitions. So people, in doing the reviews and in going forward, may want to check these definitions. I'm not going to go through them now but they were for what substantial meant, what significant portion meant, what community meant explicit targeting, implicit targeting. As you can see we really got very deeply into the details of this.

You know, established institutions. We also established that for the purpose of objections to the GAC, ALAC, GNSO, ccNSO and ASO were all established institutions for making objections. There had to be a formal existence and a detriment had to be shown.

Next. ICANN staff will provide an automatic reply to all those who submit public comments that will be at -- explain the objection procedure. At the time, getting comments was somewhat iffy, not like it is today where you kind of have a hope of getting a comments back. Then, comments sometimes went without response. But things have really quite improved in that respect.

Once formal objections or disputes are accepted for review there will be a cooling off period to allow parties to resolve the dispute or objection be for review by the panel as initiated. So there was supposed -- the whole notion was that things will be resolved amicably as much as possible with as little resort to formal panels as possible. There was very much a notion that people and applicants should really work together so that the greater satisfaction could be satisfied.

Please. Okay so then the application guidebook, after the policy was put out the board approved it and approved going forward with the production of it. It was the Applicant Guidebook. There were nine revisions of the guidebook over four years. There was incredible impatience at the time. The first revision was in 2008. The final revision in 2012.

Then after the AGB there's a certain amount of documentation that is well worth looking at both in CCT and in this working group. Objection dispute resolution mechanisms that went beyond, you know, what had been suggested in the policy. There were facts, there are addendas, there's explanatory memos. There's the applicant support program that came through. Then there's the community priority evaluation discussions. And basically have put the issues there.

Next slide please. I think it's my last one. Then there's the part of the post AGB content was the GAC advice. There were six documents on principles, two on rights protection, three on future rounds like this one, 16 on new gTLD safeguards, four on country names, one on public interest, six on specific

strings and types of strings, three on security and stability, and two on IGO INGO.

And for anybody that was at the GAC meeting late yesterday that GAC did say, and please remember to check out all these documents that we sent on the last round when you're thinking about any subsequent procedures. See? I didn't refer to rounds.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: And then there's a multitude, and I did not have time to go out and find them all. We've talked about some of them here. I think it's work that we need to do within this group. I'll be interim board decisions, there's been a number of those and they are buried in a number of board motions over the years where for example, the Red Cross interim decisions, the country names interim decisions.

Because for example, if you dig into the reserved names we had said there would be no reserved names. The board, based upon GAC advice, decided that that was a bad idea so they did reserve a certain number of names, certainly not as many as the GAC would like, but did do reserved names. So there's lots of things like that where, you know, the community made one set of decisions and then based on GAC advice and other processes going on, the board made various decisions which I think we will have to take into account as we try to look at the policy can say is this adequate going forward.

I think that's the end. Yeah. So hopefully that was correct. You know, there's the people here that were here before I came, an old-timer but not as old as some. And I always look to them to make sure that I haven't, you know, stepped in it. So thank you and I guess were open for questions and the rest of the agenda.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Thanks, Avri. That was very well done and a lot of history. And, you know, there's even a lot more things. So the GAC just issued advice on safeguards again, is that 17 now?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yes, I only counted what I found in the GAC pages, I didn't go looking for today so...

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I think there's 17 now. And there were other studies, lots of other studies that were done. There was a name collision. There were lots of issues that were brought up after the process had started and so there will be digging into some of those as well as to whether we want to have policy on those, example of name collision.

                 As Avri discussed, there was a large discussion on vertical integration. That's where the registries could own registrars; registrars could own registries. And then types of activities that the registries and registrars could engage in in order to protect against certain perceived abuses. So there were a lot of other items that were discussed that we will have to, at some point, dig into from a policy perspective.

                 Is there any questions on the history so far? Yes.

(Linda):   (Linda) (unintelligible). Just I don't remember if in that time we discussed about this integration, about the registry and the registrar, in the case of brand names.

Avri Doria: No, and in fact that came out much later. Also, at that time, while there was a certain amount of community desire for us to get into discussing of different types of TLDs there was also a claim that we really didn't know what typing would emerge at that point. It was speculative and we might have come up with more types than actually existed.

The vertical integration notion or any of that specific was certainly not done as part of the policy work at that time.

(Linda):   Okay, thank you.

Jeff Neuman: That's right, and even the vertical integration came up after the policy work. There was a study done by- actually and we have I think an economist here from that same organization, from the CRA organization, that did a study on vertical integration, initial study on it. And they did come up with trial cases that ICANN may want to or may have wanted to consider.

One of them was the single applicant - I forgot the exact term - single applicant, single registrant TLD, it wasn't called brands. And I don't even know if they had brands in mind. But it was a test case but that CRA report had actually said might want to be looked at.

But there were so many papers done at that point in time and there was very heated discussions and debates that went on about vertical integration and models we couldn't be (recharged). But they were not discussed as part of a policy process because there was a recommendation that said that registries must use registrars and may not discriminate against registrars. That was the policy.

Avri Doria: Although I do want to get that one said out loud that was answered in the chat also. And I can read it. It was basically, will there be a discussion of whether something is policy versus implementation or have we moved beyond that. Certainly at the time that this policy was done there was seen to be a very strict delimiter between what was policy and what was implementation as the PDP that has occurred since then has said and has been proved is that there really is a strong relationship between policy and implementation and therefore we have things like implementation review

teams now which we didn't have, but that's not part of this whole thing. But that will be part of our PDP going forward.

Man: For the record (unintelligible) speaking for ALAC and CCT.

Avri Doria: Please give your name please.

Man: (Unintelligible) of ALAC and CCT. Yeah, first of all thank you for the review especially for me as a newcomer. However, I just want to, looking through you PDP, I just wonder if there is a clear statement of the goal to be achieved for the 2012 round - through the - your PDP. Is there sort of (document) for the goal to be achieved by this new round? Is it 10 or 100 times larger than the previous was. Thank you.

Avri Doria: This is stating my belief. The goal was that there was an expectation of that ICANN would introduce a policy for new gTLDs. That expectation had been there since early on and that's why there had been the various experimental rounds beforehand. We certainly had no numerical goals of how many would be done. It was basically it was a job that was waited for and one we were expected to do.

Man: (Unintelligible) looking through your PDP, the previous round are for sponsored communities and so forth. However, all that seems to be lost in the 2012. Is not exactly a sponsored community. So indeed I agree with you, there was expectation according to what I remember. But I'm not saying how many new registries, new gTLD have to be introduced. I - what I mean is that what do you want to achieve for introducing this, for the - a met demand or there is a - the legacy ones are over saturated or what? To introduce competition? But anyway in that sense. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: So the history of introducing top level domains actually goes as far as back as the green paper and the white paper which ultimately established ICANN. So if you look back in 1997, 1998, the NTIA, Department of Commerce, put

out a green paper putting forth a whole bunch of discussion points on how to govern, for lack of a better term, the Internet. And there were some key principles in that green paper, which went out for comment, and ultimately became the white paper that talked about introducing new top level domains to promote competition.

The white paper than established that as a principle. And if you look at ICANN's bylaws, even as it exists today, still had the same provision back in 2005 when we started this PDP, which says that in performing its mission the following core value should guide the decisions and actions of ICANN. And Number 5 is where feasible and appropriate, depending on market mechanisms to promote and sustain a competitive environment. And, Number 6, introducing and promoting competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial in the public interest.

So as Avri said, even the ICANN bylaws created the presumption that new top level domains would be introduced. But there was certainly a lot of discussion. And as Avri said in the history, there is in that document kind of the rationale for why we were looking to expand the space at that point in time.

Avri Doria: I want to add one thing, one thing on your question about for example, the supported. The reason for including the community, both the notion of community objection and the notion of community priority was to basically -- was learning from the supported by as opposed to doing a round that was just supported, that had been a test round. This was basically having learned from that round how did we support communities while not limiting the rounds to communities.

And while also not basically determining a prior list of these are the names that were appropriate for a community. And that's why we came up with those mechanisms that said, you know, they must be given a priority if they're a

legitimate community and they must be given an objection capability if they object to somebody misusing a name.

Man: Or say, in short, it was a test drive before buying it. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Jonathan Zuck, for the CCT review team. This question may be tough to parse and answer but the overriding goal for adding new TLDs throughout history, since 1997, has been about competition it seems right, and that that's been the principal justification for their introduction.

And then there were these test rounds. And so it's clear that to some degree the purpose of the test rounds was risk assessment. In other words, would the system break if we did it? Was there any level of assessment about whether they accomplished the objectives of creating competition, et cetera. What's tough to tell, and I'm hoping there is some institutional memory, other than the community issue you just raised what word is other than the system didn't break, that would then, that we then attempted to apply in the, for lack of a better term, the super round of 2012.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah.

Jonathan Zuck: So is there some sense of that of what lessons were learned other than the lack of a negative if that makes sense?

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Jeff Neuman. Though the 2000 round was actually called the proof of concept around as the official term that they used. Each registry was, at that point was required to submit, it was Appendix U of the contract, was required to submit a proof of concept report. Those proof of concept reports should be able to be found somewhere on the archives.

And then ICANN hired a company, which actually and saw (Miram) here, called Summit Strategies, to do a proof of concept review and him of that round. That report, well over 150 pages or more, we should track it down and

find it but that report goes over a lot of the lessons learned from, not from the sponsored round of 2004 or 2005 but more from that first proof of concept around.

The sponsored round was really introduced going back was an interim measure because people wanted new gTLDs introduced and ICANN said, there was a lot of pressure from certain applicants that were awarded TLDs in 2000 and some new ones like dotTravel that had come forward, and dotXXX, that basically ICANN said the board said okay fine, we'll do a limited round for now with the ultimate goal of working on a completely open round. That was the goal.

So this 2004, 2005 was kind of an interim measure until we could get to that open round, which didn't happen until 2012. But there is a proof of concept report that we should track down, and maybe ICANN staff can help, it was a proof of concept report done by Summit Strategies.

Avri Doria: And I believe there is also a report after the supported round that's in the archives.

Jonathan Zuck: But I guess - and this is maybe just too anecdotal, but do you have any sense, Avri or Jeff, having sort of lived through it which of the principles or recommendations or implementation guidelines stem from, oh my God, let's not make that mistake again or let's do this because this didn't quite get us over the finish line. To what extent do you feel like that process was informed by the interim round or even the Summit report? Like what were the lessons learned that got incorporated or weren't they or did they just sort of happen in parallel?

Jeff Neuman: So this is Jeff Neuman. I think there were a lot of lessons learned that were incorporated into that round from the 2000 round. For example, in the 2000 round, as Avri said, was kind of a beauty contest. And it was really kind of oh that company seems like it's a financially sound company and, oh yeah,

Neustar, Neustar was an offshoot of Lockheed Martin and so Lockheed Martin is a known company so they must be good so let's give them, you know, let's put them in the basket.

Afilias was made up of a bunch of known registrars at the time and, you know, we think those registrars are doing a good job and we think they're competent so let's give them a TLD. Oh, they applied for dotWeb, well there's some legal dispute out there that may relate to dotWeb. What's their second choice? DotInfo? Okay, dotInfo is in the basket. That was the board discussion. It was literally in front of everyone and it was just a let's put that one in the basket, let's put that one in the basket.

Let's take that one out because oh wait, Neustar, they're the front end for dotBiz but they're the backend for this dotGeo one. Although we like dotGeo we don't want to give Neustar two TLDs so we'll take Geo out of the basket. That's how a two, three hour discussion of the board - or actually it was more than that - took place.

So at all costs everyone wanted to avoid the beauty contest and we wanted to really make it a predictable objective process as much as possible. So that's just one example.

The round of 2000 there were a number of different diverse set of intellectual property protections that were put into place. Some had a sunrise, some - or one at least, had an intellectual property claims process. There - the sunrise process that was done was an unvalidated sunrise, in other words, they just trusted that trademark owners that said they had a trademark actually had a trademark. There were a lot of lessons learned from that.

The IP claims that Biz had done, there were some mistakes made in that and so there were lessons learned that were incorporated. So I would say to a great extent, a lot of that informed the 2000 - I wouldn't say so much the 2005 round but certainly the 2012 round.

Avri Doria: And so - and a lot of that does show up in some of the historicals. The other thing I want to point out, which is that each of the principles, recommendations, and implementation guidelines, is mapped also in the document to the mission and core values. So there's also a direct mapping of each one to those as well as, you know, just the goal.

And I would probably, you know, say that while competition was important there were other missions and core values that motivated much of the round and those are specifically mapped there so competition, while important and especially for, you know, the CCT, was not the only motivator.

I think we should do a time check. We've got 20 minutes left on this session and we do have another item we will have to get to. But.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. Reading from the chat. Unfortunately Paul, who had asked the previous question about the 1000 limit did not catch the response. He's saying again, "The 1000 limit of gTLDs, new gTLDs, is the single most important factor of round 2. So if a figure has been established estimated, I'd really like to know as soon as possible."

And then I do have a second question so I'll ask that one first and there's one more.

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff Neuman. So the answer I gave is that that wasn't a policy issue, that was a - that was an issue that came out - or decision that came out of some technical studies that had been done or some reports from some of the technical organizations. Those reviews on the 2012 round are ongoing now. And so what'll happen is they will make recommendations based on the performance of what's happened.

In fact I think there's a preliminary report coming out this week, if it didn't already come out, on the effect of the introduction of new TLDs to the root.

So that will also guide future introduction of TLDs. But whether we need to set policy on that is probably something we'll have to take up in the group.

Avri Doria: Okay, were there other hands? Because we really do - yeah, okay one more than I guess you'll go last before - or were there other hands? Okay, yeah, I just see one - I see one way in the back. Okay so two more questions and then we'll cut this. We know that there's a lot more discussion to go.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl. One comment from lessons that we have not learned we had the last one from the 2000 round on universal acceptance that there were issues. And we rolled the program, we (unintelligible) to them. And we are now looking at this after the fact. But my question is about Digital Archery. Was there anything in the implementation guidelines that suggested somehow Digital Archery?

Avri Doria: As I was reading it, it did occur to me that perhaps there were things there that would have given the idea that that was the type of thing. But certainly we did not think of Digital Archery. We just thought of a timing and an implementation and they got creative.

Jeff Neuman: So actually one of the - sorry, this is Jeff Neuman. One of the lessons learned from the 2000 round, which I learned the hard way, was that lotteries, randomization of applications at the time, unless you were registered was an issue under California law. So ICANN did not want to go through the process initially of registering a, quote, lottery, with California. They ultimately ended up registering it and doing some randomization. But at the time they didn't want to do that.

So I think Digital Archery came out of the notion of there had to be - you had to have a way of processing applications especially 1900 of them. So that was not a policy discussion at the time but more of a how do we deal with the processing of all these applications .

Avri Doria: But it was a response to a policy saying you had to have a method of doing it. Okay, last question.

Man: (Unintelligible) from (Unintelligible) union. I'm quite surprised because I was not involved in - at that time in the process. But I'm quite surprised to listen that there was a will to help communities. Looking at the results it seems exactly the opposite because for all the communities that has gone in CPE, four out of five has been rejected. And the few that passed are still blocked because of IRP and reconsideration requests and other things. So it seems that this will to have the community doesn't work or at least failed largely.

                Second thing if you look at the results of the CPE there is another interesting factor that means the factor is that those that passed all with the minimum points, the minimal points of 14 out of 16. So very high threshold.

                And the few that passed that are still blocked because of frivolous reconsideration requests, etcetera, are blocked - they pass only with the minimum, so it means there is a problem in the measure how measured - consistence of the community because I think that this threshold that - it is impossible that doesn't exist community that are not able to reach the maximum of the points. Or are all gaming about their definition of community.

                And the final point on that, I think that the experience showed very clearly that there is a distinction between economic-based community, dotShop, the organizational of the shops around the world, dotBanks, etcetera, etcetera, and other communities are based on human rights or on cultural issues, etcetera. So you cannot ask and pretend to have the same presence all over the world.

                In the music industry you have in some countries the record industry, in others you don't have the record industry. So how you can pretend that the same measurement applies globally worldwide or dotGay depending that dotGay is present all over the world when we know in 30% of the countries

the world is a crime. So there is a real contradiction there. I don't understand how - and because you have a history memory probably you can explain how. And how you could avoid this for the future. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Sure, so this is Jeff Neuman. I'll go into some of the history and then Avri can talk about in the PDP round of 2012 how communities were emphasized. So if you go back in history ICANN in 2004 decided it wanted to introduce a limited round of sponsored TLDs that were supported by communities. What you see up on the screen are the applications that they got, dotAsia, dotCat, dotJobs, dotMobi, dotPost, dotTel, dotTravel, dotXXX.

When ICANN did the initial evaluation as to whether any of these were communities, none were found to be communities, not one of them. ICANN had a little problem on its hand in that you had all these applicants and it wasn't going to accept any of them. So ICANN did a kind of little revisionist history and decided to stretch the definition of a community so that it could approve some or all of the TLDs.

You know, some of them you can argue, dotCat, I think is definitely a good definition or had a good community at the time. Others felt TLDs like dotTravel and dotMobi, dotTel, were more generic in nature and weren't necessarily communities but were kind of pigeon holed or kind of pushed into this round hole called community and sponsored TLDs.

And so the feeling of a lot of the community at the time was look, those TLDs weren't really communities but they were kind of defined as communities and a lot of people disagreed with that. But there was a notion that we needed to have communities. So I think if you look at it kind of as a pendulum on the definition of a community, you had the pendulum, the balance swung all the way to the nature of there was no real definition of community in 2005, or 2004.

And I think it's possible some may interpret, as your comments, that the pendulum swung the other way in the 2012 round to really limit what could be defined as a community. And it's possible that some could make an argument that, as you have, that the definitions were too harsh on what is a community and perhaps we need to find more of a balance in the lessons learned from the 2004 round and the lessons learned in the 2012 round.

So I know things, looking at it today, may seem like, yeah, it was really impossible to get a community. But back in 2004 it was incredibly easy to get a community. And I think we need to find a balance in looking at the history.

Avri Doria: The only thing that I'd add to that is that in looking at our work going forward and the analysis we need to do we need to see whether there really is a concordance between what was stated in the policy and in the implementation agreements and in the guidebook and the implementation that we ended up with. I think in many cases we're going to have discussions on was this policy actually met by this implementation?

And I think on the community where, yes, the policy says support communities, but where the - as Jeff is saying in the swinging of the pendulum, the policy said suspect communities that basically that did that policy or did that implementation actually meet that policy? This is something where today with the implementation review teams while it was being done we might have had something to say about it whereas at that time it was almost impossible to say anything about it.

But, you know, you do bring up a good point in terms of the policy worked out one way, the implementation worked out another.

Jeff Neuman: So, thank you everyone, for the questions. And thanks to the CCT review team for being here as well. And I hope that helped you all. There was a - I want to jump kind of to the next subject, which is to talk about our work plan. And just go over a little bit of the conversation.

So yesterday there was a - I had a discussion with the CCT review team as well as there was a session from the CCT review team, a public engagement session that happened in the afternoon, evening time. I'm not sure how many people were able to attend that. It was actually quite interesting and it was probably the first glance that the general public got into the work that the CCT review team is doing and the questions they're trying to answer.

One thing we did certainly notice is that there - in order for us to develop policy moving forward you have to engage in some sort of review of the past to find your lessons learned and to improve on those are the future. In that doing the review there is certainly a lot of overlap between the review that we need to do for our work and the review the CCT review team needs to do for its work.

I would probably put it as a Venn diagram where there is a good amount of overlap but I do believe, and in discussions with the CCTRT, there are areas that do not overlap, that will be areas really either for the CCT team to review alone or for us to review that may not involve issues of consumer competition, choice, trust or the application process because that's really the purview of the CCT review team.

So we're going to talk a little bit about, of what we talked about before coming to this meeting. The one thing that's very clear is that in the development of our work plan we need to be cognizant of the work that each review team or that the CCT review team is doing and how we can work together so that we do not duplicate data collection, fact-finding, studies, reviews.

And so it's in a lot of cases really the best people to do that review may be the CCT review team and really came up in discussions that Jonathan and I had a couple days ago where it came up in our group that, hey, we should talk to the applicants or as many applicants as we can about their

impressions of the application process, what they liked, what they didn't like, what frustrated them.

And Jonathan said hey, you know, some of that are things that we as the CCT review team may want to do as well. So over the next few weeks we have a liaison, Carlos, raise your hand back there. Carlos is actually on all the CCT review team and our PDP working group and is the official liaison. And so through the work of Carlos and Jonathan and the cochairs here we're going to work on in ensuring to the best of our ability that there is as little duplication as possible.

And so we will come back in a report on that hopefully by the next meeting, which is in a few weeks, on some areas that I think we could start on which should not have that overlap. So that's kind of a work in progress. But all that being said, continuing on the discussions that we've had prior to the discussions with the CCT review team really is to start our work looking at overarching overall questions as a full working group, and then ultimately breaking down into work streams with different areas after we kind of looked at these overall questions.

So the overall questions related to, at least from the final report, sorry, my screen went there. Oh we only have a few minutes. So I want everyone in the working group to kind of review this and to provide comments on email as to whether they think these issues are overall issues or more appropriately fit into kind of the work streams that we set out below or even moving things that are in the work streams into the overall issues.

These citations, and everyone should have it through email, the citations are actually citations from the final report so you kind of have to review these together side-by-side. I'm wondering if there's a way that we can kind of put this into a chart that's more easily readable where you can see, you know, should there be new gTLDs or subsequent procedures and then have 4.2.1, 4.2.3 kind of referenced right next to it. I don't know if that's already...

Avri Doria: We can talk later about ways to make it easier...

Jeff Neuman: Easier to deal with...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yeah, probably not worth doing it at the moment.

Jeff Neuman: So it's below, I know, but it'd be, yeah. So the full mapping is actually in the document below hand. So what we would look at as overall subjects are, although I know it's called - the reason it's called canceling subsequent procedures is because right now the policy, as we said, is that there will be an additional TLDs that are introduced in an easier language, timely, orderly, predictable, fashion. So if we were to change that...

Avri Doria: My language, the policy language.

Jeff Neuman: Right. If we were to change that then that would need to be a policy discussion. Now the CCTRT is also ultimately looking into the consumer competition, choice, and trust and their findings may actually influence our policymaking on that. So these are all areas where before coming into this meeting I would say, yeah, we just go forward with all of these. I think we need a couple weeks to kind of sync the work up with the review team to make sure that the topics we address first might actually be one that are those that are not necessarily under the purview of the CCTRT.

                So I guess the assignment right now as the next steps for everyone to kind of look at these issues, see if they are appropriate in the way we've mapped them and then the assignment for Avri and I, and Steve - Steven Coates, and the ICANN staff is to come back after discussions with Jonathan and the CCTRT to come back with a revised work plan based on things that I think we can cover without duplication.

Susan Payne: Just a quick - sorry, Susan Payne for the record. Just a quick comment, and it's probably slightly too early for this but we had the GAC yesterday and then in their communiqué talking about the need for us not to proceed too far. They didn't go quite so far as to say we should stop our work until reviews have been completed and so on. But they certainly expressed real concern in their communiqué about the progress of, you know, this PDP not progressing too fast until the reviews have happened.

And I wondered, I mean, it occurred to me as I was looking at all of the history that Avri had listed and how much there is for us to review and also, you know, what you've just been saying about the liaison that we will be having with the CCTRT that perhaps we could do some early sort of communication with the GAC to try and allay their concerns about what we're doing, what we're looking at and how much there is for us to go back over including all of their advice.

Because I don't think, for example, at the moment we've got any GAC members in the PDP. I think some may propose to join. I don't think anyone has been in this meeting. And I think we could - we could try and manage that concerns a little right from the outset.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I think we maybe had one or two that were here but yeah, we got at least two. Right, that's what I said, one or two. Yeah. Three? Okay, sorry. I missed one. So but certainly we will be keeping contact. We're certainly also going to use the mechanism of the formal mechanisms that have been set up between the GNSO and such.

But I'm really happy that there's three here. I don't know if they're actually members of the group. I encourage them to become members of the group with the full understanding that they do not speak for the GAC, etcetera. But I definitely plan on keeping that both the formal and hopefully the informal by having participants in the group.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, and that - this is Jeff Neuman. So Tom Dale, who is the GAC
                   secretariat has formally joined the working group and we do have at least two
                   observers that are - have formally applied to be observers. I had a discussion
                   earlier this week with Tom Dale and he is collecting the names of GAC
                   members that do want to participate.

                   I know it was a subject of GAC discussions. And even in the communiqué
                   they say while they feel like it may be a little rushed that they do anticipate
                   participating in to the extent they can in the policy development process. But I
                   think your idea of communication with the GAC is a great one. And so we
                   definitely will do that as per the relationship - I won't say rules but the
                   procedures...

Avri Doria: Formal.

Jeff Neuman: The formal procedures adopted by the GNSO and the GAC.

Avri Doria: So yes, so yes, both formally and informally.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, I want to thank Avri and thank everyone for coming. Our next call of the
                   working group is on Monday - not this coming Monday but Monday the 21st, I
                   think is a Monday so that's - please look out. I think you've already gotten
                   invites to those calls. I believe that one is at a later time than the one we had
                   a few weeks ago, 2100 - 2200 UTC.

                   Thank you, everyone. We have a lot of work on our hands. And if you're in
                   this room but haven't joined the working group we look forward to you joining.
                   And thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Thank you.

END