
HELSINKI – Future New gTLDs Rounds: Policy Development

Tuesday, June 28, 2016 – 13:30 to 15:00 EEST

ICANN56 | Helsinki, Finland

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Hello everybody. Thank you for being here in time. We will immediately start. We have another nice and interesting and hopefully interactive session ahead of us. It's a 90-minute session. It's the longest, I think, that we have at all, because the issues are not that unimportant that we are going to talk about, and I'm very happy to have a number of extremely competent people around me, so that I can actually lay back and listen to how this goes.

In particular, I would like to thank Tom and Jorge, who organized this, and to our colleagues from the GNSO, the chairs of the working group on subsequent procedures.

So I start by handing over the floor to Jorge from Switzerland. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO: Okay. Hello. Good afternoon.

Thank you for giving me the floor and giving me this outstanding task of leading this session. Thank you very much. It's very

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.

much appreciated. Especially after having lunch in such a short time frame.

So we hope that nevertheless, colleagues will engage in good dialogue.

We have the benefit and also the pleasure of having here with us two of the co-chairs of the PDP on subsequent procedures on new gTLDs.

Did I say that more or less correctly?

We -- it's Jeff Neuman and Avri Doria. And the third co-chair apologizes because he had other commitments. So we will have the benefit of talking to them to engage in a dialogue with them.

And I think that first, as an overview of how we intend to structure the session, in your package, in your information package, you have a general brief about this topic, so we will first go through that brief. Tom Dale, who wrote that brief, will take that over. That's the first part of this.

Then we will engage in a direct dialogue with Jeff and Avri, and we will focus especially on a certain set of so-called overarching issues related to the expansion -- to future expansions of the gTLD space, and you may be aware, but it also may be still in your email folders that Tom sent you a draft -- a possible draft

response to these overarching questions sent to us by the PDP working group.

This was circulated on June 22nd, but we still have time until I think July 24th to send an answer to the working group.

Nevertheless, this physical face-to-face meeting is a very good opportunity to go through the elements of this draft response and to try to come up with some common ground in order to speed up the process and also to make our input as quickly as possible and also being mindful that many of us will hopefully be on vacation during July for some weeks or for some time, so it's good to get this starting.

And finally, we would also like to remind colleagues that this afternoon in this very same room we will have a cross-community session on this very topic, so it's a very good opportunity for us now to prepare for that cross-community session.

There are already colleagues who will make inputs or will be available for the cross-community session this afternoon starting at 17:00, if I'm not mistaken.

Among other topics which will be covered, will be dealt with, there are community-based applications, where we have Mark Carvell from the United Kingdom making -- intending to make a

contribution. We also will be talking about safeguards and public interest commitments, and there we have our topic leads from the E.U. commission and I guess also from the United States.

We have the topic of underserved regions related to applications on new gTLDs, and there we will have also Alice Munyua.

And finally, we also have the questions, of course, related to geo names as TLDs where we will benefit with a presence -- from the presence of Olga Cavalli.

So there will be more or less the structure. Of course as a final point to this, we will have to talk about how we organize our interaction with the PDP working group. For the time being, there's little participation from GAC people there, and at least I am personally of the view that if we want to have a good policy -- policy development process, we need active participation from GAC members in this very important PDP.

And with this, if you are ready, Tom, I would very kindly ask you to go through the brief.

TOM DALE:

Thank you, Jorge, and good afternoon.

And to pick up on that final point that Jorge made, a number of GAC members, including Jorge, and indeed including myself and Tracey, have been participating in the subsequent procedures PDP working group for some time now, but as Jorge indicated, more GAC participation is always welcome. That is not a formal nomination process. It's entirely up to you to register and participate as and when you see fit, but I would strongly encourage you to do so as well, and to assist in reporting back to the GAC.

You may be aware that you -- well, I know you get a lot of emails from me, so -- and that doesn't always make me popular, but among the many emails that you get from me are reports, when I can get them together, on meetings of this particular PDP working group. I hope they've been helpful, and I'd stress that we have here not just the GAC -- some of the GAC participants in that working group but also two of the co-chairs, and it's a very good opportunity for you to get more information if you wish.

Now, to go through the briefing that we prepared a couple of weeks ago now -- and as always, some things have moved on -- but running through the brief, which is on the screen and which was in the main briefing pack that Tracey sent to the GAC a couple of weeks ago, there were four things that we tried to cover there.

The first was the broad ICANN policy context, not just for this working group and PDP but for new gTLD policy development generally.

The second is a range of current work that's occurring, some of which you've heard about already this week.

The third was another attempt at categorizing the public-policy aspects of this work, and finally some suggested next steps. So very quickly going through those.

The first points concerning the ICANN policy context were that the -- the term "future rounds" is used, but in fact it's important to bear in mind that there is no -- there is no assumption or guarantee, if you think that's the right term, that there will be future rounds. There may or may not be future gTLD applications, but whether they're conducted in the sort of formal time frame of a round as per the most recent one is something else that is up for discussion, analysis, consideration and advice within this working group.

We noted that, in the briefing, some economic analysis on the very basic question of whether there should be new gTLDs at all was done some years ago, back in 2010, and it's not clear whether the more fundamental questions there are, in fact, being addressed at the moment in any of the many processes, but we might come back to that.

We're making the point, and it's quite important in dealing with particularly PDP working groups and others, that this is not an exercise that's somehow centrally controlled by ICANN, the ICANN Board or staff or anyone else. There are structures and processes for policy development process, particularly in the GNSO, but it is by definition a bottom-up, multistakeholder process, and it can be very unpredictable in the way of democratic processes generally, as I guess was seen in some countries recently. But that's how it goes.

The work for existing -- The time frame issue, finally, which a lot of people ask about -- that is, when. If there is going to be another round or another process, when will that happen. Well, that's not in any one person's sort of hands either. There were some comments that we provided there that ICANN made recently at a function in Geneva, but 2018, 2019 seems to be the absolute earliest that many commentators think is even feasible let alone desirable for the release of gTLDs. But as I say, no one person is in control of that at the moment. There are a lot of processes going on.

So to scroll down a little bit further, you've heard already this week about a number of review processes that are occurring that are very relevant to future gTLD policy development.

We had a discussion and a briefing yesterday on the competition, consumer trust and consumer choice review. The GNSO working group, a PDP Working Group on Subsequent Procedures, the one whose co-chairs are with us this afternoon, is obviously a major source of discussion, advice, and analysis in this area, but so is the work going on for policy development on rights protection mechanisms in gTLDs and possibly some others as well.

Finally, just scrolling down to the table that we have there, this is a document that you had put before you as the GAC in Marrakech, prepared by us. It was an attempt by us to try to provide a general set of categories for considering public-policy aspects of new gTLD procedural and policy issues, all of which are under consideration by various working groups, particularly the one that's with us today. And going down to the very final section headed "Possible Next Steps for the GAC," we had suggested, to start discussion, a couple of things. Firstly, to review the level of GAC member participation in these working groups; particularly, the subsequent procedures one, and Jorge has spoken about that. Secondly, to note that reports are coming in from other groups, such as the one we received yesterday from the chair of the CCT review team. Thirdly, to consider a response to questions that have arrived now from -- from the subsequent procedures working group. And finally, to

consider using that public-policy table that we drafted as some sort of collaborative GAC work space, and perhaps have a little bit of guidance on -- from that on organizing and clarifying some of the GAC inputs before they go out from the GAC.

Those were the suggestions made in the brief. As Jorge has said, a draft response to the request for initial input from the working group is -- is also something we would like to touch on, but at the moment, those are the broad areas that we tried to cover in the lead up to this session.

Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO:

Okay. Thank you very much for this very quick overview.

Are there any questions, any comments on the brief at this general level?

Anybody? No?

But you are there; right?

Okay. Then I think that we should go to the co-chairs of the PDP Working Group. And perhaps to break the ice, we could ask you to very briefly set the stage on where we are, without a presentation, just orally, very shortly. And then after that,

perhaps we could start talking about the overarching questions.
Is that okay with you?

JEFF NEUMAN:

Good afternoon. I'm Jeff Neuman. I'm one of the co-chairs of the working group. Avri Doria is also here, is also one of the co-chairs, and then there's a third co-chair, Steve Coates, who is actually on the Nominating Committee so he's in separate meetings. He is in Helsinki although I haven't actually seen him or anybody from the Nominating Committee. I assume they're here.

Thank you for having us in today, and, you know, we'll start with a little brief description of the work we're doing. And I'm happy to take questions.

As I said to some of the people at the table here, I may say some things that are controversial just because I want to get some discussion going. That doesn't necessarily mean I believe what I'm saying, but, really, just to get everyone talking. And, you know, it's very important, especially at this Meeting B, to have -- to be interactive and to get out our thoughts and comments.

So one of the questions I'm asked all the time is, you know, why are you doing this? Are you rushing in to have new gTLDs? You

know, what's the rush? Why don't we wait until all the reviews are done before you start your work?

And I just want to bring us back initially to the policy in 2007, which was bottom-up policy from the GNSO that was eventually approved by the Board which said that there shall be -- there shall be a mechanism for the introduction of new gTLDs in a orderly, predictable manner.

The policy was never that there be one round and never future gTLDs.

So based on that initial policy, which is unless and until overturned, that's what guides the GNSO in our work. So -- But as you'll see and as Avri will explain, there is a question that's out to the community now about whether this should be the policy -- this should continue to be the policy going forward.

So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Avri to talk about some of the other questions that's out for public comment now.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. Avri Doria speaking. One of the differences between Jeff and I is I also say things that are controversial, but generally, I believe them. So it's one of the problems that I often have.

One of the things that the policy in 2007 also said is that there would be a review. And, indeed, we are doing that review as part of the policy development process.

There are many other reviews going on at the same time. We're trying to coordinate with all of those and work sort of in parallel with them. But, indeed, part of what we're doing in the policy development process is also a review.

And as is customary in policy development processes, we start out by sending out to the community organizations, the SOs, the ACs, the stakeholder groups, the constituencies, a set of questions that are basically the initial point from which we start having the discussions.

Now, normally we do just one for the whole policy development process, but in this case, it's a complicated enough one that we've done a first one, and there will be at least one more.

In this first, one, we're basically approaching a set of six plus one overarching subjects that we're looking for views on. For example, the first question -- And this is in the form of a questionnaire, and hopefully we will be able to get answers. They won't need to be very well developed answers. They don't have to be long answers. They can be short answers. One-word answers will probably be fine in some cases.

Additional gTLDs in the future. Should there, in fact, be new gTLDs? Should there be subsequent procedures? And if not, what are the justifications for and ramifications of discontinuing the program?

Now, we've told people that there will be other rounds. Now, we're pretty much not using the word "round" in our discussion because one of the questions we're going to ask is should they be done in rounds. And until we've gotten to the point of deciding that rounds is the way to go -- and, yes, there's an assumption that we will use some sort of windowing procedure for blocks of applications, but, really, until we've gotten the feedback from the community on things like, yes, there should be gTLDs in the future, and, yes, we should do them in rounds, we're trying to avoid using that word.

Another question -- So that was two questions.

Another question is gTLD differentiation. In the last round, we went with standard applications and then community. We did not, in that case, go into differentiation of many different types of gTLD. Partly, and this was an argument I used then also, is that we were able to imagine many types at that point. The last round has shown us what the types are.

So the types has basically -- is perhaps something that has emerged, knowledge that has emerged from that previous round.

So when we're looking at the rounds, we see brands. We see geographic names, we see communities.

And then we asked the question: Is there just one size of application that fits all? Is there one size round? Do they all have to happen in the same round? How do we differentiate? Is there a reason for differentiations? And what sort of differentiations do we think need to be made?

Predictability. One of the -- The first commandment of the previous round was predictable. But then we started seeing that the world changed. We got GAC comments. We saw other events and things had to change. And so there's obviously a need for flexibility and predictability. So how do we deal with that balance. We're obviously not in a world where we can come up with a program that is 100% predictable no matter what view comes up. We know that there will be policy comments from others. We hope to avoid many of them by having a lot of participation in the meantime so there's not a lot of unknowns coming later, but there's only so many unknowns you can avoid. So we're really trying to find a balance. And we're asking again, how do we work that? How do we deal with making something

that's predictable for people that are applying, whether it's communities or businesses, that want to be able to know how much they're going to spend, how long it's going to take, what kind of work they need to do to apply and deal with the fact that, you know, there may be something unpredictable that happens, that needs to happen to make the program fit all the requirements that ICANN can throw at you.

Community engagement is how do we make sure that when we come out of this we've got the community, first of all, dealing with it and having been part of it. But also, once the program starts and we start to the effects -- see the effects, how do we deal with community engagement without it being a shock to the system, without it being something that -- that throws the application procedures into turmoil and confuses everyone. So how do we do that?

We're asking questions about limiting. Do we limit the number of applications? Let's say we are doing a round. Do we limit the number? Is 100, 200, 1,000, 2,000. Do we limit the number of applications that a single applicant can -- can apply for? And if we decide on limitations, what sort of limitations? How do we determine them? And how do we enforce them? How do we make them make sense?

So those are the kinds of questions. And then the last question we're asking is, while we're going through this process of developing the policy, how do we make sure that all of the community organizations we're dealing with, all of the SOs, ACs, stakeholder groups, constituencies, specifically in this case you folks, the GAC, how do we make sure that you are being included in the conversation and we've gotten the -- all the input from you that we can get so that we have fewer surprises as we go along later. So that's sort of a quick recap of the document, the questionnaire that we've sent that we're calling community comment one and that is due by the 25th of July. I was told that the 24th was a Sunday, so we're actually calling it the 25th. I checked. I immediately checked with staff to see. But thank you.

JORGE CANCIO:

Great. Thank you so much. I think these are really exciting and very important questions which go to the heart of any future expansion of the new gTLD name space. So I think that the -- I think the questions have been very well put down by Avri. We could have already any comment, any first reaction. Kavouss, please.

IRAN:

Thank you, Avri. Thank you, colleagues. I think I have a lot of experience with respect to the question. First, the recipient of question. Who received the question. Maybe not received by the person that you wish to answer or it should be answered. Maybe in the other hands of other people. This is one point.

But the second point is, questions should be very limited in number and should have logic to be question. For instance, can you guess how many gTLD we have to use? What is the basis to say that use 3,000 total? Use 5,000. In first round was about 1,930. So what is the basis that we say that use this one? And then, limit the number for applicants. What is the logic? Two. Why not five? And why not ten? Then, applicant is vague. In the country amid thousand of applicants then each issue 5, you have 5,000. And another country maybe one applicant only. So there should be a logic behind the questions. And more importantly should be sufficient time to answer the questions. Once the questions are limited, are clear, and have logic behind them, should have sufficient time. And above that we should have a proper way how to analyze the answers. Sometimes they may not be easy to answer the questions. Question may be very -- answer may be very vague so that people, they guess. This is -- might be the answer. No, it may not be. May be different. So should be sufficient briefing or explanation of each questions.

So I don't know whether the 25th of July, Sunday, Monday, or any day is a day that really we should rely. We are dealing with one of the most important things which many people, they have missed in the first round. If you want to be done properly we should do it properly. So let us be practical. I have been faced with hundred of these questions elsewhere. I don't know sometimes what are the problems and difficulties. So let us be really clear with ourselves. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO: Okay. Thank you, Kavouss. Any other comment? Do you want to react to that?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. This is Jeff Neuman again. I think one thing I wanted to point out is that we're asking for initial thoughts on these questions. These are not final answers. We expect to come back to a lot of these questions as we do our work. The goal is to get, as Avri said, kind of a baseline. To make sure that people in the working group and in the community actually believe there should be additional new gTLDs. Obviously if the community comes back and says unanimously, no, we don't think there should be any new gTLDs, well then, I guess we could stop work at that point. We don't need to go on to all of the other subjects.

Once we establish this baseline, the group is then going to work in five or six different tracks on very specific elements of the process for applying for a new gTLD or objecting to applications that are filed. There's a whole list of subjects, probably close to 100 or so individual subjects, that we will tackle once we have some initial thoughts on these overarching questions. But then we also believe that we'll be coming back to these questions over and over again. For example, if we decide that yes, it is a good idea to deal with different types of applications differently. For example, we may want to come up with a category of brands or a category of geographic. Another category may be sensitive strings. There's all sorts of different categories that we could come up with. We may come back to that later on and say okay, well, this should be the process for applying for a brand but this other process may be appropriate for applying for a geographic top-level domain and yet this third process may be better for applying for a sensitive string because there's different considerations. So we envision, like I said, coming back to these overall questions throughout the time period that this working group is in operation.

JORGE CANCIO:

Thank you so much for this reaction. We had Norway.

NORWAY:

Yes. Thank you. Also just a general comment on the -- on this issue. And I was -- I appreciate your thoughts about how to approach this issue with possibly new rounds or opening for new applications and so on. Looking at that, I think it's important -- as you also mentioned -- that it's important to look at lessons learned from our first round, evaluate what was a success and what -- what areas did we have problems and disputes, et cetera. So I think it's important not to try to reinvent a new Applicant Guidebook but to use the baselines that are already there and not opening up all the problematic issues that could -- could open up and create even more problems that we had in the first round. So I think that's an important issue to be mindful about. And I think also it's a good idea, as you are talking about some categories, of course, I remember we talked about categories before we made -- during making the Applicant Guidebook and, of course, as you said, you had some problems with maybe some community applications. Maybe that's something that can be addressed further to have better and clearer criteria, et cetera, for those kind of applications. And also I think also what have been made in the lessons learned about the diversity, et cetera, and the spread of geographic areas that are underrepresented, et cetera, and so on. So there are other mechanisms maybe that could be looked at. But -- so just looking forward to continue working and inputting to this process. So also thanks to Jorge being part of

this working group and looking forward to the further work.
Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you very much, Ornulf. And so I may take that as a commitment to participate in the working group?

[Laughter]

Well, we will talk about that later. In any case, I think that the -- the first comment made by Ornulf also fits well with -- if I'm not mistaken -- with the scope of the working group which is to review the 2007-2008 policy recommendations and in view of what has happened to see whether there are adjustments needed. But we already had a queue. Who was next? First Germany, then Cook Islands, I think, and then New Zealand and then Thailand. And Spain. Do you have them? And the U.K. Okay. Let's start with Germany.

GERMANY: Thank you very much. Hi, this is Sabine from Germany. I just wanted to quickly come back -- Jeff, I'm here -- on actually what you said, Jeff, and also things that Avri touched upon re, you know, predictability, flexibility, but also the different types of possible rounds or applications that you could have because you brought up, you know, a process, for example, for sensitive

strings. So my immediate reaction was, okay, but then who says what is a -- what is a sensitive string, what isn't, and especially how do you keep working on those categories if it's not -- if it doesn't turn out to be a rounds-based system. So is there any thinking on that already?

JORGE CANCIO: Okay. Let's take some more reactions first and then go with the answers. So we had -- now we had Cook Islands, please.

NEW ZEALAND: Sorry. It's New Zealand, not Cook Islands.

JORGE CANCIO: Apologies.

NEW ZEALAND: It's all right. We're close to each other. So my question is, just generally on the process. We -- the challenge for commenting, from what I can see, is that we're in some ways interrogating the objective of having gTLDs at the same time as having a look at the specifics of how many applications, should we do community applications. I was just wondering if you could talk a bit about the sequencing of the round. Are we looking to confirm the objectives of the gTLDs before locking in the

specifics? Are we working toward an existing idea of what gTLD projects should bring about as outcomes, or is it that we submit and from that we're trying to create a set of common objectives that the community wants from gTLDs? Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO:

Okay. Perhaps we could try to answer the comments we had so far and go then with the next in the list, would be the U.K.

AVRI DORIA:

So thank you for the two questions. When looking at them -- so you're right. And I'm going to take them sort of as a mixed question. But we are asking questions, for example, as Jeff had said. If we got to an answer that everyone had said, no, there should be none, then the rest of the questions might matter very little. But we didn't want to start with just one question and do a sequential like that. And I guess there's certain presumption that there's going to be a certain amount of interest within the community for more. So we definitely will be combining the answers. We will be looking at the various parts and such.

When looking at things like flexible and whether there's a round or not, I think there's very much a feedback between those two. When we're looking at -- in fact, that's partly come up in conversations already when we're saying, Well, what would

happen if we did a first come, first served? How would that work? How would we deal with people contending for the same name? How would we deal with issues of: Is this a brand? Or would we just do this is a time for brands? This is a time for that. So those are the questions we're actually asking while interpreting the other questions.

And, basically, it is a combinatorial process of looking at the various pieces of answers and putting them together to try and get a fuller picture.

And as Jeff said, once we think we have a first snapshot of that picture, we will be putting that out again and getting more comments.

One of the last comments I wanted to add on that is there was a previous comment about lessons learned. And, indeed, what wasn't mentioned here is that we're getting the lessons learned from the use of territory and names. We're getting the consumer -- competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice comments and feeding those in and getting all the other comments.

We're getting comments that we had from the outreach to -- we had pending comments from the GAC in terms of outreach to development areas and how to help support areas that needed assistance in paying for these things that in the last round came

sort of at the end and tried to track them in. Whereas, this time a lesson learned is include those things from the beginning.

So, basically, it really is trying to gather as much of this information as we can and combine it and then move on with draft answers, we think we heard this from the community, and come back and then move on to the next level down in the issues.

And, also, lastly, one of the reasons for hoping that we have lots of people from every community participating is because we will have clarifying questions of you. And when we get a comment, we're going to want to be able to go back and sort of say, We understand this but we don't quite understand that and really create a dialogue over time in terms of really understanding the answers we get.

JORGE CANCIO:

I think we are starting this dialogue here right now, so it's very good. I think we had the U.K. first and then Thailand and then Spain, please.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Yes, thank you, Jorge. And thank you very much, Jeff and Avri, for setting out the framework, for a very open and inclusive process for examining this issue in its entirety and very much

picking up on the lessons learned that you've just been recounting in various elements.

The GAC concluded back in Marrakech that we should look at the experience of community-based gTLD applications. We said that we would undertake some analysis. And, indeed, we have now, courtesy of the Council of Europe, two experts who have started work, Eve Salomon and (saying name), who some of you actually know -- they have been talking to you, Avri -- to start looking at the whole background on community-based applications, looking at the kind of factors that determined why there were actually so few applications submitted in the current round and to look at the experience of those applications that were submitted. So that work will continue, and we will want that to feed into the working group as an input from the GAC. So that's a very important element, I think.

The opportunity, the vision, if you like, of the round was that there should be opportunities for community-based applications, and there should be some prioritization process and so on. So we will look at all of that and help you with that aspect.

My other point that I wanted to take the mic was to understand better really where the economic and cost-benefit analysis is featuring in the preparatory work. You know, what is the

opportunity? Perhaps in the experience of brand applications, many of them felt, well, they had to do it to defend themselves. There wasn't really a sort of business case that one might have thought there could have been. Maybe other brands did have some kind of business case.

The whole sort of economic and the benefits analysis I think would be very useful to understand. And if you're commissioning work on that, it would be very useful to know about it and to be able to track that.

I think those are the main two points I wanted to make at this point. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO:

Okay. Thank you. That was very helpful. Let's take, first, Thailand and then respond to both. Thank you.

THAILAND:

Okay. Wanawit from GAC Thailand. From the new gTLD subsequent round or even this current round, the IDN is also one of the important aspects of new gTLD. And when you talk about the IDN for the U-label, the country that do not use the ASCII, what we normally call, it's still something new. So I think I do see the big gap between the technical communities that are

dealing with all the terms we call LGR, label generation, drew the cross groupings among the characters.

At the policy level, there is a huge gap there. I don't know whether any GAC members here were aware of the roles, that you need to dealing with this as well, because your characters, your country, nobody else could make a decision.

That are the issues on the question and really choose if it could touch on the issue of IDN from the experience on the current round, that would be very helpful and could be made the GAC roles that we led to more than the technical part's communities that dealing with and how the GAC do see the potential regs because this is a cross-cutting issue. It could lead to the trust, consumer trust. It also could lead to security aspects and also create the confusion for the users in the Internet.

And I think if we can have some area of work that led to the IDN specifically, that would be great. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO:

Thank you so much. Would you like to react to these very substantial comments?

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah, thanks. There was a lot in there so those were great comments. I'll start with the IDNs first, and then I'll touch on the other questions. We do have one of our -- we're calling the work tracks after we get through some of the overarching questions.

One of our work tracks is devoted exclusively to IDNs and also to universal acceptance, which is partially an issue with IDNs but it's also an issue with ASCII top-level domains.

So we definitely think that that's important for us to learn about, lessons learned, but also to understand the technology and the policy implications behind that. And any help that GAC members can provide would be greatly appreciated. That is one of the tougher areas and one I personally have the least amount of experience in. So I certainly am looking forward to that work being done and learning more about that because it is incredibly important. And it's probably one of the -- between universal acceptance and some of the technology not being caught up to be able to be use the IDNs effectively is probably one of the biggest -- or the biggest reasons why those -- I believe those haven't taken off as much as I believe there is potential for them to be used.

On the community-based questions, I am absolutely looking forward to that cost-benefit -- or to the analysis being done on the communities. I think that's some great work. And I'm glad

to hear that that's going on and absolutely look forward to seeing the results or even talking to the people doing the study. Avri just mentioned that they had reached out to her. So I would absolutely love talking to them and having the working group talk to them to share their experiences.

I think community -- I agree. I think there were a lot less community-based applications than what I thought there would be. And part of that could be that it was so difficult to qualify as a community.

And so certainly some lessons learned on that and how we can have a balance to make sure that communities can actually find a space, find their space, and not be hindered by some of the criteria that were established, I think, would be something that would be great to develop going forward. So I'm absolutely looking forward to that.

And with respect to cost-benefit analysis, you know, that's one of the tasks -- there was a question yesterday to the CCT review team, or to Jonathan Zuck, as to whether we're coordinating our efforts. And I think I would concur with Jonathan's answer yesterday, that we are definitely coordinating, making sure that we're not overlapping in the work that we're doing. So cost-benefit analysis is one of the areas that Jonathan and the CCT review team is working on. We fully expect to take the findings

from the CCT review team and incorporate them into our work. So that is something that we're looking forward to getting from the CCT review team in the weeks and months ahead.

JORGE CANCIO: Okay. Avri, anything to add?

AVRI DORIA: No. Well, actually, only one thing on the IDNs. And one of the things that became obvious, that it is part of mixed with the outreach part and making sure that the people that actually would use IDNs and live with them are the ones that know about this, know about this in time to be able to apply.

So another thing we need to look at is how the outreach was done to communities, to IDN-using communities, and not just having IDNs be translations of perhaps existing names but to, basically, start getting some innovative use among people using different scripts and languages.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you so much.

I think that there are some fields of synergy emerging there, IDNs, the work that has been done also by GAC members on the underserved regions where we have a working group whose co-

chair will be participating in the cross-community session this afternoon; the work about community-based applications. So I would invite colleagues to take this as an ongoing process, as a beginning of an engagement in this work.

I had Spain and then Egypt, please.

SPAIN:

Thank you very much, Jorge.

I don't know if I'm going to add to the synergies or quite the contrary.

The first set of questions, the overarching questions you are asking, deal with whether we need or there should be additional new gTLDs in the future. I think that that could depend on the demand for new gTLDs there are out there.

I would really like that serious a demand analysis is carried out. And not demand by registries or registrars but demand by the end users, be it individuals or entities, companies, institutions, because I have the feeling that there is not a crave for new gTLDs out there. The market is quite flooded now.

One indication of this is that many new gTLDs or second-level domains in the new gTLDs are used to redirect to old domain names that are under legacy new gTLDs, so many, many second-

level domains in the new gTLDs were made as defensive registrations. We should wonder whether we are not creating new gTLDs just to increase the cost of end users in registering them to protect their trademarks or their brands or creating conflicts with peoples, local communities, countries that sometimes may feel that they have been robbed of their -- in their identifiers by someone who has nothing to do with the country.

So I think that's -- new gTLDs cannot be created for the benefit of registries and registrars but for the benefit of the whole community, and that is something that must be taken into account before any -- any new round or an ongoing mechanism is put up. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO:

Thank you very much, Gema. I think this goes to the center of the first overarching question, and as there is, I think, a remote question which also addresses this topic, I would kindly ask Olof to read it out.

REMOTE INTERVENTION:

Thank you, Chair, and it comes from Aaron Pace, who is not -- I think I should underline that -- representing a GAC member or observer, but we let it through.

Anyway, a deceptively simple question going, I quote: Why is there a holdup in opening a new round? End quote.

JORGE CANCIO:

So I don't know if -- are your questions, Manal, related to this overarching question or -- yes?

So let's go for you, and then let us hear the answers from Jeff and Avri. Thank you.

EGYPT:

Thanks. And thanks to Jeff and Avri, too. I'm afraid I have more questions than answers at this point in time, but allow me first to say that I'm glad to know you already have a track for IDNs and I definitely agree that different categories should be treated differently, but more generally, that any future rounds should be based on lessons learned, like Norway said, from the previous round.

So having said that, and seeing that the questions are future-oriented and future-looking, I'm wondering whether you considered having a similar set of questions for the current round. I mean, to get the sense how the current round is doing and then draw conclusions from such questions.

And also related towards what's been just mentioned, how are we going to decide that this is enough, we don't need more?

I mean, I got stuck at the very first question, whether we need more gTLDs or not, so what's the criteria to say that we don't need any more? Is it the end user demand, "We're too confused so this is enough"? Is it the business, "We're not doing well so this is enough"? I mean, again, it -- it's not very clear how are we going to set the bar and say, "This is enough," apart from subjective reactions like a certain number or "This is enough" or "Why are we holding the current" -- so I leave it here. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO: If you want to take those questions.

JEFF NEUMAN: Sure.

I think we're getting into some good controversial areas, so I get to make some statements and hopefully that will spark some more conversation.

But I think we got two interesting sides -- two interesting questions back to back, one from Spain and then one from the remote participant that were kind of two sides -- as Avri said to me, they're two sides of the same coin, right?

One is saying -- from Spain you're saying, "Why" -- "I don't really feel like we need any more," and then we're getting comments saying, "Why isn't it just permanently open?"

And so we're getting both of the comments and what we're trying to do is trying to come up with a baseline. We don't know the criteria yet. We're trying to develop some criteria.

For example, I could say that, you know, if you look at some Web sites that have some statistics on new TLDs, there are 20 -- as of today, there are 23,148,318 new second-level domains set up and registered in the new gTLDs. That's a pretty substantial amount of registrations.

I don't know the breakdown at this point of how many are defensive versus redirect versus registrations that point to content. You know, that -- I don't have that information yet and that's information we'll try to obtain, but some would argue that that does show demand.

It's also very difficult to show, in advance, demand.

To be a little controversial, I was in a discussion -- I was listening to the discussion that you all were having on the three characters, and I heard some countries, some governments, saying that they would like to use the three characters for their own government.

We could ask the same question: Is there a demand by end users to use -- to register those three characters or is that something that the government and the country would actually like to put out there to see if there is demand, right?

So I think there's -- it's very difficult to know, but if we put it out there -- some would argue that if you put the TLD out there and people register it, then there is demand.

Sometimes you can't measure that in advance.

But for brands, again, that's -- brands don't rely on end user registrations, they rely on their own use, so I think it's a little early to make any judgments as to whether brands registered are purely for defensive purposes or registered to use them, so I think that's something we'll see in the next few years.

But these are all great questions. These are questions that we're getting as well. Hopefully we'll get some data behind that, and hopefully we can figure out, going forward, how to deal with all these questions on criteria, how do we measure whether we need more new gTLDs.

And then there was another question about -- now I'm forgetting it. Maybe Avri wrote it down, but -- yeah, I'll turn it over to you, but if I think of it --

AVRI DORIA:

I don't know if you -- I don't know if I'll hit the question but it will give you time to think of it.

I was thinking of two things.

One, I was thinking in terms of an answer of looking at what's going on in the current, I believe that that's pretty much what we're counting on most of the other reviews to do, but if we have a question that isn't answered by one of those, I think we'll certainly approach. And that's part of the sort of cyclical nature we're taking to this, is: Come with some first questions, get some answers, and then go digging.

One of the questions that I come up with, listening to your question, is, I know anecdotally that for some people that do buy the new names, the first thing they do is indeed map them to an old name, because you want to use it immediately. And then there's a development of new servers, new services. And what I'd actually like to find out -- so it's something that I'll go looking for after this -- is to what degree does that first map to an old name remain that way as opposed to, in some time later, becoming a native -- a native site on that name.

So that would be the kind of metric that I would look for to sort of say -- yeah, it makes a lot of sense when you buy something, a new name, that you map it to an old one, simply because you want it to be immediately useful, but what do you do with it in

the long run and what is the rate of change on that? How long does that take to do it? Or do they remain permanently mapped to their old .COM? Which I doubt but I'd really like to see the end.

So I liked your question in terms of bringing up something that would be good for perhaps CCT or one of the other groups to actually go digging for.

JEFF NEUMAN:

So now I remembered and Avri did touch on it about lessons learned.

When we get into the specific tracks that we look at, there are a lot of things that we will be looking at that the CCT review team is not going to be looking at due to the nature of -- they're looking at consumer choice, trust, competition.

So for example -- and I just randomly turned to one of our work tracks, which is Track 3, which is looking at string contention, objections, and disputes.

Well, obviously the first thing that that track will look at is how were the string similarity evaluations done in this past round? Was it efficient? Was it effective? Was it fair?

They'll look at lessons learned and ways to improve it.

For example, I'm sure they will look at the question that there was GAC advice and there was input from, I remember, the business constituency and a number of others on plurals versus singular, right? We'll look at how that worked out, what was good about that process, what was not so good about that process, and how do we handle that going forward.

So as we get into the very specifics, we will absolutely be looking at what happened in the last round and then seeing what improvements could be made, if any, going forward.

JORGE CANCIO: Good. Are there any follow-up questions? Nicholas and then Thomas.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, Jorge.

I kind of have the same question Germany asked a while ago regarding sensitive strings, right?

I would like to know who and using what criteria -- I mean, who establishes what is sensitive or controversial, and based on what?

JORGE CANCIO: That's an easy question, right?

Let's take Thomas first, and so you have time to think about it.

THOMAS de HAAN:

Yes. Thank you, Jorge. And just coming back to the fundamental question, would -- should there be a new round or should there not be a new round, I think that's, of course, a question which should be asked and answered before you go on.

I would give a slightly different perspective, as Spain gave, saying, "Okay, is there a need?"

I think especially as governments, there is, let's say, the market and there's also the, let's say, to let flourish the market we shouldn't interfere with the market. Let the market decide whether they want or not TLDs. It's not up to us, let's say.

And I think a second big consideration to take on board is the fact that opening up a first round gives some expectations.

I mean, once you close the rounds and -- basically you're interfering with the competition because you will be reinforcing all the first thousand or more, which have, for example, very attractive names. For example, I would say .BANK would be -- is an attractive one as (indiscernible) case.

If you don't allow any other string, that would be de facto monopolizing, let's say, one specific very clear-cut business case.

So I would say -- and that's -- maybe certain registries would not like this who have applied for it, but why should there not be a .BANKING or .NICEBANKS?

So it's -- I think we should take this very much in consideration for the fundamental question. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO:

Okay. These are all very good points. Let's take also Iran, please, before answering.

IRAN:

Thank you, Jorge. I think the question asked by our colleagues about what is -- is the gTLD or new gTLD sensitive or not is a difficult question. In view of one, something is insensitive; in view of others, it's not insensitive at all. Culture diversity dominating. So I don't think that these type of questions, is it sensitive or is it not, it gives any guidance.

And my question is asking the first question, do we need a new gTLD? Is it really the question that we have to raise, or there has been already some actions in that? We have heard in two

consecutive meetings with ICANN Board and someone from ICANN I don't main explain us even the time frame, so on and so forth. So we come back saying what is going on is totally outside or not to be taken into consideration.

I don't know what the need. Should there be any new gTLD or not, is it a question that we have to raise, really?

Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO:

Well, I think we have a set of questions on the table which have been drafted, I guess, with the best of their ability by the members of this very diverse working group. And, anyhow, over to you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. I'll take a first attempt at some of those. And one of the things I do want to say is that, fortunately, the group is much bigger than the two of us in terms of the ability to answer things.

I think in terms of sensitive strings, when I look at that, and this is really a personal first take on it, first of all, there are many different types of things that make a string sensitive. For example, we had issues of regulated industries and whether that was an area of sensitivity.

And so looking at a first-level analysis on what constitutes sensitivity becomes part of the approach to that.

I think, you know, always having the multistakeholder process in terms of solving these hard problems and taking the views of the various stakeholders and stakeholder groups and discussions and that. I think remembering, going back to always we have the base; that at a certain point, you don't a priori define those things. You have the ability to object and have some form of adjudication for those strings that someone sees and didn't think of beforehand as perhaps sensitive but sees and feels a sensitivity for and presents a case to a review body.

So I think that any answer we come up with would be based on not only what we've done before in terms of, you're right, at a certain point we can't come up in the first instance and say, "This is the list of sensitive strings," and we rely on what we have which is the objection process, but that we can do some work on that. We can look at certain types of string that there are sensitivities about and perhaps do an analysis. Perhaps remove certain kinds of sensitive strings from -- and make them a different type.

You know, they may be a type of string.

So that's -- that is, I think, a big part of those answers, never forgetting that we've got an existing application guidebook and

we have a multistakeholder process to discuss these things and discover the answers.

So that was my first attempt at that issue.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. And on the issue of blocking or, you know, can we -- should we let the market just work and keep adding new TLDs, I think that there are a number of people that have made that exact argument.

You used the example of .BANK and should there be a .BANKING.

Some might -- There's a group -- a new group that's formed called -- it's again another abbreviation -- VTLDs, the verified top-level domains, and those are top-level domains like .BANK and .PHARMACY that actually look at the credentials before allowing anyone to come in, and you have to be a licensed pharmacy for .PHARMACY or you have to be a licensed bank in order to get a .BANK. The question would then become do we allow a .BANK where they actually verify everything in advance but then also allow a .BANKING with doesn't verify everything in advance. And then what does that do the end user who learned to trust .BANK and do their banking with .BANK but now you have a .BANKING that doesn't necessarily have the same criteria.

Are we asking for some fraud or some potential abuse on consumers?

So there's a lot of things to think about in terms of opening things up to anyone who wants to compete and anyone who wants to introduce new top-level domains. But there are certainly definite views in here of whether we should limit the number of TLDs or have -- you know, just completely let the market do what it's going to do.

JORGE CANCIO: Okay. I think we had a request from the public and Olga, and Thailand. So, gentleman.

JODEE RICH: Hi, my name is Jodee Rich. I'm the CEO of .CEO.

Hi, Jeff. Jeffrey!

Jeff, you used 28 million as a number to perhaps encourage us that the new gTLD process had been successful.

Can I ask you to consider if it turned out that over 90% of those 28 million were either given away for free or sold for under a dollar, would that influence in any way your proposition that you think the program has been successful?

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you for that question.

I'm mindful that we should finish in nine minutes, so I will do a last call for questions.

And please be remind that this is only a warmup for the cross-community session we will be having here starting at 5:00 p.m. with other constituencies in this same room.

So is there anybody else?

Iran, and then -- So let's take Olga, Argentina; Thailand; and then Kavouss.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Jorge, and thank you Avri and Jeff for being with us.

I have a question about something which is written in the first Applicant Guidebook but for some reason it was not, perhaps, properly enforced in the process of the first round. It is that if there is a geographic name, it is -- it could be advised that the applicant get in touch with the relevant community or region or subregion or whatever the river, mountain or region is located to.

As we have been reviewing this issue in our GAC working group on protection of geographic names in new gTLDs, we have seen

that an early contact in between the applicant and the possible impacted community could be advisable.

Are you foreseeing some way of making this part of the process of applying for a TLD that could be relevant for a community or for a region?

JORGE CANCIO: We had Thailand.

THAILAND: Yeah, thank you very much. I'm just following that Jeff mention about to set out the criteria for each application types and tiers.

I just think about it's such a good idea because different type of applications might be different -- the (indiscernible) needs to be achieved; right? But I would like just to make sure that we carefully reviewing process, because if you look at in the branding, marketing, they have the power to set everything to meet the criteria, versus at the community-based organizations or even nonprofit organization, it might be hard for them to meet the criteria. To make sure that whenever you set up the criteria, to make it easy for all organization. Treat them equally treatment to reviewing processes. That's to make sure that everything is good for all who want to get the registration.

Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you. Very important point.

And, please, Kavouss, last question in this session.

IRAN: Last question or last comment, perhaps. It's not question.

I said that in other occasions we should not engage in a purely academical research in the ICANN. This is not the university of ICANN.

If you open and widen the questions as much as you want, then there would be no output or will be confusing output; that you will be selecting some of the one that you wish, it would not yield the output that is expected.

So we should be practical, and we should be mindful of the time and effort and availability of those and not put the people before fait accompli.

Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you so much.

And the last intervention is for Jeff and Avri, very briefly. I guess you also have another meeting now, and I also stand on the strict instructions from my chairman to finish the session.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Okay. So there are a number of questions. Let's see if I can respond quickly.

Jodee, thank you for your question on the statistics. I just want to say you missed the beginning of the meeting where I said don't necessarily believe everything I say. I'm going to make statements that are controversial. I may or may not believe them.

But what I said during that is that some people would point to the fact that there are 23 million registrations to say that it's a success; not necessarily that I would. But that's something that we'll, as a group, look into.

Olga raised a question on geographic names and something in the guidebook. Obviously there's work that's ongoing. Your group is working on it. Then there's the Cross-Community Working Group. We're looking to the outcomes of that group and look for some advice from you all, and then take that advice and incorporate it into our work.

Categories. There's been a number of questions on categories and setting criteria. I just threw out there some potential categories, one being sensitive strings, just to get some reaction. I don't know if that will or won't be a category. That's something the group will discuss. But, obviously, if they come up with categories, they're going to have to define what does and does not meet those categories, tightly bounded so that it can be enforced.

And, Kavouss, I am completely in agreement with your comment that we need to be practical. A lot of the discussions that went on for eight years and for the last round were theoretical, philosophical, academic.

We now have a lot of data to see what actually happened so we can focus on the practical questions and not have to worry about what might happen. So thank you for that.

AVRI DORIA:

My last comment is in two hours, we'll be having the cross-community conversation where we can go on with this conversation and to reiterate the invitation to get involved in the group. Come and join. And we're counting on the fact that Kavouss is there and will keep us honest all the way through.

JORGE CANCIO: Okay. Over to you, Chair.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. And I think this has been an excellent session which is quite different from how we discussed this issue a few years back.

I would just, off the spot, think -- there are several elements that have led to this. One, of course, is probably the more realistic expectations now compared to those who wanted to make millions and millions of money on the one side but also the governments who were afraid that the world may go down if there are no safeguards. I think we're all a little bit more relaxed now that the world hasn't changed that much despite or because of the new gTLDs.

But, also, I think the opening up of the GAC from having closed sessions only a few years ago to being inviting, getting people like you in, discussing things in the hope has, I think, made a difference. We know each other better now. We discuss on a different level of understanding of the issues. So I would like to thank all of you who made this opening and this interaction possible. I think this is the way to go.

And yeah, we're looking forward to having as many GAC members as there are spaces here with the other people from

the community in the continuation of this discussion today. But also, and this is in order to be sustainable, we need to have more people than just one or two who signed up so far to participate in the PDP. I think we all understand now how important this discussion is. We understand the will of the GNSO to actually take our views, inputs in. If we are not there, it's our own fault.

So we really have to be present and continue this excellent discussion.

And just one last element. You have received the draft -- a first draft of answers to the questions that they have sent to us. Please have a look at them. The deadline is 22nd of July. But let's try to use the time while we're here to work on these answers and give some -- at this stage, we will not go into all of the details, like the questions don't either, but try to give meaningful input, also, via this written channel. That would be, I think, also useful for all of us.

So it's 3:00 on the spot. We have 15 minutes to coffee. It's over there. We have two chains to queue for coffee. So thank you very much. It was a perfect session.

[Applause]

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: And thanks to Jorge and Tom as well for preparing this.

[Coffee break]