Transcription ICANN London
GNSO NTAG 2012 New gTLD Applicants
Wednesday 25 June 2014

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#jun
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Man: It is June 25th - in the Sovereign Room. This is GNSO NTAG 2012 New gTLD Application Round Session at 10 o'clock.

(Jacob Malthouse):   All right. Hello everyone and welcome. We'll get started. So thanks for coming. Let's take a minute or two for people to get settled. So thank you and welcome. I'm (Jacob Malthouse). I'm Chair of the gTLD - no longer Chair of the new gTLD group. It wasn't until about a half hour ago.

This is one of the final bits of work that the interns have been beepering away on earlier this year. One of the things that applicants have been talking about was this, you know, interest in starting to look at what had happened in the new gTLD application round and what might happen in the future given that it's two years since reveal date - two years since applications were first revealed and everybody submitted into the ICANN process. So it's a different time and if it's dragged out for two long, you might start to lose some of those lessons in the midst of time.

So this is an opportunity for us to check in as a community in its group to think about what's happening now and the future. As part of that, one of the things that we did was really to interview a number of applicants who had been through the process. So I'm going to talk a little bit about that and share some of the results of that initial exploration. We'll then turn over to (Res Hoovie) sitting beside me who will moderate the next channel as a selection of different applicants.

There'll be an open Q&A forum for about 15 minutes. And then we'll turn over to some of the big heavy-hitters who influenced the new gTLD round throughout the process and before. And that panel will be moderated by (Maria Ferrill). (Maria) on the end. And then we'll have some conclusions and wrap up. So thanks for (unintelligible) us in this experiment and we'll look forward to a good discussion. I'll turn over to the next slide.

So applicant exit interviews - essentially what we did is look at a group of people who had proceeded from filing their application all the way through to getting a contract with ICANN. And we asked about 30 people who had been through that process who invited RAFG members to - cause that was the most accessible list. We had 23 responses to six questions. Next slide please.

So here are the questions. It just basically gives you a flavor for what we wanted to look at. How successful were different parts of the program? Which were most important to you? And by importantly, mean, more impactful. What delays were the most burdensome? What parts needed the most improvement? And how else can ICANN improve the program going forward?

Next slide please. So you can see we looked at quite a number of different aspects ranging from change request to the independent objector to how the - new gTLD microsite works. So, broad range of communications and sort of a procedure aspects of the program. Next slide please.

So what went well? Generally, people felt like pre-delegation testing have been going well, contracting has been going well, delegation and the draw are all things that people thought were generally under-successful or pre-satisfactory. Next slide.

What went okay? Generally, people felt like the customer service center was satisfactory, rights protection objection, satisfactory, morality, public order

objections, satisfactory - the TLD application system, satisfactory. There're those asterisks beside that which I'll get into, and the refunds process satisfactory. Next slide. What didn't go so well?

So people were generally happy with the change request process, connect advice. People weren't super happy with how that was handled. Public interest commitment, independent objector, and you can see here - the task - some people thought satisfactory, other people's not so much. So it's kind of a okay leaning to not okay result. Next slide please. So just to summarize that, one of the things that jumped out was that the - the only thing that really jumped out as a good aspect in terms of the application process itself because other things like pre-delegation testing contracting type come afterwards was a draw.

So people generally felt like that was a good process that worked well. Customer service center, et cetera, and (unintelligible) as we discussed. Next slide. So what was the most important thing - and I think impactful is actually a better word - the most impactful thing for your application? Definitely GAC advice, again, the draw, ICANN options, community objection, and initial evaluation and CPE came at the same.

Next slide. Worst delays - name coalition is the worst delay. People were most unhappy about that. Development was a draw which is actually interesting cause it's one of the most positive aspects of the program. Actually, also, was one of the worst delays for people. Then GAC advice, objections, and the caplets - the infamous TLD application system which resurfaces.

Next slide please. Overall improvement - so what are people looking to see in the future. Timeline certainty is at the top of the list. Improvements in customer service - shorter timelines - are really the top three that jumped out for people. Consistent objection results and clear objection rules also made the top five. Specific improvements- next slide.

People would love to see more investment in the customer service center in the processing of change request, how connect advice is handled and then the other two TLD application systems and initial evaluation. So I think overall, the impression that we had from this - and I'd say it's - you know, again, it's not scientific for a qualitative first impression but I think many people would agree that those give us a flavor of how the round went.

And we'd certainly like to see more of this type of research and I'm sure we will see more of this type of research going forward. Sufficient - consistent, sufficient, and certain - those really seem to be the - messages that came out of this. And I think they are a good takeaway in terms of any future planning that the community might do around retail fees. Let's really keep those - those five words in the back of their heads that they find future rounds.

So with that, I'll turn it over to the applicant discussion panel to get their impressions and feedback.

Woman: Thanks, (Jacob). So I think I have everybody up here with me although I also have some other people up here with me. So I'm going to turn it over to Brett to introduce himself and we'll go down his list. So if you guys can find the - a mic and speak when you're ready.

Brett Fausett: Thanks. I'm Brett Fausett. I'm the General Council of the registry. We're an applicant for gTLDs. These we applied for 54. At the time we were applying, we thought we were a large applicant. It turns out we were only a modest applicant.

We've got seven TLDs in production and we've got - I think we've been assigned 18 of them. And we probably have as many more still in contention.

Man: (Unintelligible) from dot Berlin. We are the applicant for the first city council domain which made it to the (unintelligible) availability. You know, we are

engaged in a lot of applications more, but today I have just my half as Berlin on.

(Sarah Ladstone): That's good. I'm (Sarah Ladstone) from VeriSign. I had applied to 14 of its own gTLDs and about 200 back-end registry TLD. We've got one of those TLDs in production and looking forward to this conversation.

Craig Shwartz: Hi, my name is Craig Shwartz. I'm a managing director at TLD registry services. We are the community applicant for the docking - anything.insurance top-level domains. We're pleased that .bank was finally invited to start contracting early last month and are hopeful for the same with .insurance in about the coming month.

Philip Sheppard: Good morning. I'm Philip Sheppard - Director General of the brand registry group. And as complement to this process, we have polled our 26-odd members to ask them also what their feedback had been on this. And I'll be talking a little bit about that a little bit later. I can only be here for about 40 minutes and so I am (hot-desking) with (Nick Wood) about (unintelligible) who (unintelligible) made his company with a number of brand clients and a lot of experience also with this process. Thank you.

Woman: Thank you everyone. So I have a bunch of questions and I'd actually like each of them to be addressed by each of you, if at all possible. If you have no response, that's fine. So what was the most challenging for you with regard to informing your stakeholders or your investors about the status of an application? And whoever wants to start with that one is fine. Or I'll call on you.

Man: Maybe I'll start. Firstly, because Berlin is the most long-standing applicant and we started our company in 2005 already and needed to keep stakeholders and investors up and informed for quite a long time - nearly a decade - before started this year. And since all were - nearly all were from our industry or from Berlin, they were really into the aspect about Berlin that

keeps their attention up. And would make them also proud is that Berlin was not the only city that applied.

We are in contention with - let's say, from a city perspective in location marketing - we're in contention to a Tokyo to - Paris to New York and so on. And having this own DOD along with the other big - much bigger metropolises is quite something which keeps your attention for a long time.

Woman: Can anyone else want to - yes, go ahead. Craig.

Craig Shwartz: Hi - Craig Shwartz. So I think for us - and when we look at who our board of directors are and their chief internet security officers and chief information officers and people who are used to managing risks on a day-to-day basis in their banks and their insurance companies. Trying to explain to them how the rules continue to evolve throughout the process and that what we had in the original guidebook and the original registry agreement ongoing change after change after change.

And so when you tell a chief internet security or a chief risk officer that the rules that they knew and they knew and understood on day X are suddenly different on day Y. It was baffling to many of them. Either that in combination with the fact that there were just many elements of the program that developed at the time the applications were submitted whether it was the CPE process or the trademark clearing house.

The GAC advice didn't come out the way we had expected GAC advice to come out. The early warnings were very focused on specific applications and efficiencies in applications. And we expected at - GAC advice to come out the same way that it - that would be - that would be application-specific and not create these new categories and broad sweeping kind of generalizations about certain strings. So, to tie it all together I think it's - if you're in the ICANN sandbox, it's still a little bit baffling.

But if you're three or four or five steps removed, you're an investor or a director or an advisory counselor trying to explain that the bar changes and has changed so many times is a difficult pill to swallow. That was a big challenge for us.

Woman: I think from an RA application effective knowing how much of the RA you're going to actually be able to negotiate not knowing that - not knowing how long that's going to take is a challenge because that impacts the timing expectations that you can give to the registrar and you know that you need to give them plenty of notice to be able to put them in the still fronts and make it - do a good job with it.

(Unintelligible) Craig, from a back-end registry perspective, you know, customers aren't used to something and then being told that it's all different. They're not used to that. That's something that's absolutely foreign to these companies that usually have expectation is that certainty. And so that was very difficult from Craig's perspective, you know, whereas he had difficulty keeping his stakeholders updated.

You know, it was a challenge to the back-end registry to update the expectations of the customers that you're operating the back-end for who are totally used to this environment.

Man: That's interesting to hear some resonance in the comments. I think for brands, I've just made a note of asset that's four challenges that come from different sides. One, I think in general, there was a challenge because for the last 15 years, the main names would be a pain in the ass brands. And it's all been about brands protection and fraud and fighting crime online. And that's been the mindset for certain companies.

And to change that mindset from saying this is pain, this is a problem, this is a cost center to now, this is a rather interesting opportunity for some companies was - it was and still is an interesting challenge. And some of - I

think - and the ones who have applied here the relatively large number proportionately but relatively small number of all brands have applied I think are the enlightened ones who access all that transition and saw that opportunity more.

Secondly, having done that, absolute resonating in terms of business certainty or embarking on the process and some of the things are changing as the process is going along. And that's just not what these guys are used to in the way that they negotiate. A part of that also I think is that - when you said what is it about (unintelligible) and what does it look like, we have this thing called the application guidebook. And the application guidebook history, I was part of the process in terms of what sort of went into that.

I - ultimately, it was written to try to sell excel to two audiences. And the first audience was an internal ICANN audience about the positive and the bodies and it was sharing how that policy was being placed into a series of things to do with the applications. I've got a second audience - the external one - the main name applicant - who's own interest in specifically the purchase and how to apply.

And as a result we had a hugely complicated and sometimes duplicative document that was just not right for the perspective of all the applicants. And I think that is something that can be actually relatively easily addressed for future rounds just in the way that it is structured. And of course, finally, and (unintelligible) to hear this - there was of course, a whole chunk of standardized register agreements which was simply irrelevant for brands because there was a number of clauses of course to do with register protection.

And typically dot Brands are not having registrants, there's nobody to protect (unintelligible) for failure in terms of the failure of the TLD is probably the last thing that's a matter if the entire company itself is to go down. So it was

things that were simply saying is this standard contract but is it relevant and an - often an easy sale. So there's four challenges.

Woman: Well, building on that, each of you represents companies who are used to negotiating contracts in multiple cultures with multiple jurisdictions involved. What surprised you about working with ICANN?

Woman: Well certainly, from the back-end registry perspective, I think having a contract negotiation period being called a contract acceptance period was very different from what funds are used to kind of dealing with - they're accomplishing such a thing. And so that was different. Also, a queuing system in terms of prioritizing those that accepted verses those that wanted to negotiate again was very different from the standard purchasing cycle that you would usually tend to see and that these - many of these applicants are used to.

Man: I think one major issue was the whole sort of client servicing approach. And typically, if you're spending a sum of money - to something $85,000 - you would expect to have from your service provider a point of contact. So you would have a client service manager dedicated to you that's named so relationship-building can take place well there to solve your problems. And I think the sort of anonymity of the process and the sort of - the black hole of tasks and even in some queries I sometimes felt it was a bit like speaking to the Delphi Oracle unless you got the decision of the question absolutely right.

The response that came back wasn't necessarily the one that you wanted cause it wasn't intuitive understanding as to what the problem would be. And that's a sort of understanding, off course you'd get, if you do have client services managers dedicated to it. So I think it was part of that sort of professionalism of approach that we used to in other areas of these sort of sums of money that we didn't see in ICANN.

Man: Yes, on the difference in cultures, I mean we only really had that with regard to the letter of credit. ICANN originally ask for a AAA writ of bank. And so we were fortunate that you registry - that we had an existing relationship with AAA the rated Swiss bank. And we got a letter of credit that was typically standard for Switzerland. It turned out that it was not typically standard for ICANN.

                And we had to go through multiple iteration to that. And we were fortunate that because we had this existing relationship with the bank that if we had revisions to it, that they could turn it for us in 24/48 hours. And we did that three or four times, actually.

                And - but you know, I think probably not everyone had the same relationship with the bank. If we were new to the bank, it would have been painful. So that was one of the places. And you know, when you think about P - how would we do this again? I think everyone knows and everyone agrees. And I would certainly expect ICANN to agree to that each standard form of letter of credit that you could just take to the bank and say can you issue this would be the way to do it.

                But that was one of our, yes, sort of cultural frustrations in the contracting process.

Woman: So, changing tag a bit. What was your best experience with bringing your new detail to market?

Man: Just since we have - in GAs since March, there already a lot of domains online now. And we have some preliminary resides how many domains are used and are part of whatever or have an X records and so on. And what I found really good is that just a week after the GA started, we already had some of the domain names was new, unique content being number one in Google for that search term. And that was really amazing how quickly Google followed up and you - the start of the new gTLDs.

Also Google put on - if you - a half year ago, if we were using - let's say, giving burn injure into Google - then the city of Berlin was the first. If you have the small dot before Berlin and put this into Google, now - it now really directs to the TLD. So that was another thing where Google has started to mention the dot in front of a term. And that's interesting.

So you just type in now dot whatever which is already in the root and being used on GA and you find directly the registry for that.

Man: The most exciting part absolutely has been seeing your names in the wild being used by users. And it turns out, you know, in very surprising ways. You know, I didn't expect a competition between Unix's text editors on who could be the sexiest. But you know, you've got E-macs.sexy and (unintelligible) .sexy and they both got sites up. It's - you know, it's fun to see your TLD being used in surprising ways by users.

That is absolutely been the greatest joy.

Woman: I was just - it's not my TLD - but last night we had some transport to an even. And on the side of the bus, it said dub, dub, dub .brand.london. That was exciting - even more exciting and the bus driver knew all about it and was so excited about it. And that was fun to me.

Man: I mean, a couple of things for brands. And what's - when it's good to be able to start to give positive messages about problems that we've seen online such as counterfeiting and crime and to say look, there are now opportunities whereby individual companies could start to do things about this. So the ability to find that this is the coming is very positive. And I think other than that, also, the start now of dialog as companies start to engage their marketing and their social media people in the opportunity.

And we formed a small working group also within the DRG just to look at some concepts and some voluntary standards and ideas. And the more you get people talking about this new thing and new ways maybe of addressing and sort of landing pages and that you start to see more and more opportunities for doing things in different ways and to improve communication. And that becomes quite exciting and that should - those things start to motivate all different parts of the organizations.

Woman: So looking back to your interactions with ICANN, what do you think worked and what do you think could have been improved or could be improved for the next round?

Brett Fausett: You know, I think you have to divide communications with ICANN as a two periods. There was the before the evaluations were done period and the post-evaluations were done period. You know, in the pre-evaluation period, to its great credit, ICANN had these procedures in place to make sure that no one got inside information that no one else had. So if you wanted to talk to an ICANN staff or they had to have two people present.

They would go back and record the conversation and who said what to whom so that they could sort of make sure among the new gTLD evaluation team that everyone had equal information. And that was great. But it also meant that you couldn't get conversation to progress very quickly. And I know that as we were going through the process, you know, look - the people on our team have been involved in this process forever.

And we thought we knew the guidebook inside and out until (unintelligible) actually started applying. And then once you started applying, you realize that there were questions that you have and you had to go through ICANN. And, you know, some of the times, you know, you would ask a question. I don't - you know, sometimes they would just tear it back to you - the answer - in the guidebook or point to the second one. And you know, while I actually had questions about - there were nuances there.

It was hard to draw those out. It was - you know, once we had the guidebook - and sometimes, you know, I remember expressing to (Curt) or someone the frustration that lay with the section of the guidebook. And he said, oh this has been fixed forever. And it's not - well you know, it's been in the last three versions, but no one's actually had tried to deal with it yet. And so it - we, as applicants based a whole lot of questions that had never come up before as we were writing our applications.

And there wasn't a good process in place to give information back. And, you know, part of that was because ICANN wanted to make sure that I didn't get information that not - no one else had. So if you did have a question, they wanted to take it back, discuss it internally with their team and publish it out to the community at the same time. And, you know, absolutely, that was the way - that was the fair way to do it. I wonder if in the future there might be a more efficient way to do it so that we can get answers to questions more quickly.

And I think we will. I mean, we worked through the guidebook the first time. I think now that we've seen what past - which is pretty much everything - that we have maybe a different feeling about, you know, what the application process was like. I think it will get easier. I think the questions will turn more quickly.

And so that was - you know, that was just an observation. I think it'll get better. But it was hard to send.

Craig Shwartz: Hi, this is Craig again. And so I echo a lot of what Brett just said. I think also too this was - there was a scalability issue, right, on ICANN's side that they - the program was built on the presumption that they would get X number of applications and it turned out to be, you know, four fold that. And so I think it was a resource issue at the beginning that there just weren't enough bodies to be responsive in a timely manner. I think it's been greatly improved.

And I think the answers now come a lot more quickly. I do think the next round things will be differently - will be different in that the vast majority of the questions will have been asked in this round and can be incorporated into the guidebook perhaps more clarity. Again, to echo a point that Brett made, having come from ICANN and being part of the development of the guidebook, if as an applicant on this guide, I still had lots of questions and I felt like I was running into customer service, you know, sometimes a couple of times a week.

And it seemed like responses were coming slowly and weren't always particularly helpful. So it required just further back and forth. And again, I think with time and experience and resources, that the folks that come after us in the next round will benefit greatly from what we've done in this round.

Same with us, especially the customer service support. We had a lot of questions for us and clients. And they have been first level support in the first instance there. In many cases, the first level support didn't understand our question, and was going forth and back and you need to escalate this. And that took long time.

If they would have said, okay, this is a question we can't answer exactly, we'll give it to the second or third level, it would go much quicker. But I think it's a problem any customer support - it's obvious ICANN support has the same problems.

Man: Yeah, following on that, I mean it was clear to me, through some of the question and answer process, that people on our side of the question/answer had a lot more information about the guidebook than the people at ICANN. And, you know, I knew that they were new. They were scaling. Sometimes they were new trainees.

You know, you didn't always know who was answering your question. I didn't know if it was a new hire or, you know, (Kirk Britz). You know, it could be anybody. It was unticketed. It was undocumented. You didn't know.

And sometimes it was clear that, you know, I know this guidebook better than you do. And you had to go back and say, you know, can you look at this?

Man: (Unintelligible) document, and was essentially modular in sense of time and phases and dedication around. (Unintelligible) there was to consider that there were different audiences and different departments who would be looking at what was in the book, and what they need to do.

And having a modular approach that was both in time, but also in the depth of knowledge in terms of who needs to know what, and just means that you could find out for technical back end, et cetera, would be very helpful, because then the nature of the language can change as necessary, to suit those audiences. And as a communication document then, it becomes much more user friendly.

Woman: Following on to that, a number of people have brought up the guidebook at this point. Do you feel that the guidebook addressed your class of TLD appropriately? Because we've got brands, we've got GOs, we've got generics represented here.

Man: Yes, so the gTLDs were a special category, and the applicant guidebook was a lot of protections which it didn't cover at the end of the day, Patagonia and Amazon and some other ones. But I think they were really good. These things have developed over a long time, and I think that something should be in the next guidebook as well.

(Sarah): Yeah, this is (Sarah). It's slightly different to the question, but I would have liked to have seen something in the guidebook, and I would like to see it perhaps next time, around back-end registries. And so, for example, there

being an accreditation process for back-end registries that just happened once, instead of having to - that would have been more efficient and more cost effective, I think, to be worked through.

So, I mean, you know, as a back-end registry for brands, Spec 11 was welcomed. And I'm sure that Craig's got comments on the community side. But just purely as a technical back-end registry, I would have liked to have seen accommodation for our, you know, for our particular needs.

Craig Schwartz: Hi, Craig Schwartz again. So from a community applicant perspective, these remarks are similar to those I made in my opening, in response to the first question, and that is the community priority evaluation process was not fully baked. And everyone didn't understand it at the time the guidebook came out.

And again, it was one of many pieces of the puzzle that evolved over time. So had there been more understanding about it, perhaps more applicants would have chosen community. Perhaps some that chose it might not have. So people perhaps could have made better decisions had there been more information. So that's one observation.

I think as well, where there was a lot of clarity eventually in the community objection proceeding with regard to panel selections and identification of the panelists, and the process to object to panelists, there just seemed to be much more transparency with the ICC process on community objections than there's been on the EIU process for community priority evaluation.

But the parties that are impacted by those are generally all the same. So again, more evolved and thorough information at the onset might have caused people just to make different decisions. And we might see more community applicants than we'll see today, and perhaps we would have seen last.

Man: From the perspective of dot Brands, you'll be not surprised to hear my answer to your question is a resounding no, as brands were mostly ignored, wholly ignored, in the book, in the application guidebook and registry agreement, which had 12 specifications and, as a result, of course, we, after the event, have spent a year negotiating Specification 13 with a few things, just adjusting what adjustments were necessary to make.

It has to be said that actually one of the more interesting parts of negotiating Specification 13 was a very necessary definition of dot Brands that had to go into that as part of that, which took some considerable amount of thinking on all sides in order to get right.

So I think it was something that we recognized would have taken some time had that done previously. But anyway, that work is now done and is there for the future.

Man: You know, for the registries part, we took great care to apply for things that were straight down the middle of the guidebook. So the guidebook actually did speak to our applications, because that's what we went for. The only little curveball we had was that we certainly thought, when we applied for it, that dot com was a great TLD.

Woman: Thank you for that. Sorry, I'm still giggling. What are some of the lessons that any of you learned while bringing your TLDs to market, either from a marketing perspective or a technical perspective?

Man: You know, I was surprised - I don't want to step on any toes here, because now they're valued partners. I was actually surprised how unprepared the registrars were to take on these new TLDs, and how unprepared they were in their search bars to give users what they wanted.

I mean I found that many registrars -- and sexy had been live for a while now -- that if you typed in, you know, example dot sexy, which I always used

because I knew it was taken. I wanted to see what they were going to suggest to me when it was taken. They would try to sell me a dot co or a dot com or a dot net.

I thought, you know, here I am. I'm a pre-qualified customer for dot sexy, because I just told you that's what I was looking for. Why aren't you offering me dot sexy. And they were sending me something else. So that was a frustrating thing for me, because I didn't think our would-be customers were getting the right kind of customer experience when they came to the registrar.

Now that was six months ago, and there have been, you know, great improvements. I think a lot of learning has happened at the registrar level where people are buying these names. But I was awfully surprised that the registrars, I didn't think, as a group, were all ready to go at launch.

We had been preparing for this for, you know, this has been my life for, you know, eight years, something like that. So and I didn't appreciate that it wasn't the top priority at the registrars. And, you know, look, some were great. I'm generalizing here. But I thought that the sales experience would have been better at launch, because we thought we had so much time to prepare for this.

Man: You know, the same was at the registrar. That's quite an interesting thing. The registrars that make the most problems with onboarding, for instance, they didn't register a single domain name at the end of the day. So we have it's really a split. So a few registrars make up your business or the registrations. You have a lot of registrars would sign up and never register or hardly register. That's a key learning we had as well.

But also from the marketing perspective, we discussed this already in the GO top level domain group, that you had, at launch, even if you are a city or a region which was a long-term sustainable perspective of the TLD, you have

only one shot to do a big marketing bang at launch to get attention of the media, the press, and the people as well.

So in Berlin we did this 14-day - starting 14 days before the general availability and one week after. There was a three weeks big bang culminating on the launch date. And after that, attention really drops and you can't catch up with this big attention on the things.

You need to rely then on the people which put your domain name in posters and the public, and advertising in the public, as we see with (unintelligible) at the moment.

Woman: Any final thoughts that you want to share with the audience today? All right, well thank you all for joining us.

Man: Can I say one thing?

Woman: Yeah.

Man: A plug for something that's coming for everyone. Being that we're talking about the lessons learned at what's next, at the GNSO council meeting this afternoon, I think we're going to approve a working group, a drafting group, to look at the lessons learned from Round 1, and to create issue reports to come back to ICANN staff that may or may not result in policy development processes that would inform subsequent rounds.

So it's going to be an open group. It's going to be open to anyone. I think if you're in this room, you're probably interested in the work that's going to happen. So know that that's coming. There will probably be an announcement if we do approve it this afternoon, in the next week, asking for membership. So keep your eyes open.

Man: I think there's one comment that came to us from a number of different members of the DRG, which was not only relevant to the application round, but indeed to a lot of ICANN communication in general, is acronyms -- just the continual use of acronyms in all forms of communication is there, despite sort of the availability of glossaries, et cetera.

              They do pervade discussions, even meetings such as this. And if only we can recognize there's a whole new stakeholder set there who is not as yet familiar with the topics as many have been historically, that would help greatly.

              I mean I think there's something like six undefined acronyms on the new Web site of ICANN's home page, and there are eight undefined acronyms on the applicant's portal page, including EW, IEE, PDT and PIC. So just an appeal for clarity. Thank you.

Woman: Fair enough. We're also catching up with many of those acronyms. So I'd like to thank everybody who was on the panel today for your time and effort. I think this has been helpful -- it was to me -- to get different perspectives. And I'll turn it back over to Jacob.

(Jacob Malthouse):   Thanks. Next slide. So the next panel is a group of stakeholders - representative of stakeholder groups that have been active through the new gTLD program, development of the guidebook, and also during the implementation of the program itself to date. So I'm really excited to turn it over to (Maria), and hear the perspectives of the broader ICANN community under the new gTLD program.

(Maria Ferrill):   Thank you, (Jacob). And thank you to (unintelligible) registry constituency for organizing this. So our panel is going to be - I guess we're going to be taking up what the last panel did, which was looking at some of the real nitty gritty of what it was like to be an applicant.

And we're broadening the focus a little bit to people who were really, really integral to the process of developing the new gTLD round, and also people who kind of have had the hot potato turned over to them (unintelligible), and they're trying to make things work with it as we go along.

So I have a panel of about - oh, sorry, of five people. And I'm going to tell you their names and ask them to introduce themselves. And also I want to point out that we have a microphone right in the middle of the room, and we strongly request or encourage people to come ask questions. Just stand at the mic and signal me, and we'll get some good interaction going here.

So today on our panel we have (William Ellis) from (Nominess). We have Rich Merdinger from GoDaddy. Peter Nettleford, who is a Government Advisory Committee representative from Australia. We have Kristina Rosette, who is the chair of the Intellectual Property Constituency. And somewhere we have Evan Leibovitch. Where are you, Evan? Oh, there you are. Hello.

And so I'm going to ask each of you just to give a really quick (unintelligible) of, you know, what has - just remind people of who you are, but also what has your involvement in the new gTLD process been, just simple from the functional point of view, just to help people situate you in the debate. And so I'm going to ask Rich to begin.

Rich Merdinger: Hello. Rich Merdinger. I'm Vice President of Domain Strategy with GoDaddy. I've been with the company since 1997, so I've been able to watch the expansion of this name space for quite some time. GoDaddy applied for three names, home, casa and godaddy.

So I was integral with the application process there, but predominantly been working with registries over the course of the last years as far as the launch strategies, and really where the rubber hits the road, watching the smoke rise up and trying to get traction going.

Peter Nettleford: Thank you. Peter Nettleford. I'm the Australian GAC representative. I'm also one of the current vice chairs of the GAC. In terms of the GAC's role in this process, for those of you who have been following it for some time, the GAC was very active in the policy development process before the launch of the round, including through a normal scorecard to discussions with the Board.

There's certainly some questions about that process. I'm hearing loud and clear that the GAC advice process, which followed after the application launch, is one of the most important and challenging, from the perspective of many people in this group, so I look forward to an interesting discussion on that.

In terms of after the process, it's already been mentioned by many of the speakers, the GAC had a role which was set out in the applicant guidebook for individual GAC members to ensure early warnings.

The Australian government was quite prolific in issuing those early warnings. We felt that that was an important step to go through in terms of procedural fairness as we were looking at applications. So we certainly availed ourselves of that opportunity.

And the GAC also issued advice. And again I've already heard some concerns about the early warning process being particular to applications versus the way the GAC advice came out creating categories, et cetera. I'm sure there are other questions and concerns about where the GAC went.

And in terms of the last thing I'll mention, I'm interested to hear that the GNSO is looking at doing some work towards future rounds, setting up issues, going through the issues report process.

The GAC has also formed a working group to look at issues which are of interest to the GAC from the current round, where we thought the process

could potentially be refined or improved for future rounds. And we've identified a number of issues.

Some of you, I believe, were probably in the GAC room this morning at 9:00 when one of those issues was discussed relating to geographic names. So it was an interaction between the GAC and the community on that issue. So that's probably enough for now.

(William Ellis): So good morning everybody. My name is (Will Ellis). I'm the gTLD leader at (Nominess). So my role is really to (unintelligible) for the UK. We're the back-end registry operator for a number of brands that we work with (unintelligible) one of our clients, BBC. Eventually Comcast is (unintelligible).

But we're also the applicant for dot (unintelligible) and dot wales for the Welsh region. So we're the direct applicant for those TLDs. And so it's really GOs and brands that we specialize in in this space.

(Maria Ferrill): Thank you, (Will). Evan, please?

Evan Leibovitch: Hi. My name's Evan Leibovitch. I'm from Toronto. I'm vice chair of ALAC, and also chair of the new gTLD working group that ALAC has to examine the end user context, that is the effect of the expansion program on people who are neither buyers nor sellers of domains.

We have been involved for quite some time. You may know, during this 50th meeting, that there's also the second at-large summit going on. I was also involved in the communiqué that came out of the first at-large summit in Mexico City regarding the new gTLD program.

We identified a number of issues. Unfortunately some of those issues still exist. We've been a little concerned with the fact that some things about the programs, such as the PIC program, with which apparently both the applicants and we have serious concerns.

We indicate problems that have tried to be solved by tacking on solutions rather than baking them in from the beginning. We've been involved in things like the applicant support program.

We were given, by the Board, the ability to file objections, only at the time the objections were handled, then to have them tossed out for lack of standing, which seemed to be a strange contradiction. So it's kind of hard to know our position or our place in all this.

Currently we're involved in trying to examine the PIC situation, which folks in at-large have come to believe isn't really worth a hill of beans, and trying to figure out a way to deal with it besides that.

On a lot of issues, our position has been somewhat nuanced. On things like the GAC scorecard, in Brussels we took a position that agreed with the Board on a lot of issues, and also agreed with the GAC on a number of issues. There's some nuances.

For instance, on the IGO thing, we came out very strongly in favor of protection for Red Cross names, but strongly against protection for the IOC names, because we figured that they had different positions and different criteria for being eligible for protection from a public interest point of view.

This is our role here. This is what we've tried to bring in. And hopefully we've done a reasonable job at it. Thanks.

(Maria Ferrill):   Thank you, Evan. Kristina?

Kristina Rosette: Sure. Just speaking briefly personally, and then talking more broadly about the IPC, I was actually on the GNSO council when the gTLD policy recommendations were being developed. So I had a role in working on those. I was a member of the implementation recommendation team in terms of

drafting those recommendations which were then taken up by the special trademark issues. I think that's what the acronym stands for.

I have worked with a number of applicants both kind of brand and generic. And for anyone who is new, who may not know this, I - well I'm still counsel to Patagonia, but I was assisting them with their application before they decided to withdraw it.

In terms of the IPC's role, the IPC has been very interested, obviously from the outset, by virtue of its mandate in ensuring that there are adequate and cost-effective right to protection mechanisms available in new gTLDs, ranging from, you know, staff needing really the coordination of the IRT through to working with applicants that have come to us with specific questions and the like.

We are focusing now really on - you know, we've really just started to take a look at the new gTLD program from a retrospective view. So although I have some kind of particular points, I just want to make sure that everyone's clear that they're really intended to be illustrative as opposed to definitive.

You know, compliance obviously with the new gTLD registry agreement is something. You know, historically the IPC has had a close eye on compliance issues. And I think that's probably, you know, really for now where we're focusing. Obviously we have some issues with regard to how the objection process was handled.

I think - well, we'll get into it. But I think it's probably safe to say that the IPC view is really that the legal rights objection is probably the only one that doesn't need to have some close scrutiny.

(Maria Ferrill):   Thanks, Kristina. So we've been on this new gTLD policy thing for a long time, a good decade or more. And I wonder what people on the panel think of how have you changed over time? So, for example, Kristina, was there a

magical moment when people in the trademark community, you know, who started - well for the very, very, you know, rightfully fearful approach to new gTLDs?

Then we had the idea of the dot Brands coming in. And so there was sort of a, you know, not an evolutional view (unintelligible) perhaps the addition of more voices. You know, I'm curious about how that changed over time.

Evan, you know, whether the at-large interaction with the GAC and the public policy objections, you know, and whether that's changed over time? Have you changed? Because, you know, particularly you with the GAC, you know, again we started probably many people got quite fearful of new gTLDs.

But over time we've kind of got down to the nitty gritty of engaging with them and saying, okay, they're going to come. How do we make it, you know, work for us? So, Kristina, I'm going to put you on the spot and ask you that thought.

Kristina Rosette: I think it's probably more accurate to say that, you know, we probably are one of the constituencies that's been most directly and immediately affected by new gTLDs, in large part because we now have a number of members who are kind of also brand applicants, so are in the process of kind of transitioning out.

It's made, I think, generally trying to come up with consensus positions more challenging. I think I'm reluctant to say that the brand community has embraced new gTLDs. The sentiment that I have heard over and over - and granted, there are some.

But I think the sentiment that I've heard over and over again is that a lot of the brand applications are really from the perspective of, you know, if I'm given lemons, the least I can do is try and make lemonade.

So, you know, I think that's probably kind of the biggest shift I think we're going to see going forward, is really frankly how new gTLDs themselves are going to impact kind of the structure of the GNSO, and how the policy development is done -- you know, how the GAC advice comes into play and the like.

(Maria Ferrill):   Evan, have you any thoughts on how or if ALAC views or the at-large views generally have changed on the new gTLD process over the last -- I hate to say it -- but over the last decade we've been working very intensively on this?

Evan Leibovitch: Well the views - the point of view hasn't changed. The effect that we've had on the process has. I remember some time back, we had always been an advocate of having better categorization. And I think right now that we're seeing the aftereffects of not having done something better in that regard.

The community evaluation process was so tight that a lot of groups that should have been able to come in as communities did not. And we think this provided an obstacle in some cases, actually, to legitimate community views that could have come in. But the community evaluation process was so laden with anti-gaming measures that it just made it too difficult for a lot to come in.

The applicant support program, which had always been an issue with us, with ICANN going into global world to try and make it so that there were fewer barriers to entry within the developing world, well if you take a look at the source countries of most of the applicants right now, you'll see it's very, very heavily skewed to a very, very little - there was very little uptake on the applicant support program, despite the fact of taking practically thousands of person-hours to develop.

So, you know, on one hand it was a win that we got it. On the other hand, it was a loss that nobody took it up. So, you know, we've had an effect on the process, but it's been very much of a mixed bag.

(Maria Ferrill): Thanks, Evan. You mention categorization there. It's funny. When Peter was making his introductory remarks, I misheard a comment he made. And, Peter, you said that the GAC advice created categories. And what I heard was the GAC advice created casualties. So I wonder, could you give us a bit of insight on how that process has worked out?

Peter Nettleford: You set me up a minefield with the introduction. It's no surprise that the - and I agree with Evan that the GAC and the ALAC have shared a number of concerns. We've diverged also on a number of areas. But one of the things the GAC was looking at and pushed for at various stages was greater categorization or an attempt to deal with that in advance of launching the process.

You know, I can't prejudice the GAC's discussions now to know whether that's something we would look at going forward. But it seemed that the reflections from my personal point of view, the applicant guidebook was a little bit schizophrenic on this, for the current round.

There was some explicit categorization in, for example, the geographic names area. And clearly the GAC had some views, or certainly some GAC members had very strong views about whether that hit the right balance.

There were other areas where it wasn't clearly a category. De facto, there was some categorization or effect of that. So we've all talked about the community application process, and the community objection mechanism. And again, we're hearing a lot of concerns from the community about whether that hit the right balance with what we would all think of as communities. We were able to (unintelligible); they were able to use that process.

And it was so tight that they were confused about whether they should so some communities just didn't use it. Some communities did use but didn't necessarily know exactly how to use it. The outcomes have been mixed from the community point of view.

And we've obviously heard from our brand colleagues that from their perspective, having some sort of process to do with that particular situation would have been useful potentially up front rather than dealing with a letter.

So in terms of what the GAC is looking at now, you know, in terms of whether the GAC's views have changed, you know, we're a very diverse group. I would say yes and probably each individual member's views have changed as we learn more things.

So in terms of the future rounds working which is where some of our efforts are being focused, we're looking at geographic (pains) as a sub issue, we're looking at the cluster of community issues, we're looking at some of the developing economy applicant support issues already mentioned by (Evan). And just this particular meeting, we have added an additional subgroup to look at the IGO cluster of issues which is still being worked through here and we think it would be useful to start to look at that in a little more detail.

So you know, as I mentioned before, I'm really interested to hear that the GNSO is doing some more work. I know the ALAC colleagues will be looking at these issues.

And one of the things I was very keen to promote in this session was that we all have got to at least coordinate our efforts so that we know what's going on in different parts of he community, particularly as we get close to the IOC Review which will be coming up shortly. And there's obviously going to be a key process step in moving towards any future rounds.

Woman: Thank you Peter. Yes, you bring up the - sorry, the Applicant Guide Book. One comment that Brett Fausett actually made in the session before ours I thought was very, very telling.

It was we thought we knew the guidebook inside out until we had to start applying. And I think that's probably an experience a lot of people had in that when the policy was being made, there was so much thought given to, you know, looking at every situation imaginable. But you know, our capacity for imagination I guess isn't what we thought it was because so many questions, you know, did seem - there's so many ambiguities.

So I put it to Rich and to Will. And what do you think we could do to improve the Applicant Guidebook next time around assuming we even use an Applicant Guidebook model?

Rich Merdinger: Well as a registrar and predominantly downstream of the implementation of the registries using the guidebook to guide their implementations, basically I expected that it would be somewhat interpretive as people were reading through the guidebook trying to figure out exactly what it meant to them and their particular case and their vertical and in their category of domain.

So I think to have been more prescriptive early on like it sounds like it would have been a good idea, I think it would have actually constrained innovation and would have restrained the agile methodology of interpretation, refinement of understanding that results in the actual implementation of the TLDs.

So looking forward, I think that the guidebook can reflect lessons learned, not just in what we could have done better in the guidebook, but what the actual implementation that people have gone through. And again, not be overly prescriptive, but just try to provide more clarity on meaning so that it can then continue to reiterate through those processes.

(William Ellis): I would agree with that. The other thing I would say is I would have to take one of the - he said before he left was that have an appointed member from the ICANN Staff to be your kind of account manager through this process; someone to help handhold you through this process. Especially as you're

going for the brands in this space because, you know, brands apply back to going to 2012 when those open.

You know, you get direction of Staff within the brands. Some people are learning that program and then they're moving on somewhere else and then somebody else has to learn that process again. And they're relying on the consultants in this space and the backend registry operators like ourselves to really be that place to help inform them and guide them through that process.

But it would be nice to have that in more of a formal sense to help them and handhold them through the process is actually quite daunting for someone coming in new into this space.

One person said to me, "It's a consultant's dream in this area because it is so complicated." And I think that really to try and have more of a transparency and clarity within the process is really where we need to get too.

When an applicant is signing a contract with ICANN, it's a point of trust at that point. And you know, you're doing it in good faith on both sides. And as soon as the goal posts gets moved or something changes, especially when people aren't close to process, kind of then think that, you know, you're being conned, you're being kind of ripped off in that process, and that's got to change in round two.

So to enable that, you know, the certainty so they know where they stand with things and then where they are with the timing, I think that is probably for me the biggest lesson that we can learn throughout this process.

And you know, hopefully a lot of the backend register operators like ourselves, we've learned a lot through the process already so it should be a hell-of-a-lot smoother in the second round anyway, as long as we don't change again to something else.

Woman: You know, I think that's going to be one of the things - sorry Kristina - of this session is, you know, how much should we change and how much should we leave the same, you know, once we start tinkering or is it all going to pull apart.

Kristina, you wanted to come in there.

Kristina Rosette: Yes, and I alluded to this earlier but there's a fairly strong feeling that Module 3 needs, with the exception of the legal rights objection, a pretty significant overhaul. In the sense that as it currently stands, I think at the time, none of us anticipated the extreme variations in how each of the providers and even within each provider, how the panel would apply the various criteria.

And it seems clear to us that while the guiding principles for each of the objections obviously, you know, shouldn't necessarily be changed. There needs to be much greater specific guidance to both the providers and the panels to ensure that you're having consistent and predictable outcomes when you have the same set of facts.

And of course they're - I think and I don't think this is unique to the IPC, but I think the ICCC structure needs a close look too.

Woman: You know, so consistency, you know, is some of the message that are coming out here pretty clearly.

Nick, actually why don't you go first.

Nick Wood: Thank you. Nick Wood, (Unintelligible) from the Brand Registry Group.

I think the point about the dispute resolution providers is (consistency) as invited into it, providers of services, panelists in the UDRP and others.

And there's never been very much consistency between them. We've kind of exported to the community the right for outside agencies to review disputes within the community. And I think in the gTLD process, we saw great inconsistencies.

I would like to see or a number of Brands I've spoken with, would like to see the panel providers have a regulation over them so they have to meet standards for them to be reviewed for them to be held accountable for their decisions. It's taken further than what you're saying Kristine.

For certain, they didn't think that well managed so some predictability, their delivery just stretched on and on and on and they were completely accountable.

So I think it wouldn't be unreasonable to place over them a letter of oversight, contractual oversight, which includes service delivery, and it includes adequate reporting so we could have standardization. And we could measure how effective they were for us.

Woman: Yes, thanks very much Nick. I mean that's - it seems that we have sort of created a great body of knowledge of how to do this stuff. And I wonder how well that is being captured to be applied, you know, in future rounds or future reiterations.

Do people have any particular views going all the way from, you know, how the questions were answered by applicants in the course of the process all the way to almost the jurisprudence of how the decisions are made by panels and that? How it can be captured but also particularly how it should be applied?

Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: One of the things that struck me is really odd about the way things were handled was the references, the things that just consumer confusion. And it seems there was remarkably little input from actual consumers with coming up with both the criteria and the way they were resolved.

You know, ICANN has come to agonize over things like Dot Cam versus Dot Com in a world where the public has already gotten use to the fact that Car Dot Com and Cars Dot Com go to different places. Where something Dot Com and something Dot CO exist in the same name space, whether or not I can do anything about that is irrelevant. The fact is they exist, the world of consumers has figured out how to deal with that.

And that should be taken into account when trying to presume what is confusingly similar. The whole way that this is being done appears to be very confused and inconsistent.

And just going back to, you know, the wish list going forward, the very fact that there's now a policy versus implementation working group within the GNSO I think helps to indicate some of the confusion of where the break off was between where the GNSO thought it was being sufficiently clear, and then how ICANN Staff or whatever processes inside made the sausage, decided to actually come out with how that was going to be done.

You know, so for instance - and the PICs are a perfect example of that. Yes, there is some mechanism to have, you know, the public interest represented. Whether or not the PIC was the best way to do that, I mean it seems like (unintelligible) I saw at the beginning, it doesn't seem like the applicants like the way the PIC was handled and certainly neither did At Large.

Woman: That brings up a really interesting point Evan. In what have we learned as an organization from the new gTLD process to date? I mean it strikes me that ICANN has changed enormously, you know, through the process. I mean it's

grown enormously; it's become a lot more politically engaged, it's become much more politically controversial organization.

And I'm wondering what are the panelists' views on how the new gTLD process has changed ICANN itself in terms of how we do our business, how we interact, different parts of the community, and good things/bad things? How have we changed?

Peter?

Peter Nettleford: It's a very question and there's probably a wide range of answers. But one that I'll focus on is, because Evan just mentioned it, is policy implementation. And I think a lot of focus has been put on the policy process as well.

As I mentioned I think in my first intervention, I think the GAC approach to providing advice after the application window has raised a number of questions and in the way the Board has responded to that has raised a number of questions about the way the policy is developed and implemented in this space.

So for those of you who may know, the GAC and the GNSO working together, and also working with the Board, on ways to get the GAC more effectively involved in policy processes going forward. I think for future rounds, this will be critical.

We probably have a number of areas where we share views and don't share views, but one thing we probably all agree on is in a future round, the process should be clearer and more transparent, more predictable for all parties involved, and I think that's something we should try to work towards.

Without looking back to much, I think, you know, we should avoid a situation where we have differing GAC advice and GNSO recommendations and that

we're putting the Board in a difficult situation and we're changing things towards the end of what is a very long process anyway.

So I think a real clear focus on the roles of different entities within the ICANN structure and how policy is made and then decisions taken, I think is something that should all really work together and focus on before a future round happens.

Woman: Any other takers? How has the organization been changed? Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: You know, I think we're only starting to see them. I think the fact that you have 3000 people registered for this meeting is probably the very first indication.

You know, I think there are now a lot more entities and individuals globally who are aware of ICANN does by virtue of the new gTLD program. I suspect that is only going to continue to increase, and I think it's really just a matter of time before you start seeing a lot more active participation from some of these new entrants.

I referenced earlier that kind of the difficulties that we as the IPC are facing in light of, you know, a lot of our core most active members are now members of the Brand Registry Group and how that's impacting our membership and our participation and the like. And I think that's going to be true throughout the entire GNSO. I think we're also already seeing it in other aspects of the GNSO.

And I think just how the structure absorbs all of those new participants, how the way we do things is going to have to change because what works when you have 300 active participants doesn't' work when you have 3000.

And I think scaling is something that I don't have a very good sense that ICANN as a corporation has really done much strategic planning around.

Woman: Rich, go ahead.

Rich Merdinger: Thank you. Yes, there's another dimension of this as we go from 300 to 3000
                 is that we've also increased the number of registries and individual
                 businesses if you will that were applicants that have products that they're
                 bringing to market.

                 And while ICANN is largely a policymaking organization, there are now other
                 dimensions of this that still require community involvement. And you're
                 seeing, you know, the Brand Registry Group exists, you've got the Domain
                 Name Association which is another aggregation point for these participants to
                 come together in ways that are complementary to what is taking place at
                 ICANN, not competitive to what's taking place at ICANN.

                 So there will be - I think ICANN will need to be forming partnerships a little bit
                 more so than they needed to in the past with these adjacent organizations
                 because we do have the common goal of the registrants and the users of the
                 Internet to be pleased and fruitful with the products that we're bringing to
                 market (unintelligible).

Woman: Please go ahead Will.

(William Ellis):   I was just going to add to that. I think ICANN, in my opinion, has a job to do in
                 terms of facilitating a further job on the awareness level. And we still have a
                 long way to go in terms of raising that level up to an acceptable point with the
                 end consumer.

                 We're starting to obviously get some really great stuff coming through from
                 the Brand Registry Group that it's representing the interests of the brands.
                 Many brands don't even want to be part of that in terms of actually they've got
                 a day job to do; they've got a business to run. It's not to downplay the
                 (unintelligible) of the Brand Registry Group, they do a fantastic job.

It's just to say that the brands have a job of actually running a business. They just want their TLD and go about their business.

So I think we need to sort of broaden that effort out beyond just the industry. And I personally believe that ICANN could play a better role in helping to facilitate the debate over how do we raise the awareness level rather than just leaving it up to the registrar community to help to feed that through to their customer base, and ultimately also leaving it to the brands to do to their respective customers.

So you know, even around the ICANN events, I think they could play a role there in terms of helping to facilitate more PR awareness of the program.

You know, you've got to hop in a cab and ask anybody what's a gTLD. And then quickly realize that no one understands what the hell that means. Or then you can even go down to the kind of simple things; what's Dot London. And you know, arguably one of the better promoted TLDs out there at the moment is Dot London and still there is not the awareness.

So I think we still have a long way to go. I think the registrars have a very difficult job to do in terms of on boarding; lots of different TLDs into this space. (Unintelligible) different launch programs to contend with, still trying to get their heads around how the hell we built up the founding propositions of each TLD. And I still think we need to build at that clarity.

So a brand knows that they have their own TLD space but they also actually, "Okay, what do I do in the generic space, what do I do in the GO space." So anyway.

Woman: Thanks Will. Nick Wood.

Nick Wood: Yes, I think that's very true Will anecdotally because I think it's interesting to raise anecdotes.

When the Brand Registry Group were discussing with their response to community to staff the Board's specification for their team, we needed to go around and talk to different stakeholder groups.

And one of the ways that this organization has developed in the way it works is that the stakeholder groups face each other and they want to fully understand if this group is asking for something, does that something have any value to us? Could we also ask for us, and could we do a bit of trading if we give them this, can we get that back?

Now the Brand Registry Group had nothing to trade. It was a very interesting experience because there were newcomers to the ICANN community who went around to the parts of the community and were being asked, "Well what community do you (unintelligible)?" And it was very hard for them to understand that.

Now I think actually lots of the brands are beginning to trust the multi-stakeholder community, they're beginning to understand it. But it's very, very hard.

I'm sure that the GO community - Craig can probably talk about it, but I'm sure you've had the same kind of thing that it's new, it's emerging, and where we all kind of fit into this; it's just not clear.

Will's point about brands and newcomers trusting this environment - that would trust goes straight back to the predictability as well. Lots of the brands in the Brand Registry Group are companies born of the Internet and they really care about this space and they understand it; they've been here.

But there are others here, three or four, five or six this week, who have said, "Okay, I'm beginning to understand this but I may never come back to an ICANN meeting."

Woman: (Unintelligible) Nick, would that be the devil's advocate here, would that be a good or a bad thing?

Nick Wood: Well in a sense it's just we're maturing. I mean this process we're talking about 1930 applicants. But imagine if in the second round there's 19,030 applicants.

All these things we're talking about, public comments, read the applications, it's not going to work. ICANN's going to have to (unintelligible) some kind of sausage machine that just pushes them out.

So don't let's talk about how we'll do something for the 3000 applicants. We've got to think about 19,000 or maybe 19 - only 19. I mean really difficult things for us to cope with.

And brands can see that people here actually bring a lot of kind of integrity to the table in their own positions. And businesses do understand that the people have other positions that they don't agree with; that's absolutely fine. But they do want the predictability and they do want the rule of law.

And as one of the new members said to me, "If we don't have a rule of law what do we have? Do we have the rule of the mob? Do we have tyranny? What do we have if that's not there?" So they look for this community to work. And then somewhere in all of this for the rules to be followed.

Woman: It all comes down to the rules doesn't it, yes, as we set them.

Nick Wood: We're in England, we like the rules.

Woman: I mean as a blow in to the UK, one of the great things that you've invested and delivered onto the world is the common law system, and you know, the common law. And you know, the approach is do something until you find it's (done), really, you know, a more receptive to innovation than perhaps some other systems.

I'm wondering what do the panelists and perhaps other people in the room think about how the new gTLD process has changed the DNS industry itself.

Some of the things that occur to me are the, you know, great amount of capital you needed to apply for a new gTLD or a multiple gTLDs, so that's brought into the mix.

And a lot of professional investors and investment funds, you know, people have higher perhaps expectation of consistency, delivery, performance, results, than we may have had before. The capital requirements, the investment requirements necessary to be in this game in a big way, you know, also they bring a lot more investors but they perhaps lead to industry consolidation as well.

And then, you know, if you look at the Applicant Guidebook, the really detailed and, you know, quite arduous - rightly arduous - requirements for backend for registry provisions has meant that a lot of people have said, "Look, I can't do that. I'm going to go for a backend registry provider." So you know, we've seen ccTLDs come in and say, "Well we're going to do this," or the others.

So I'm just wondering, what are your observations on how the broader domain name system on the domain name industry has changed as a result of the new gTLD process.

Will, I see you reaching for the buzzer.

(William Ellis): Sorry I have a (unintelligible).

You know, I was just going to say that I think something from our side, we have a country code. You know, we could have taken - I mean (Denick) for example, to the option of not applying for anything in Round 1. We saw it slightly differently in that this space is evolving into the future of the Internet.

And I kind of always equate it back down to how brands, when they're first deciding whether to get a Web site. And at that time, it was kind of, "Shall we be on line, shouldn't we be online? Our business is currently offline in the high street."

So and then it was like kind of, "Okay, I guess we should go and we should be online and this is going to be the future now and the high street is going to be dead and that's the way it's going to work."

And you know, I think it's now moving now into healthy mix of choice, you know, where you've got the Dot Com, you've got country codes if you want to just say where you are in the world and splitting up that way. You've got generics that can start to own category and start to, you know, like Dot Jewelry or Dot Fashion and going into that kind of area.

And then you've got brands that where you can actually start to own your own space and really drilldown into the detail of the DNS and have some stronger analytics around that. And we provide a lot of that service ourselves on our backend registry service.

And then also it's ownable for a brand in that space. So you've got a real mixture of choice now. And GOs help to localize off of that as well.

So in my mind it's about choice. We just haven't necessarily explained to the end consumer why they need that choice at the moment. And I think that's still the biggest job that we need to do.

We've put it out there, we've got it all available. It's starting to roll out. We just need to now explain the demarcation of this so that brands and consumers understand this space better.

A shopping list isn't enough to just say, "Here's a lot of choice." You could explain why is that good for me, why would I go to that site versus another site?

Rich Merdinger: Before you press the button, I'll just chime in very quickly.

And being on the retail side of this, what we've done is we've introduced a whole slew of new raw materials that have specific purposes and some cases with verticals, and we've got some very generic raw materials for our registrants.

But what we haven't done is provided them necessarily with a set of blueprints on what they can build with those raw materials or why using those raw materials is paramount to just having what they've had in the past.

And isn't necessarily our responsibility to provide those blueprints but to look for those to be emerging from those registrants and from the businesses that are making use of our raw materials, but to try to embrace them in ways that are truly valuable and productive for the Internet users as a whole.

Woman: So how do people see the evolution going forward? Well here's a better way of asking that question.

Should we continue to have new gTLDs? Shall we have a new round? Should we not have rounds, dispense of them but create a sausage machine that just kind of, you know, takes any applications and revolves them as they go?

Basically should we have more new gTLDs? Have we learned to not be apt to decide? And if so, what should the machine that makes them in terms of the ICANN process, what should that look like?

Evan, I haven't heard from you for awhile.

Evan Leibovitch: Well it's interesting hearing some of the comments about competition and choice and so on, especially from end users.

One of the things that we've been trying to search for instance in the metrics groups going forward is that he competition isn't just between the new gTLDs. It's not between the gTLDs and the cc's. It's between how an end user wants to get their Internet information and how it's brought back to them.

And that's not just within the ICANN bubble. That's also looking at things like Facebook home pages and QR codes and URL shorteners and all sort of things like that.

And we've tried, from ALAC, within trying to make sure that when the metrics are done, that the metrics are not just, "Well okay, there were 22 gTLDs and now there's X number." Was there more choice? Well duh, that's not the issue, okay.

What kind of choice, what kind of things are end users doing? Is the gTLD expansion doing what it's suppose to, or as some in the At Large community are suggesting, if this isn't done right this is going to drive people out of the entire realm of memorable domain names period. And have them go to other means of getting their information, right.

Are the search engines going to be benefit from this? Is Facebook going to benefit from this?

One of the things that we've asked to go forward in the metrics is just that, you know. Is there going to be a growth in use of search engines? Is there going to be a growth in use of QR codes? Is there going to be a growth in alternative ways for consumers to get at their information?

This is why, when we're thinking about choice and competition, you have to consider that it's more than just within the domain name bubble.

It's actually been a real source of concern of mine that there's been so much pushback against asking for these metrics, which makes me wonder if either people are scared of something or if there is willful oblivion going on or whatever. But I don't think it can be ignored. It's really important to get this right because the consumers will find - will get to various ways of finding their information. You know, in the Chrome browser right now, whether you type a search term or you type a domain name it blur - it totally blurs it, it is a single window.

You have seen, you know, we went through that thing about dot list domains or whatever that was trying to take that in yet one direction but since that isn't happening, well maybe something else is going to happen. Maybe there is going to be some new technology that is going to deal with this totally in a different way So I am just suggesting that as you are thinking about this as you are going into a possible new round just consider that the competition and choices you are dealing with are not just within the domain name space but also have to look at what is out there.

I find it fascinating that ICANN has gone through this - I don't know if it is a working group or it is a marketing campaign or whatever called Universal Acceptance. It surprises me that this effort even needs to be done and I - it shouldn't be just a technical thing, you know, or the browser is resolving IDN's - that is - it is going way beyond that. So if ICANN has to have something say, "Well we are promoting Universal Acceptance," what does that say in terms of, you know, what people are thinking of - the choice

issues. I am curious to know what other people think about the Universal Acceptance of - issues and where this - what this is actually trying to bring out to the community.

Woman: Evan I think you have unwittingly put your finger on a debate that has been haunting economists for about 60 years now and that is the idea and is there such a thing as latent demand - is it possible to go to consumers and sell them something they didn't know they wanted and so I think we have got two points of view here, you know, should ICANN be doing the lab work to educate consumers and tell them they need or they want to know what new detail these are or is - should ICANN realize that this is an innovate or (unintelligible) moment where you either make the DNS relevant or have it fade into oblivion.

I have got a really annoying habit and well, I have got a few but one of them which I torment my husband with quite a bit is that whenever the poor guy is trying to find something on the Internet he has got an appalling habit of typing a search term into the URL bar. It drives me nuts. I make him take search bar - search terms and put them into the search bar - only URL's are allowed into the URL bar and he rightly tells me, one, "This is nonsense because it works," two, "If the DNS is so important why does it need to be supported in this way," you know, why does he need me to police his Internet habits.

In any case Christina you wanted to come in there.

Christina Rodriguez: Yes, I mean, the ICC doesn't have a position as to (Mark Gedt) I should say, on new rounds and should there be rounds done in rounds or should it be a rolling basis. We haven't gotten into that level of detail.

What we do have a position is that, you know, ICANN has undertaken a commitment to conduct certain reviews in the new gTLD Program and that it is pointless frankly to do those reviews unless there is - unless they intend to

honor the implicit commitment that the output of those reviews will be considered and integrated where appropriate. So...

Woman: Sorry, Christina, I didn't understand the outcome of those reviews will be considered?

Christina Rodriguez: Integrated into whatever the next round would be or whatever the future would be so, you know, as Evan pointed out the metrics for that first ACSO are being developed. I think we are coming up pretty soon on the time to kick off the review that the GAC asked for and that the board had agreed to with regard to RPM so, you know, I think it is important that we keep in mind that those commitments are out there. You know, all of that obviously is subject to the caveat that if ICANN decides to terminate the AoC which it can do under the AoC then, you know, what happens is anyone's guess.

Woman: Right, sure and then runs to a much (unintelligible) question of ICANN accountability, you know, which is the flavor of the week but back to this idea of new (DTLD) - should we continue to, you know, to turn the handle on that machine - should we continue to have more of them if these reviews go ahead and should they be ran - should there be cycles - what should it - what should the future look like?

Man: So I think in my opinion I think yes, I think it is - I think there is a ground swell of opinion that round two will happen, it is just a case of when. I think there is still a lot more to go through to getting over round one first and making that work and I am sure Go Daddy would be quite happy if I - if we didn't have a round two tomorrow and the purpose is to get to the initial round. So I think we still have that to get done but at the same time we should be preparing for round two and in my opinion I think it will be helpful to have a date in the diary of when we think that is going to happen.

And this is about putting the certainty or - into the program about saying, okay, sure we need to do a review, a wash-up of round one and part of this is

helpful information to hear from some of the applicants and people involved within that to say what their frustrations were and to add so that we don't make the same mistakes in round two but - and to hear from businesses and individuals about their opinions of - and do they have clarity of what each of those (unintelligible) does for them.

So after we do that and have a set sort of timeline of process in place to deliver that but it will be helpful to know when round two is so everyone can start to gear up - to start to talk to brands so that they can be saying, okay, round two is happening - this is what has happened from round one so that we can start to inform them if - it is almost kind of a bit crazy to start to sort of say well it is sometime in the future maybe but what does that mean and it doesn't really help people when you are having those discussions with brands and, you know, several years down the line you knock on the door again and say, "Hey remember me," you know, so I think there needs to be a more set program in place to deliver that.

Man: And if I could again the - there is a reference earlier to the sausage machine I believe and it is one of my favorite so now you know that. Anyway, basically we still have a lot of raw meat that is going to the hopper of that sausage machine and we have got some that has come out there other end but it has yet to be prepared, it has yet to be delivered nor consumed in a meaningful way that we really know what is going to be happening here.

So what I - at this point in time I am very optimistic for additional rounds or possibly an ongoing - I am not making a suggestion one way or the other, I am saying it is a little bit preliminary to be talking about how we are going to do another round because the value has proven to be so great to our DN constituents, the registrants and the user because it is so fresh. That doesn't mean that we need to wait until we understand that before we decide whether or not we are going to discuss future rounds. The discussion should overlap and it should almost be a lagging discussion if you will but continually taking in the information that we are learning and the value that we are seeing on

the industry so that we can make a good argument to those brands about why they need to be participating and they can participate in that value as well.

And as far as universal acceptance is concerned, this is an industry that has been around for a long time. I come from an engineering background. I know what it is like to think to myself, well TLDs that is Comnet.org and I don't think Museum - I don't think six characters so I am going to create data structures that are - I would have created data structures that were limited and there is going to be inherent infrastructure hurdles to overcome so I do think that we do need to give attention to that because it could lead to unforeseen negative experiences that we don't want to be dealing with down the road because then we are not serving our registrants and the Internet community.

Woman: Brett (unintelligible) - Brett Fausett.

Brett Fausett: Yes, I think it is worth remembering that at the November 2000 ICANN meeting when ICANN approved the first seven new TLDs (Vince Syr) said something then that has stuck with me for a very long time and he said he looked forward to the day when the creation of new registries was as routine and boring as the creation of new registrars and I think that has always been the in-stake goal - I think we may be as far away from that date now as we were from 2000. I think it is a very long time away but I think we are working to that and I don't know how we are going to get there and when we are going to get there but I think that will come someday.

Woman: Thank you Brett that is an interesting one. I was under the impression that (Vince) didn't really like the new TLDs. No, I don't think he - he did, however, say that - that is true - Nick..

Nick Wood: In the brand community there was a discussion a couple of years ago whether this was about the privatization of the Internet where the brand players would be creating a kind of trusted zone where consumers would

recognize them and because the shopping bags used to say (whttpwww) and then they carry the (unintelligible) - they carry the twitches and (unintelligible) that says (unintelligible) because they know they can be found on the Internet. The facilitation is there - people can use it - they can find it.

And brands have been concerned about trust and creating a place for their consumers where they know that they can be found and (unintelligible) and things like that but now they are beginning to think they are not sure if that is what this is about - they are not sure if it is happening on a registry - the reach of the Internet isn't about something else or the Internet of things coming so it is unclear. Lots of brands want to be followers, they don't want to be the pioneers in this but one of the pressures for the second round I think will be when some of the biggest brand applicants in this finally reveal what they are going to do and do it.

And if that happens then I think there will be an extraordinary pressure on this organization from brands coming in and I don't know if that is going to be a good thing or a bad thing. I happen to work with them so I am always sympathetic and I try and voice their concerns but actually for everyone else - Will was saying earlier - he was talking about (unintelligible). He said we will receive ccLTD but everything he has said since then has been about the 14 brands so when people - when we look at (nominet) we used to look at (unintelligible) kind of benign (unintelligible) cc channel D provider but now you are a gTLD backend - you are a gTLD applicant, you are an EBERO provider and you are a registrar so everything is kind of changing this.

I think it would be (unintelligible) to say that - to do the review like Christina said. I think if we don't have some good metrics and also some of the anecdotes coming out of it about what is difficult and what isn't difficult because Richard you have been talking about the pain that you have been suffering with the scare and the change coming.

I run a small registrar as well. It is terrible - it is really terrible. A year ago there was just over gTLDs delegated this week. This week there is 320 gTLDs delegated. That kind of pressure is one thing when the second round comes if there is a sausage machine I would like there to be some kind of volume control on it and we might turn it up and down from time to time so we can say that the change that comes is a little bit more manageable.

Woman: Thank you Nick. I suppose beginning to wind things to a close here. I am - because we are looking at what we are going to do going forward and any form of review - I mean Christina has talked about the number of different avenues for review and in, you know, in addition to the new gTLD review and process itself - it strikes me as we are going to need an awful lot of energy to keep going with this and I think that is a wonderful thing but I wonder just looking back on the last number of years I am looking forward at what is going to be required to either keep this machine going, tweak it , stop it, all of those things.

Would you do it again? Christina, would you do it again?

Christina Rodriguez: Oh, wow. You know, I don't know that I can to be honest with you. I don't know that I can and I am thinking about it from the perspective of like first off personally starting from GNSO council working on the policy recommendations, the IRT to come in on the guidebook and whatever.

I don't know that I can and I don't know that I want to - to be honest with you, you know, I have a family, I would like to see them.

Woman: Okay, Rich.

Rich Merdinger: I was not heavily personally involved with what you went through and what I would like to say is I have some of that fresh energy just like many people in the pipeline do and we would be standing on your shoulders and be able to carry it forward.

So first of all I appreciate all the effort that everyone that was heavily involved in this did put into it because we are starting to see the fruits of those labors now so would the individuals personally do it again, possibly not, but would their followers be able to take that and hopefully bring it forward in a way that would be complementary and even evolutionary - I certainly hope so.

Woman: Thank you Rich. Evan what is the appetite in the At Large for continuing with this process or going forward?

Evan Lebovitch: I think there is a real heavy desire to after the first round is done, step back, see what went wrong and try and build on that. That is why we have been involved in the metrics - that is why when the GNSO came out with their metrics in that large site it wasn't sufficient. We added some more and thankfully the board went along with it.

You know, it has sort have been a little bit surprising how little public market research has been done in advance of this program to see what the demand was and likewise it is going to be useful at least for me, in a user point of view to see what the uptake has been - to see what the acceptance has been - to see how many, I am not going to phrase this right but I will do my best - to see how many non-defensive, non-redundant names are in use in the new program.

I think that is going to be very important, just volume of names is not it. Names that are actually going to go to unique destinations I think is going to be whether it is measurable or not. I think that is actually going to be one of the telling things of how much need there is to go forward with the whole lack of new names.

Woman: Thank you. Peter I am going to put you on the spot. I know the GAC probably feels like it is lying slap in the middle of all of this but yes, would you do it again - will you do it again?

Peter Dengate Thrush: I am sure we have little choice. I, yes look the GAC is looking forward to future rounds and not necessarily looking forward as in we are excited about it but we are looking forward to future rounds and to the extent that they are going to happen we would like to try to improve the predictability etc. from the current round but it won't necessarily be easy but I think we are all genuinely interested in trying to improve it for the future - personally, very excited about it.

Woman: You know, I would hate to end on a wistful note because this has been a tremendous program of activity. I mean it is the biggest thing - the single biggest thing ICANN has ever done and I know it has (unintelligible) over the last few years. You know, some of us have almost felt that the job ICANN was doing with the program and project it was carrying was bigger than the animal of ICANN itself but I think we have evolved and grown and developed and I guess any last comments and - on people - maybe the top just one final round on the top one thing that you think we can change or do better or should focus on as in when there is a next time round and - Nick.

Nick Wood: Yes, well because probably a lot of people would agree that there does need to be a layer of independent accountability for decisions because decisions have impacted upon people who have invested a lot of money and it is about predictability and the - and I think people will really look for that in the future. This was kind of put - it was kind of - this looked like permissive innovation but it turned out to be pretty disruptive and so we wanted the rules of it - we wanted the guidebook to be like a set of rules and they have moved so much it has been for the brand perspective for any investors or people involved with this that the pressure on people like (Christine) and people in the IPC has been extraordinary and we just need to get that right. It would make things so much better and we would look so much more professional and we could avoid some of the issues. So some layer of accountability where decisions have consequences.

Man: One wish was it - a better process for the next time and my subsidiary wish is that will make it much easier when we get to the bottlenecks and I think we all talked about scaling issues from the GAC's point of view and I expect from many other people being faced with 900 applications to have a look at with a range of different issues, business models, etc. etc. in a relatively short time frame was extremely challenging.

So if we have a process lead before that starts that deals with the, you know, a range of issues that we are seeing this time improved upon then hopefully we will get more predictable, more timely, better outcomes next time.

Man: The - as someone again that is at the end of the launch process for TLD meaning the registrar and my involvement with it the mechanisms that we have in place for registries and registrars to come to terms with their RRAs and the way that there is a lack of transparency dealing with multiple parties dealing with our contracts etc. I would like to see some attention given to the way that those arrangements are put together.

I don't want to over speak now, I just know that has been a delaying factor for many relationships because we are trying to make the same decisions over and over again and we are not able to leverage them necessarily in the industry for the betterment and the consistency of all.

(William Ellis):   So I would just - I think a lot has already been said that I would agree with. I think for us as a back-end registry operator it is really about building the speed into helping the - our brands through the process quicker and still obviously on a secure and safe network but certainly making sure that the cookie cutter kind of approach can happen and I think that to me is really the sort of sway in which the brands will either still thrive or fail on that basis because, you know, it is no good just having a few brands at the top and not allowing some of the medium tier brands to take part in this so I think certainly cost from ICANN into the fee and the speed of which we move to onboard brands is going to be a challenge and so yes, from our point of view

it is about speed of process really I think is the biggest way in which we can add value to - from our side but obviously we need to be working with ICANN and their partners to achieve that.

Woman: Thank you (Will). Evan you are up next and I am sure you have got some very good comments you want to make. I wonder would you mind also touching on and, you know, applicant support and what we can do to improve that next time around and - because I think the take-up was extremely low and, you know, a lot of people were - we could - it is - there is room for us to improve.

Evan Lebovitch: Okay, two things before I answer that question. A very lively debate came up within the At Large Community. I guess (unintelligible) to brands but it came up over the whole closed generics and Amazon issue which got into almost a philosophical debate about ownership of dictionary words a and that is not going to be resolved here but I think at least within our community that has become a big deal. I don't know how much it effects what is going on here but it - but the whole closed generics of, you know, should one company like Amazon be allowed to own the word "book" and I don't know really what the follow is from that but that is an ongoing thing that is probably going to guide some of the future ALAC sensibilities on this going forward. I can't say more beyond that but it has really fueled that kind of debate that goes much deeper than just domain names.

On the issue of applicant support one of the things I notice is as we were going through this is there was such a desire to make sure that it wasn't gained - that you were going to have say a company that would put a branch office into a developing country just for the sake of being able to gain the system and get a program under applicant support. That is going to be a challenge if we want to make this work. We have been able to see there is players that will push the boundaries to the extent that they can and there is still as much of a need as ever to geographically balance the source of where gTLDs are coming from. That hasn't happened. If it is going to there has got

to be a number of barriers that need to be reduced or dropped. They may not all be financial but there definitely has to be some outreach going on.

So we are definitely interested in trying to learn some lessons. Having the help of the rest of the community is going to be helpful but like I say, you know, the biggest forensics that we have been able to done so - do so far is essentially to say we anti-gamed the thing to death and there has got to be a way to figure our way around that but so far that will continue to be a challenge.

Woman: To a large extent really overlapping in many aspects is what Nick was saying in terms of certainty and predictability and accountability and I just for nostalgic sake hold that - the GNSO's final report on the introduction on new gTLDs and what really strikes me is how many of those core policy recommendations really explicitly refer to pre-published criteria that can be relied upon - transparent, predictable, (unintelligible) etc. and I think that is really critical both in terms of from the perspective of new applicants, you know, the discussions I have had are trying to explain to very large companies that you all would know, well, you know, it is just ICANN.

At a certain point you just have to say this is how they do things. I know that what I am telling you now is completely different from what I told you six months ago. That is just the way it is and that is really not going to work for this organization so I think there really does need to be a very concerted effort to insure that if there is a next round or rolling or however it is done that there really is a very exhaustive, concerted effort to insure that the criteria, the evaluation, the objections are - that we have as much certainty and predictability in it as we possibly can because I think there is a going to come a period of time where the absence of those things and particularly on the accountability side will really start to erode trust outside of kind of the core ICANN community.

Rule of law - absolutely - I again, speaking personally I am troubled by the possibility that there could be an effort to obtain - to develop policies and requirements within ICANN that aren't supported under existing legal regimes. This isn't - ICANN shouldn't be a super legislature.

And finally, you know, from the IPC perspective we were encouraged to see some of the innovation that we saw in rights protection mechanisms. We would like to see more. We would like to see, you know, registries saying, I know that this is a floor in terms of what I am required to do but it is important to me as a registry operator to do more than that and obviously that, you know, I think that is something we would really like to see.

Woman: Well thank you everyone very, very much. I think this has been a really terrific session. I think probably from the themes that have emerged and I would pick on two really.

One is not from (unintelligible) ICANN change and purchase new gTLDs but how the new gTLDs have really changed ICANN, you know, made us mature the model in terms of policy and implementation making it evolve the GNSO in terms of how to allow people to participate - how the GAC and the GNSO and the board interact and, you know, it has been a painful process but I think the model has matured enormously as we go from those 300 active participants to 3,000 I think it is early days. We have a long way to go.

And the other key message that I take from this is that we just have to get these different reviews right. You know, that we need to - as Evan said, you know, pause for thought, look at what has been done well, what has been done poorly but also, you know, how these things are being used, how the market is evolving and hopefully in many, many different delightful and unpredictable ways.

And so and I think one theme - maybe it is not a theme or just an observation really is, you know, a lot of people did a lot of work on the new gTLDs from a

long time back and I think their goal is that a lot of people will benefit and so I think we are probably in the, you know, in the down swing of - it will be from an awful lot of work and we are in the early upswing of what (unintelligible) going to look like - what does the new world look like and hopefully it is a delightful and bright and innovative and unpredictable one and - in all the best ways.

And - but I think, you know, in terms of the motivation and the - I think a lot of people owe a lot to, you know, to the people like Christina and Evan and, you know, in the GAC and all of the people who have really been working for a long time in the hope that the work will benefit a lot of people, not just a small number of people so I hope we get there.

And in the famously misquoted words of Mao Tso Tung when asked about the - what is the outcome of the French Revolution being around 1968 - actually it was '69 he was asked this he said "It is too early to tell," and, you know, really as something as revolutionary as this it is too early to tell. The actual truth is that it was actually one of his underlings was asked the question, no Mao himself and he was asked about the end and the parse and the protest of the 1968 generation the year before. This story is much better if you told - tell it about the revolution.

So I want to say think you to Jacob for inviting me. Thank you to the wonderful panelist and - for giving their all and thank you very much to the (unintelligible) of the registry constituency for having us here today and personally for me at the GNSO camp this is incredibly useful because we are just at the beginning stages and thanks to Brett Fausett of looking at our review so this is all grist to the mill. Thank you very much.

END