EN

SINGAPORE – New gTLD Program Update
Monday, March 24th 2014 – 12:00 to 13:30
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

TRANG NGUYEN:	We'll just be a couple more minutes, everyone.

Sorry about the delay, everyone. Please give us a couple more minutes to get the presentation up.

Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you for joining us today.

This is the new gTLD Program Update Session. My name is Trang Nguyen. I'm the director of gTLD operations responsible for overseeing the execution of many of the program processes. If you are a regular to our monthly Webinar, you will know that Christine Willett typic leads these sessions. Unfortunately, Christine cannot attend the Singapore meeting so I will be this session today on her behalf.

I also have here with me here several ICANN staff. Francisco Arias, Karen Lentz, Aaron Hickmann, Russ Weinstein, Cristina Flores, and I hope Naela is also here, that will present with me today.

Next slide, please.

So we have a lot of updates planned for you today. I will start off by giving you a recap of all of the accomplishments that we have made since the Buenos Aires meeting. And then Russ, Cristina, and I will give you a progress report on application processing. And then Francisco is going to tell us what's going on with name collision. And Aaron and

Karen will then talk discuss some operational support mechanisms, and Naela will close out the presentation with IDN TLD variants.

It's been about four months since Buenos Aires. And if you would indulge me for just a minute and let's take a look back at where we were about four months ago.

At the time in Buenos Aires, I think there were about 400 applications that were not able to move forward because of GAC advice. You know, of the -- of all, I think there were about half of the active applications at that point had been invited to contracting. That's about 900 or so. And of that number we had only signed 144 contracts. That's a pretty good number, but, you know, I think we -- I think we know that we could have done a little bit better.

And then if you look at the number of gTLDs delegated in Buenos Aires, it was 24, you know.

But look at these numbers and where we are at today. Well, 358 contracts signed as of last Friday. That's more than double the amount of contracts that we had signed in Buenos Aires.

Look at predelegation testing, 266 applications have passed predelegation testing. That's an increase of more than fivefold.

And look at the number of new gTLDs delegated. 182. Is it still 182 as of today?

So great, great numbers, great progress. And we didn't do this all on our own. You all contributed to this amazing progress that we've made

since Buenos Aires. So thank you very much, everybody, to for all of your hard work over the last few months.

Next slide, please.

So let's stay on this positive note for a minute longer and talk about some of the accomplishments that we were able to make over the last four months. I talked about the 400 applications that were not able to move forward. So they weren't able to move forward because of GAC advice, and primarily for two things. GAC category 1 advice, which had to do with safeguards for certain categories of strings and GAC category 2 advice which had to do with nonexclusive access for generic gTLDs.

So since the Buenos Aires meeting, the NGPC had adopted an implementation framework for GAC category 1 advice, and they have also approved an implementation approach for generic gTLDs that intend to operate in a nonexclusive manner. So bolt of those two things actually cleared the way for most of the applications. I think as of today there are other than 22 applications that are still pending at GAC advice. So, you know, obviously, that probably makes a lot of people happy.

In those applications that have been cleared, are actually now able to move forward to contracting and contention resolution.

So speaking of contention resolution, for those of you who are not as familiar with the new gTLD program, the Applicant Guidebook provides for two mechanisms to resolve contention resolution. Community priority evaluation, also known as CPE, and auction.

So CPE is a mechanism that is available to community applicants to gain priority in a contention set. There are, I believe, 32 applications that

can choose to go through CPE in order to resolve their contention sets, and as of last Friday, we have posted the long-awaited for CPE results for the first four applications.

So I know a lot of work went into that so congratulations to Russ and his team for meeting that milestone.

The CPE results are currently posted on the CPE page of the microsite. It was the quickest way for us to get these things out to you so that's where we posted them but we will be posting them also on the application status page very soon. So that's where you can find them if you want to look at them.

And for auction, so auction is the other available mechanism for contention resolution, and it's important to note that auction is the mechanism of last resort. And earlier this month we posted the final auction rules. A lot of you provided input into those auction rules, so thank you very much for your contributions.

The team also last week posted the auction schedules as well as sent out auction notifications. So a lot of progress on that front as well.

So I'm not going to read through this slide here. You can see for yourself all of the progress that we've made and accomplishments that we've made since the Buenos Aires meeting. But we know that our work is not done; that this is not it. There's still a lot of work to be done.

Nicole, next slide, please.

So we know that one of the areas that there's still work to be done is application evaluations. There is still a small number of applications that are in initial evaluation and extended evaluation. We're working very closely with the applicant and the evaluators to bring those to a conclusion.

There's still objections. You know, the majority of the objections have been completed but there are still 14 objection cases that are pending, so we're continuing to monitor those and work closely with the dispute resolution service provider.

Auction. You know, we've done -- we make great progress in auction but we noted there's still a lot of work left for us to do in order to ensure a successful first auction in June.

Name collision. The name collision framework is currently out for public comment. So if you haven't had a chance, please go take a look and provide your input.

Also out for public comments currently is the proposal for an implementation approach to deal with the perceived inconsistencies in the string confusion objection determinations.

I believe the reply period for that public comment closes on April 3rd. So there's still a few days left if you want to get your comments in.

For the folks who are standing in the back, we have plenty of seats here in the front if you'd like to come up.

Nicole.

So aside from some of the things I have talked about that directly impact the program, our team internally are also working on a number of things. We're working on ways to improve our own internal processes in order to gain efficiencies in the processing of things like CPEs, in the processing of contracts, and also in the processing of transition to delegation. So we're not resting on our laurels. We know there's always work to be done and we're continuing to work hard to identify areas for improvement.

So as the saying goes, no rest for the weary.

Nicole, next slide, please.

All right. So now we are getting into a more detailed part of the presentation. We are going to be giving you some updates on progress that we have made with regards to the application processing.

Next slide, please.

Before we move forward with the rest of the presentation, I thought I would give a little bit of -- or talk a little bit about application statuses. Partly because I think it's a good way to set the stage for the rest of the presentation, but partly also because I realize that we have provided a lot of new statuses recently, and we haven't necessarily done a very good job of explaining what these statuses mean. So I want to spend a few minutes talking about this.

The title of this slide is Application Statuses - Improved Reporting. And I think that pretty accurately reflects the intent that we had when we created some of these new statuses. In -- If you recall, for a long time, the only statuses you could see on the microsite was evaluation

statuses. So you could see if an application is in initial evaluation, you can see if an application is in extended evaluation, but beyond that, you couldn't see anything else.

So at the end of January, we added some new application statuses to the microsite. We added in contracting, we added in predelegation testing, we added in transition to delegation, we added delegation. So that just was a step to provide you with some additional visibility into where an application is beyond evaluation.

And then last week -- was it last week? Last week, we added two new statuses, on hold and will not proceed.

So what do these statuses mean? Well, on hold means just that, that the application is on hold because it has pending activities that could impact the status of the application. So examples of these pending activities include an ICANN accountability mechanism, it includes, you know, maybe a currently open ICANN public comment forum regarding a proposed implementation plan for a program-related activity. So those are a couple of examples of what pending activities could be.

And then will not proceed. So will not proceed means that the application will not move forward because -- or based on the outcome of a program process that it had completed. So an example would be if an application lost a legal rights objection, then the application would not proceed.

Next slide, please.

So with application status, it's important to note that application statuses are not final. They can change as the application moves from one program step to the next.

The only exception are the withdrawn and delegated status. Those two statuses are final statuses. They will not change. So just wanted to make sure that you get that important distinction. Those are the two statuses that we believe are final statuses, but all of the other statuses could change.

Not approved and applicant support statuses.

Not approved means the application will not continue because of a resolution that the ICANN Board has passed. So currently there are three applications that reflect this status, and it is because the NGPC approved a -- or accepted, not approved, accepted a GAC advice to not approve those applications.

Applicant support. Applicant support means that the application was applied for under the Applicant Support Program and did not meet the minimum requirements. So as per the rules, if the application was applied for under the Applicant Support Program and does not meet the minimum requirements under that program, it is not eligible for evaluation under the new gTLD program. So there's one application that reflects that status.

Next slide, please.

And then this slide basically shows you the remaining application statuses that reflects a program step that the application may be undergoing.

So I think that's it for me. So hopefully that a little bit of an overview of application statuses will give you some context for the remaining -- remainder of the presentation.

So now I'm going to ask Cristina to come up and give you an update on evaluation, objections, and GAC advice.

CRISTINA FLORES: Thank you, Trang. Hi, everyone. As Trang mentioned I'm Cristina Flores, and I'm a manager in the gTLD operations department.

So starting off with evaluation, as many of you know, we are nearing the end of the evaluation phase of the program. Of the original 1930 applications that were submitted, there are only seven applications that remain in either initial or extended evaluation. 150 applications have been withdrawn and 1771 applications have passed.

I think it's worth noting that the passed number is not inclusive of the withdrawals, so if an application passed evaluation and then subsequently withdrew, then it's not included in the pass count for this slide.

There are also two applications that did not complete evaluation which are reflected here as such.

Next slide.

Moving on to objections, as Trang also mentioned, this is an area where we have made a lot of progress since Buenos Aires. Of the original 263 objections that were admitted, 95% of the cases have been resolved meaning that either an expert determination was reached or that the

objection was withdrawn or otherwise terminated before an expert determination was reached.

Also as Trang discussed, on March 14th we updated application statuses and contention sets to reflect the outcomes of objections. So if you go to the application status page, you'll see some that reflect "will not proceed," and then Russ is going to go into more detail on what you'll see with the contention set updates that were made recently.

There's an overview of the objection status of each of the 263 original objections. And of the 14 that remain in progress, I'd just like to note that all of them were stayed at some point in time, which has delayed the completion of these objections.

Next slide, please.

Here we have a little bit of information on the public comment forum that was also previously mentioned regarding the proposal that ICANN published to address some very specific perceived inconsistent expert determinations on string confusion objections. The reply period closes on April 3rd. So, if you'd like to make a comment, we encourage you to visit the forum and review the proposal and submit your comment for consideration.

Next slide, please.

Moving on to GAC advice, I think most of the people in the room are probably very familiar with GAC advice. But I'll give a little bit of history, since it's been in the works for quite a while.

In the Beijing Communique, which was in April of last year, the GAC proposed some specific safeguards that would apply to a very broad category of strings which we refer to category one. So these strings, these safeguards would apply to strings relating to consumer protection, sensitive strings, and regulated markets. Slide.

The visual on this slide shows the 386 applications that applied for the 186 strings that were listed.

The strings were categorized among 14 different categories, which are listed here. And all 386 of these applications were held until the new gTLD program committee of the ICANN board could determine how to implement the advice.

Slide, please.

So the major milestone that was reached between Buenos Aires and now was that, on February 5th, the NGPC adopted an implementation framework. I encourage you to go to the link on the slide to view the framework in detail but, at a very high level, essentially, outlines 10 safeguards that will be incorporated into the registry agreement for applications that were subject to the advice. And then, depending on whether the string was listed in -- depending on which of these three categories the string was listed, certain safeguards will be included, incorporated into specification of the registry agreement as public interest commitments. It's also worth noting that these are not negotiable terms and will be automatically incorporated as these applications proceed to contracting. Slide.

Just a couple extra notes on category one advice. As I mentioned, since these will be incorporated into specification 11, as public interest commitments, or PICs as we refer to them, they are enforceable by the PICDRP or the public interest commitment dispute resolution procedure, or, like all provisions in the registry agreement, through ICANN's contractual compliance program. And we published an applicant advisory with some additional detail about this kind of consolidating all of the information and things that have occurred over the past year last week. So I encourage you to review that on the Web site.

So the next broad category of strings that were included in the Beijing Communique are referred to as category two. And the category safeguard advice states that, for strings representing generic terms, exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal.

Next slide. The diagram on this slide shows a flow chart, I guess, of how we've processed and implemented this advice. So of the strings that were listed, 186 applications were affected initially.

And so we reached out to all the applications for these strings that were included in category two advice, and we asked them to indicate whether or not they intended to operate as exclusive access and whether or not their applications that they originally submitted were consistent with how they intend to operate.

For those that did not intend to operate as exclusive access and had applications consistent with this, they proceeded forward in the program, I believe, in October of last year, which was the vast majority of them.

There were 12 applications that did intend to operate as exclusive access, and those are currently still being held. They're included in the 22 number that Trang referred to earlier. They're still being held, pending the NGPC's consideration of that advice. And then that middle group, the 35, were applications that stated that, no, we don't intend to operate as exclusive access, but our application did state that.

So we've reached out to those applicants. And we've asked them to submit change requests to bring their application up to date with how they intend to operate the registry. And, once those change requests have been approved, they'll be allowed to move forward in the program. All the responses that are here including, you know, both the original responses and then the responses regarding how people will operate in the public interest survey will go on the microsite on the GAC category two advice page.

So the next steps for GAC advice, as the vast majority have a move-forward path, the only outstanding thing that we're waiting for is the NGPC's consideration of the statements on how the 12 applications will operate in the public interest if they're exclusive access.

There's quite a bit of information out there about GAC category two advice; so we also published an applicant advisory consolidating a lot of this information and, hopefully, addressing a lot of the community's questions last week on the microsite.

So I will turn it over to Russ Weinstein now for an update on string contention.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Thanks, Cristina. So with all the busy work that Trang and Cristina's team were doing updating application statuses and processing through the objections and thing, we were able to update contention sets and contention set statuses.

So what we started with was the string similarity panels results and the contention sets that created there a little over a year ago with 234 contention sets. Then, recently, we published the updates to those contention sets given all the application processing that's taken place up to this point. And so we're down to 233 contention sets. The objections had various impacts on contention sets. Applications were added. Applications were taken out. What's going on? Thank you.

So applications were added. Applications were taken out. Contention sets were joined. New contention set was created. So we're down to 233 total contention sets. Of the 233, 186 remain unresolved. So we have 47 resolved. We have 164 of what we're calling active contention sets. And those are applications where no applications within the set are on hold and direct contention continues today.

And then we have the on-hold sets. And there's a little bit more information about the on-hold sets in the applicant advisory that Trang referenced. But those are sets where at least one application in the set is on hold for one of the reasons Trang mentioned before.

Next.

So with all of the changes to contention sets, we wanted to better communicate and better report this information out to the community. So we worked to redesign the contention set page on the microsite. So

what the page now has for you is we added all the contention sets, 1-233. We gave them all a number based on priority. Lowest priority number of the set drove the name of the contention set. We gave every set a name using the string or strings involved in the sets. And then we provided the status there of active, resolved, or on hold and the total number of applications that were ever a number of that set. And then you can look into more detail on the page by clicking the little arrow on the side. And that will give you all the applications that are in that set and their current application status. And we also recognized there was some very complex contention sets created. And just listing things wasn't always the best way to communicate the information; so we created images, graphical representations, of the contention sets. And those are available on the page. And we'll keep those updated regularly. Next.

So on to contention resolution mechanisms, as Trang described. Community priority evaluations, one of the resolution mechanisms for contention. The current status with CPE is we have 19 pending eligibility. And many of those are subject to that GAC advice. And, while the GAC advice may now have somewhat been resolved, they're still processing through all the change requests and things. And some of them are in those sets that are on hold. So there's various reasons why. But, as sets become eligible, they'll be invited on a weekly basis to pursue CPE. We have eight currently now in evaluation. And, as Trang mentioned, we got the first four results recently published, I think, just last week. We got those out.

And we recognize that evaluation took much longer than we originally anticipated. But, in working with the panel, we are confident that these

future evaluations will trend back towards that 3-month time frame that we previously articulated.

Next.

So wanted to kind of recap a little bit about what CPE does. Trang gave you the process and what the reason behind doing CPE is. And we wanted to just kind of reset a little bit since we published the results and talk about what the results are based on.

So the applicant guidebook defines the criteria for CPE. There's the four categories -- community establishment, nexus between proposed string and community, registration policies, and community endorsement.

And we asked the CPE panel to develop a set of guidelines which we published back in September that they didn't change the criteria in any way. They just helped further clarify to the community how they were going to be interpreting that criteria and using it to process the evaluations. The evaluations were all performed by the Economist Intelligence Unit. There are our panel -- CPE panel firm. And they're taking the application and responses as well as publicly available information into account in their evaluations.

And then they're providing us with a report which we published last week, and all the future reports will look somewhat like that.

And, as you know, the bar to earn priority is a very high bar. So, in this current group of results, none of the applications did meet that bar. So they didn't prevail in CPE. They didn't prevail the contention set, but they're still eligible for future processing. So they can continue working

with the members of the contention set on self-resolution. Or, if necessary, they can go forward to an auction.

Next.

And with that, auctions. So we've got a busy time over the -- since Buenos Aires really, on auctions. Coming out of the Buenos Aires meeting, the board requested a public comment on the auction rules and some of the processes around auction, which we did put out back in December. That forum closed in February.

And we've been working since then to synthesize the comments and update the documents as necessary, which we did on March 6th. We published the report, summary of analysis report of the comments. And, as well, we're able to produce an updated set of auction rules and updated bidder's agreement. They'll now allow us to move forward to auction operations.

The one thing holding us back from moving forward to operations after we got those documents updated was the contention sets and the application statuses. So, once we got those things updated in the middle of the month, we were able to refresh the schedule that we had published back in December and republish an updated schedule for auctions, reset the first auction date as June 4th. And they're going to happen about once a month after that.

And then we were able to start notifying the eligible contention set and contention set members that their contention sets are being sent to auction if they don't self-resolve before they're scheduled.

So I'm going have a session later today -- I think it's in a couple hours or so -- on auctions. So we'll get way more into the details on that session. And, if you have questions and you can make it to the session later today, I would ask that you hold them until then, because I think we're going to try to flesh out a lot of the things that you're probably wondering about auctions in that. So with that I'll turn it back to Trang to talk about contracting.

TRANG NGUYEN: Thanks, Russ.

So a quick update where we are with contracting. Next slide, please.

So, as of last Friday, we invited 1,094 applications to the contracting process. And of that number 502 have responded to the invitation. So, if I look at the average response rate that is now at 46%, which is up from the approximately 33% that we were stuck at for a really long time. So we're trending in the right direction. I like to see that percentage go up a bit higher, but we're trending in the right way. And the average response time is about 37 days. Next, please.

And of the 502 applications that responded to our invitation, we've actually sent out 427 registry agreements to the applicants for review and signature.

So I want to pause here for a second and look back. So I think it was October of last year on one of our monthly webinars, I shared with you the contracting process and said that the contracting processing cycle is about 15-business day cycle or approximately three weeks. So, if I use that as the measuring stick and I look at the 427 number, what this is

saying is that, basically, 39% of the 427 registry agreements sent out for signature were processed within that 3-week cycle time.

Okay. 61% were not processed within that 3-week cycle time. 61% were processed within a 41-calendar day time frame.

So you may ask why 41 days versus the three-week cycle time. Well, what we've realized is that sometimes, when an applicant responds to our contracting invitations, their responses aren't complete. So that requires us to go back to the applicants, ask for additional information. That cause some delays. Some applicants also want to negotiate the terms and conditions of the registry agreement. And, obviously, that will cause delays.

There are certain other requirements within the registry agreements, like the continuing operations instrument, also known as COI. And, in some instances, those COIs are not in compliance by the time that the applicant provides a response to the contracting invite. So that means that we have to reach out to the applicant, work with them to get the COI in compliance before we can proceed with drafting the registry agreement. So, you know, it could be any number of those type of reasons that's causing delays and causing, you know, a significant percentage, 61 percentage, of the 407 -- 427 contracts to be processed in, you know, a time frame that's beyond a three-week cycle.

So next slide, please.

If we take a look at this number here, so of the 427 contracts that we sent out to the applicants, we have signed 358 contracts as of last Friday.

So you can see there what that means. I think the conversion rate there is probably around 85%, which is a pretty solid number, you know. But we would like to see that go closer to 100%, if possible. And on average we're executing contracts in about 13 days. So that's between the time frame when we send a contract out to when the contract is actually executed.

Do I have any other slides for contracting? Next.

Okay. Registry operator code of conduct.

So the registry operator code of conduct is a set of guidelines for the registry operator relating to certain and limited operations of a registry. So this code of conduct is part of the registry agreement. And applies to all registry operators unless an exemption to it is provided by ICANN. So last week we have posted about 54, 55 exemption requests to the microsite for comments. Any comments submitted between 30 days of the date that we posted, the request will be considered and reviewed by ICANN in making a determination.

The 54, 55 number that I threw out there actually isn't a totality of the requests that we got. We got a lot more than that. But several of the requests that we have are not complete. So we're still currently following up with applicants to obtain the required information. And, once we have complete information, we'll get them posted. It's likely that we're going to go into a weekly cycle of posting these things probably towards the beginning of the week. So on this slide here, you see, you know, some links. There's a link to where all of these exemption requests are posted. There's a link for submitting comments. And there's also a link to view all of the comments that

have been submitted. We've also created a frequently asked questions that has a lot of good information in there. So I encourage you to read that.

Now I'm going hand it back to Russ.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Thanks, Trang.

So, putting my other hat on, we'll talk about the predelegation activities now.

So this is predelegation testing and the transition to delegation processes. Next. So predelegation testing is moving along pretty well. We have 266 complete appointments so far, all passes. And we're getting the pipeline very full. You see 42 invited and 30 scheduled. We had dipped pretty well low in the February and March time frame in terms of number of contracts being signed and then folks getting in to predelegation testing, so our provider was hungry for more work. They have capacity to do up to 20 a week; and we can even increase that in the future, if needed.

But so far we haven't seen the pipeline sustain itself to where we need to increase beyond that 20 a week. So we're going to hold that until we see differently.

So what we have so far is we have 20 -- we had 20 start last week. 20 more are starting today. And we're already slated for 10 more starting next week.

We anticipate several of those invited to fill in that 10 up to 20 for next week. And start filling that pipeline even more. So all the -- getting through contracting through predelegation testing is certainly a priority of ours, and we're working hard for that.

Next.

And then the transition to delegation, as mentioned, 182 delegations to date. Significant process since Buenos Aires. You see the gray bar there, the pending eligibility. So, when we envisioned this process and harmonized it with coming out of contracting, starting predelegation testing, in parallel we envisioned that the registries would be starting and completing registry on-boarding in the same time period that they were doing predelegation testing, thus allowing people to move right on to predelegation testing and getting their delegation tokens and on to delegation. That's not happening as often as we would have expected. So what we notice is that the registry operators aren't getting the on-boarding completed in that 5-6 week time period for predelegation testing as often as we would expect. So that's something to think about. I know there's some confusion. The predelegation testing and the transition to delegation activities work with the application primary contact. And the registry on-boarding works with the registry operator point of contact. But now, with the launch of the gTLD portal, hopefully, we'll start seeing those come back in line and be able to process.

When applicants are moving through everything as we expected, the current trend is it takes about 60 days to go from signing an RA to being a gTLD in the root zone. So that's what the current -- if you're doing

everything when you're supposed to, that's kind of a timeline you can expect for those activities.

With that I will turn it over to Francisco to talk about name collisions.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Thank you, Russ. Hello, everyone. I'm Francisco Arias, the director of technical services at ICANN. I'm going to give a brief update on name collision activities.

We have a more detailed session immediately after this one. And I will encourage everyone that is interested in the subject to attend that session. And, if possible, hold your questions until you hear the full description of where we are in this topic next.

So right now we are -- we have the draft name collision management framework for public comment. This was published last month at the end of the month. Has been there for almost a month. And the reply period closes on 21st of April. If you're interested in the subject, please go on and provide your input in the public forum.

In summary, the current proposal is intended to supersede what we have right now in the registry agreement. We have -- there's a lead block list as a current proposal to handle this issue. Or should I say one of the components. And the idea is that this mechanism will be superseded by what is proposed in the draft framework.

The draft framework has three main points. First is to reserve or to not delegate three strings -- corp, home and mail. Corp and home are not new in the list. They have been there in the plan that was approved by

the NGPC in October of last year. So mainly is a new addition in this list of strings that are considered too high risk and, therefore, are proposed to not be delegated ever.

The next component of the new measures will be to have a 120-day period during which there is no activation of names. This is different to the current period that is already defined in the contract. The current period is -- starts at contracting and is focused on resolving the issues related to internal name certificates. This new period will start, if approved, at delegation time. So, during the 120 days starting at delegation, no names will be allowed to be activated under the TLD. And also, during this period, the registry will be required to introduce a few wildcard records in the TLD zone. These wildcard records, basically, what they do is, when someone is making a DNS query, doesn't matter what the name is under the TLD, they will get a positive response and they will receive a special IP address that ensures that no traffic goes outside of the computer that's making the request. It's an IP address in what's called the lookback log, so it's represented in the same server.

This mechanism will be for those TLDs that have not been already delegated. Those already delegated and have their SLD block list, what they will do is introduce an SRV record in the zone for the names in the SLD block list. This will be like an approximation to the full wildcard solution. The intention here is to avoid having wildcard records in the TLDs that are already in registration. This is following what has been previously published by ICANN in regards to avoiding the use of wild cards as much as possible. So waiting to hear from the exerts on the subject, for example security expert to see if they see an issue with the

mechanisms that have been proposed, for example, having the wildcard in the TLDs.

So this is the short summary of what is being proposed. And please attend the next session in which we will have more information. And we hope to hear your requests. Thank you. Now I'm going to hand it to Aaron.

AARON HICKMANN: Thank you, Francisco. My name is Aaron Hickmann. And I'll be giving a brief update on the EBERO program as well as the trademark clearinghouse. Next slide, please.

For those of you who don't know, the EBERO program is an emergency reaction program that we have in the event of a failing registry.

We've added a third provider recently. Nominet signed a contract back in February. And we are going to be bringing them operationally live in May. So they will join CORE and CNNIC as our current operational providers.

Over the last quarter we've also been busy. We've held a couple of different exercises. We created a test registry and simulated a failure with both CORE and CNNIC to test both our processes as well as the EBERO providers. And I'm very happy to say that the exercises went extremely well. We had a great collaborative effort where we very quickly and effectively restored the key services. Both providers easily met SLAs. And so we're very confident that, in the event of an actual event, we'll be able to respond accordingly.

Additionally, moving forward we know that we still need to add a few more providers to handle additional geographic coverage. So we have an RFP right now in draft that will, hopefully, be released next month. And we are aiming to select our finalists by June. And then certainly, as soon as possible, get them contracted and operational so that we have additional jurisdictional and geographic coverage.

Next slide, please.

On the trademark clearinghouse, wanted to just show how far we've come since ICANN 48. We have about a 50% increase in the number of TMCH records over all as well as the non-Latin records. Jurisdictions are up about 15%. Abused labels up about three times. UDRP cases up as well. And, certainly, because back in -- at ICANN 48 we hadn't gone through sunrise or claims, there were no transactions yet. There's been about 100 sunrise periods that have opened and a little over 50 claims periods that have opened. So that's resulted in just over 21,000 transactions through that system. And, of course, that has to be supported by registrars. And so we're happy to note that registrars that have been certified under the trademark database system have almost reached 100. We do get those regularly. And, probably by this time next week, we'll pass that 100 threshold. With that I'll turn it over to Karen Lentz to talk about TLD launch programs.

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you, Aaron.

Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Karen Lentz, director of operations and policy research at ICANN. I'm going to highlight a couple of items

related to TLD launch processes. Since the meeting we had in Buenos Aires, we've done a couple of things relating to the process we have for registries who request an approved launch program. That would be something that they wish to do for their startup that wouldn't ordinarily be permitted under the requirements of the agreement. So, following the Buenos Aires meeting, we published the review guidelines that are applied when we get those requests. So those are available as well.

We also developed a draft qualified launch program that was contemplated as part of the requirements in the agreement such that, if we could develop a program that would permit registries to allocate a certain limited number of names to third parties to be able to promote their TLDs in advance of the sunrise, that we could incorporate that into the requirements. So we developed a draft QLP we call it program. We opened a public comment period on that. That comment period closed on the 15th. And so we did get quite a few comments which we are taking under consideration now.

The comments generally supported the concept. Many of them had suggested changes. So we're looking at looking at those right now. And then there is an additional session, not specifically focused on these but more on the TLD launch start -- and start up and on-boarding processes that is this afternoon at 5:00. I'll turn it back to Trang.

TRANG NGUYEN: Thank you, Karen. So at the beginning -- we're almost done, guys. At the beginning of the presentation we did a look back at Buenos Aires. So now we're going to try to do a look forward to London.

Next slide, please.

So we have some numbers up here, and I know the role team is probably not feeling very easy about this because there's no disclaimers, but these weren't meant to be hard numbers and goals we set for ourselves for London. They're basically just milestones we're looking at and hoping to hit by the time of the London meeting.

We are looking -- we are looking forward to hitting the 200th delegation. Potentially could happen before London.

And then 400 registry agreements signed. That's what we're hoping to get to by London as well.

Obviously all of these things, you know -- we can't do that on our own. We need a lot of help from you guys, too. But these are just some of the things that we're looking forward to being able to report to you in London.

Next slide, please.

Okay. So I promise one last presentation, and that's from Naela on the IDN variants program, and then we will open it up for questions.

NAELA SARRAS: Thank you, Trang. So I promise this will be really short. It's actually more of an advertisement than it is a presentation.

So I'm here because -- my name is Naela Sarras. I'm the IDN manager at ICANN. And we're working on a program called the IDN variant TLD program.

It's core mission is to work on rules for the DNS root zone, basically, that will do two things. One is decide what are valid codepoints that could be used for labels in the root zone. That's one facet of it that does not exist as of today, believe it or not, still. So all the labels that are going in the root zone, and I think I heard 182 are in the root zone as of very recently, 22 of those are IDNs. These labels are evaluated on a one-by-one basis for IDNs.

So we're looking to create rules for the IDN labels, and then for some IDN labels, we have what's been called a variant label, a variant label. We don't really have a -- we still don't have a very good definition for what a variant label is, but you can think of it as a label that's equivalent or the same as the primary or the base label.

So our variant TLD program has developed a very comprehensive procedure for how we go about creating these rules, and it actually is very much a community-based effort, and it needs the community to create the rules, basically. It calls for having each community set up their own script generation panels what they're called, and then they develop the rules for their script, and then they submit those rules to ICANN. ICANN has what's called an integration panel. They take the rules, integrate them into the long list of rules for the root zone, and, voila, we actually then become -- we have label generation rules for the root zone.

So we'll talk very extensively about this tomorrow at 8:30 a.m. We'll give an update about the program and what the role of the community is. And then in the afternoon, we have another session from 1:00 to 5:00, it's more like a marathon, where we're going to cover many, many

topics that appear in the procedure and how it needs to -- how it's executed.

So I'm here really to appeal to you, because all of you are community members and impacted by what the decisions we're making are, and, frankly, it's because we need you to get together and make these rules.

So there will be many, many more details tomorrow about what constitutes a generation panel and how they work and how they submit the work to the integration panel, et cetera. So I hope I see some of you there, maybe all of you, Wednesday. I'm sorry; I said tomorrow. Today is only Monday, even though it feels like we've been here. So the sessions I promise are all on Wednesday. Wednesday 8:30 to 10:00 and then Wednesday from 1:00 to 5:00 p.m. And that's it, and I will see you there.

So we'll go back to Trang.

TRANG NGUYEN: Thank you, Naela. So with that we'll close the presentation part and we're going to open it up for questions. Because of the challenges of the layout of the room, I think we're going to have to ask everyone to come up and sit at the table and then use these hand-held microphones for those that wish to come up and ask a question.

So I think Nicole is going to sit here. Oh, we do have a mic back there. Okay. Terrific.

>>   One two, one two. May I?

TRANG NGUYEN: Why don't we go ahead and start on this side, please.

>>   Sure. As a CPE applicant, what mechanism do I have for appeal if I failed CPE?

TRANG NGUYEN: I'm sorry; was the question what appeals mechanism there may be for CPE results?

>>   Sorry. If I'm an applicant and I've applied for a community application and I failed CPE, what is my mechanism for appeal?

TRANG NGUYEN: The guidebook currently does not provide for an appeal mechanism for CPE results. The mechanism that is available to the applicant is what Russ had mentioned earlier, which is you still have the ability to try to resolve the contention on your own or to go through auction.

>>   And just one more question. GAC 2 advice, what's the time frame for resolution?

TRANG NGUYEN:	So with regards to GAC cat 2, the -- we still have some work to do, staff still has some work to do. I think we need to still publish or do a public comment forum for all of the public interest statements that have been submitted before we can present those comments back to the NGPC.
	So we internally have not discussed a specific time frame, but we're hoping that we would make some progress on that front by London.
	Amadeu.
AMADEU ABRIL i ABRIL:	Okay. I have three questions. One, I don't know whether it's for Trang or Russ regarding the delegation rate.
	You give the absolute numbers, but I don't know whether the per-week number, you know, the expected 20 or not. In my perception, it does not at all. And we have some TLDs that passed predelegation long before Christmas. They're still waiting.
	So can you explain whether we're doing the 20 per week or not, and when we hope that we will reach that rate regarding delegation, and whether there is something that's delaying that part? Because all the rest seems to go much faster than the delegation in our experience, especially since Christmas. Before Christmas, you know, one was quite sure when you would be delegated. Now we have no idea for the ones that are pending.
	The second one is for Karen regarding the qualified launch program and the approved launch program, and it's double. First, when do you expect a final decision on the qualified launch program? And the

second one that's related. CORE and its customer has filed a number of approved launch program requests that are being put on hold because of this procedure of consultation for the qualified launch program. Not that we agree on that. We don't think that all of them are related. Some are, some are not. So when we can again move on on this that we sent?

And the third one is on the community priority. And it's -- I am a little bit troubled about the evaluations published. Not just, you know, whether they fail or not, but the reasoning of the evaluators for them seems to be all or nothing everywhere. It's a four or a zero. In all of those that is zero, one, two, or zero one two or three is possible, shouldn't say, there's the maximum or the minimum. There's no grays there. And some of them are traveling. For instance, there's one, I have no relation or even know the applicants or anyone related, they say something like for performance, well, you have the procedure but you don't have a completely detailed appeals process. Have you explained to them the word size limits of question 20 in the TAS? Because what I did for the 11 community applications was cutting them once and over again because they could not fit in the TAS. There were five different questions in question 20 and, therefore, some of them are incomplete and some things you could just sketch what was the answer but not provide detailed answers for all these.

So have you addressed that with the evaluators?

Thanks.

TRANG NGUYEN:	Karen, do you want to answer the qualified launch program question first?

KAREN LENTZ:	Sure. Thanks, Amadeu.

So the question was essentially the time frame for resolving the qualified launch program and the associated requests. So we did have a number of individual requests which, as Amadeu noted, we thought it was related or could be covered by the QLP. We did want to ask those requesters to hold pending our -- the comment period on the QLP.

So to answer your question, we are intending to move pretty quickly on it. We've been through the comment and are developing an updated draft as well as the comment -- public comment report. So I would say one to two weeks is the time frame. And the individual requests are related to that.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:	Amadeu, this is Russ. First of all, touch on the delegation rate. So we're managing to internally the thousand per year delegations into the root zone. So that was the agreed-upon number going into the guidebook based on the study. So we're managing to a rate of a thousand per year. That averages to about 20 a week, but we have the capacity and flexibility with working with the IANA team to issue more delegation tokens or less delegation tokens based on demand as we need, as long as we're managing to that -- that overall thousand per year.

With respect to why certain applications aren't moving forward past predelegation testing, largely that's driven by what I was talking about earlier in my slides about registry on-boarding not being completed. So there's three criteria that we're using before moving someone forward to giving them a delegation token, and that is a successful completion of predelegation testing, completion of the registry on-boarding step one, and not identified as one of the applications that can't move forward with the alternate path for delegation for the name collision framework.

So we only have four applications in the name collision hold, and the rest of them are due to not completing on-boarding.

And to your point on CPE. So we've been working with the panel, and we review their work and ask questions and have them help justify why the scores were what they are. And that's what we had them write in their reports.

We're comfortable with the reports as published, and the results as published, we think they followed the criteria identified in the guidebook and used the scoring identified in the guidebook.

So....

TRANG NGUYEN: And to add on to that, Amadeu, the evaluation panels for CPE actually look at the entire public portion of the application and not just what's presented by the applicant in question 20. So, you know, if you split up your answers and put it elsewhere in the application, they are -- they do and they are looking at the entire public portion of the applications.

With regards to the results, I mean, they are performing independent review of these applications, you know, based on the criteria that have been published against what's in the application. You know, so -- And that's what's come up so far for these first four. It's not necessarily indicative of what the scores will be for the rest of the evaluations.

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: Hello, Dirk Krischenowski. I'm speaking in my capacity as a shareholder in one of the hotel projects applications.

It was said already in this ICANN meeting in the two days ago that ICANN is really looking stupid in the string confusion objection process by ICANN staff. And I want to echo this and come back to what you are doing in this string confusion process.

You want to make believe that, for instance, an apple and a banana are so similar -- no -- yeah. That they are so similar that it's the same, and that's fine. And at the same time, you're saying an orange and tangerine or mandarin orange, they are so similar that you can't sell them at the same time for the same reason.

So making people believe that strings which have nothing to do with each other and which are obviously so separate from each other that they don't confuse consumers are the same like others that confuse consumers isn't going to work.

ICANN behaves like the three monkeys: don't hear, don't say, and don't see anything in this case. So I'm asking what is ICANN doing to correct the obvious mistakes and not the perceived you played on the display

earlier this session to make this process to be correct, and correct the incorrect decisions on this?

That's my first point. And my second point is string, the community priority evaluation process. Here as an applicant in this respect as well, we have the feeling that the CPE is the real black box. The people don't respond from the Economist Intelligence Unit. You don't have the possibility to enter exchange with them. You don't know what they have recognized from your applications from the comments and from other sources. So that's a really black box. And out of the black box do come results where you don't -- even don't know where is the evaluator. And ICANN has said they have evaluators for each string from the respective community or from the respective branch and knowledge in this, so that's opaque. And I want you to do something in this respect.

TRANG NGUYEN: Thank you, Dirk.

Amy, could I please ask you to address Dirk's first question?

AMY STATHOS: Sure. Thank you, Trang.

With respect to the string confusion objection determinations, as the community I believe knows, there was and continues to be a public comment open on a particular set of what are deemed perceived inconsistent determinations. The New gTLD Committee has indicated that this is a first step, and the results from this particular public

comment will help inform to the extent the New gTLD Program Committee is evaluating further processes that may be proposed for implementation as well for what -- well, your examples people might deem to be pretty unreasonable type of determinations that came out of the -- the dispute resolution or objection proceedings.

So it's not a complete closed door at this point where they're taking it step by step to figure out what everybody in the community is thinking about the various aspects.

TRANG NGUYEN: Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Hello, hello, Jordyn Buchanan with Google.

I just have a quick question about the barrow system.

Oh, you're surprised.

So you mentioned that you're looking for additional providers in order to meet geographic and jurisdictional diversity requirements. I'm curious what those requirements that you're targeting are, how they were developed and what the community involvement was in that process.

>>   We're still actually determining what geographic requirements we need. The concern is to make sure we have enough geographic dispersion to

handle any sort of data protection concerns. And we haven't finalized any decision on that. We're still examining that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So I guess the last part of my question is the most relevant, then, which is what's the process for engaging the community in that determination?

TRANG NGUYEN: Jordyn, why don't I take that question and get back to you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks.

WERNER STAUB: I have just a small question. For the TLDs on hold for the new status that has been distributed. Some of them say they're on hold pending mechanism. But that's the only thing that can be found. There's no further indication about which accountability mechanism, what kind of process has been initiated. So how can we find more information about those cases?

TRANG NGUYEN: Hi, Werner. I believe the reconsideration requests are posted on the ICANN Web site. We can share the link, Nicole. I don't know how we go about doing that. But we can certainly share the link to that page.

And, you know, the complaints filed with the ombudsman are confidential and not necessarily information that will be made available. And not -- I'll let Amy chime in.

AMY STATHOS: Yeah. So I think there are three accountability mechanisms that we have available under our bylaws including the ombudsman, the reconsideration requests as well as the independent review. The reconsideration requests and the independent review proceedings are posted on the Web site. They each have their own page, so you can identify which ones have been accessed. With respect to the ombudsman, most people have let us know if they have gone to the ombudsman. And, if they have, then the status is placed on hold for further evaluation. It doesn't -- you know, there's no determination as to -- at that point that it's going to stay on hold forever or indefinitely or anything. It's put on hold so we can continue to evaluate the process and steps that are being taken so we make sure that we understand the status of all the aspects that are going on surrounding a particular application going forward.

WERNER STAUB: So, to understand, if there's a contention set and one of those applications doesn't know about anything but just happens to learn that it is on hold, this means, if nothing is published, the other party in the contention set must have submitted something to the ombudsman. Is that correct?

AMY STATHOS: I don't think we can imagine what might happen without understanding facts of each particular case. If you have a particular question about a particular application, I'd encourage you to send it through to the CSC, and there will be answers provided.

TRANG NGUYEN: Let's move to this side of the room, please.

>>   Quickly, I'd like to remind everyone to please state your name for the record.

PETER VERGOTE: Good afternoon. Peter Vergote from DNS Belgium. We are an applicant for new gTLDs.

I have a question for Karen concerning a prelaunch program. It's a pretty straightforward question.

How many requests for approved launch programs has ICANN received so far? And, of those, how many have been validated in a positive way?

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you, Peter. So the question is around how many requests for approved launch programs we've had. So -- and I'm going to give rough numbers here because I don't have them all in front of me. But to date there have been about 25, in the neighborhood of 25. Some of them have been withdrawn. Some of them have been turned down. Some of them have been held, as we've previously noted, while we did the

public comment period on the qualified launch program. Some of them are still in process in terms of going back and forth with the requester and getting clarifications or more information on the request. So there haven't been any formal approvals to date.

PETER VERGOTE: Okay. Thanks. That was clear enough. Can I have one follow-up question?

Is ICANN considering giving the pending status of all of those 25 requests, those are still active, to improve on the process? Because a lot of applicants are actually waiting for a final decision on their approved launch program.

KAREN LENTZ: So is your question about publishing the statistics or response to the individual --

PETER VERGOTE: No. Your response to my second question was, as of today, no approved launch programs have been validated in a positive way, which might pose a problem for the applicants. So I'm just asking is ICANN considering to improve on the current process of approving the request for approved launch programs?

KAREN LENTZ: Yeah. So we're following the procedure that's posted. I don't think any -- you know, there shouldn't be any applicant that's unclear about the --

you know, the particular request. We've been communicating back and forth. But, you know, if that's not the case or if you want to suggest, you know, how it can be improved and how we can make the process more effective, then I encourage you to contact us with that.

PETER VERGOTE: Okay, thanks.

KAREN LENTZ: Craig.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Hi, I'm Craig Schwartz from fTLD Registry Services. I have a question based upon something I -- an exchange between you and a questioner earlier and then a comment.

One of the first questions was about what kind of follow-up there could be as a result of a CPE result. And I think you said that you can either continue to work it out with another applicant or you go to auction. Are the ICANN accountability mechanisms not available to those that did not prevail in CPE?

KAREN LENTZ: Yes, they are. The accountability mechanisms are available with respect to -- the ombudsman is available if the party believes they've been treated unfairly. Reconsideration is available if someone believes the process or policies weren't followed and so on and so forth. So, yes, they are available.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Okay. Just want to be clear on that.

And then the second question or comment, really, follows up on what Werner asked about the ombudsman and his role in the -- kind of the accountability process. Whereas, the request for reconsideration and the independent review processes are very well-defined, the time frames for applying, the time frames for responding, the ombudsman seems to be a little bit of a black hole in terms of applicants being informed about what's going on.

I asked that question because one of our applications is in that on-hold or pending status. And it would be good to have some understanding about what the time frame ahead looks like with regard to when that would be resolved. So it seems like there just needs to be some more transparency into that particular accountability mechanism. And it's a comment, not a question.

TRANG NGUYEN: Thank you, Craig. Move to this side of the room, please.

>>   Good afternoon.   My name is Maniam from Singapore. And I'm from a computing corporation called Infitt. My question is: If I explain the long process of the new TLD today, for those stakeholders who missed the boat on the first round of IDN gTLD, when is the next round, if any at all. It looks weird, right?

TRANG NGUYEN: The next round of gTLDs. I think that's sort of come up in discussions at this ICANN meeting quite a lot. I think there's still work that needs to be done before the second round. I think there are a couple of sessions going on right now. There's a session on metrics that, basically, the community and ICANN staff has been working on defining metrics that would be used to measure the success of the first program before the second program would be launched. So I encourage you to participate in those conversations. As of right now, we don't have any particular time frame defined for the second round.

MANIAM: Thank you.

TRANG NGUYEN: I'm going to -- I think we only have a few minutes left in this session. So I'm going to close the Q&A line. If you have any other additional questions, you can always submit them on the screen.

KATRIN OLMER: My name is Katrin Olmer from Dotzon. I have one question regarding specification 13. We saw the latest draft. And do you have an estimate when this will be final so we can consult with our clients whether they want to sign that one?

>> Thank you, Katrin. Cyrus, can I ask you?

CYRUS NAMAZI: Yes. Thank you. Our expectation, actually, is for NGPC to consider it this week during this meeting and, hopefully, adopt it as proposed.

CONSTANTINE ROUSSOS: This is Constantine from dot music. I have a question in regards to exclusive access, those pertaining to GAC advice. From what I'm aware, every applicant has to answer financial questions that are scored. So, if an applicant changes from exclusive to non-exclusive, do they have to resubmit their financial application? Because it has impact on their projections and their COI.

Because this is graded. So I wanted to know if that's going to be done. That's my first question.

If that's not going to be done, I'd like to know why some can get a free pass and not be rescored based on a process. And, when it comes to something like CPE, there's conflicting guidelines. For example, here it says that the -- that it should be a transparent process in terms of who the expert is. I have no idea who these experts are, their names in terms of these results that just came out. All we saw was some scores that were really, really low. So I can't see the transparency.

And also it says here that the evaluators are selected based on their knowledge of specific countries, regions, and industries as they pertain to applications. So how do we know this? Who are these people? Why isn't ICANN being transparent and accountable?

And I know a lot of us here with the community applications have spent more than half a decade on these things. And we want this to be

transparent, and we don't want this becoming a -- you know, an inconsistent and not -- you know, consistent with the guidelines.

Because, in many cases, ICANN seems to hide behind the ICANN guidebook but then chooses to ignore certain things. So I wanted to know why we don't know who these panelists are and why the process isn't as transparent as the guidelines say. Thank you.

TRANG NGUYEN: Thank you, Constantine. Let me address the question on GAC advice.

So, yes, that's true that a number of applicants have submitted change requests to align their applications with the intent to operate their TLD as a non-exclusive access registry.   You know, when we look at these change requests, we're not necessarily trying to interpret what the applicant's business model may be or how it may change based on, you know, what they want to do.

Because you have to understand that, you know, there's, on the one end of the spectrum, you've got exclusive access. And, on the other end of the spectrum, you have non-exclusive access. And you have a lot of things in between, right? So it's not -- you know, it's difficult for ICANN to look at an application and make any kind of determinations, although we do when we look at the change requests is to make sure and determine that the application -- the changes look like it fits the definition of non-exclusive. So, you know, anyway, we are not actually forcing applicants to change their financials and updating financials. That is something that the applicant has to make a determination on its open, just as it did with the original application, and how making it non-

exclusive would, you know, affect or not affect any of the financial information that it previously submitted.

CONSTANTINE ROUSSOS: So you're saying that it's not going to affect the financials?

TRANG NGUYEN: I'm not saying it's going to affect it or not affect it one way or the other. I'm saying that the applicant needs to tell us whether or not it's going to affect or not affect.

CONSTANTINE ROUSSOS: It's a scored section. That's all I'm saying. Why shouldn't certain points -- why should they not be scored again? I'm just looking at this process where we're being scored. Things are being added. For example, the guidebook doesn't say that with CPE the EIU is supposed to contact all the entities that supported us. That's not in the applicant guidebook. But, when it comes to other things, ICANN doesn't verify things that other people have wrote in their applications. So there's a bit of a discrepancy versus the community applicants that's pretty clear. So we're trying to make this process more transparent. I'm trying to understand what we're supposed to do and who is accountable here?

TRANG NGUYEN: Right. So we do look at the change requests submitted. And, if a reevaluation is required, obviously, we will perform reevaluation. But in certain cases reevaluation isn't always required. And then, with regards

to your second question about CPE and transparency, Russ, you want to take that?

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Yeah. Constantine, I don't think we're quite prepared to answer that question in this forum right now. We can take that offline and get an answer back. But we did take care in selecting the EIU as the expert panel for CPE. And we're happy with their progress and with the expertise they're bringing to the process. So we'll review the question.

CONSTANTINE ROUSSOS: -- the experts, for example, in music. We don't know anything. You're just throwing it out there. And we're seeing scores of 4 or 6 or something crazy. Like I said, a lot of people spent a lot of time on these. And we would appreciate to be have a bit more guidance from ICANN in this process. We just feel we haven't received anything.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Thanks. I'll take it under consideration.

TRANG NGUYEN: Jon.

JON NEVETT: Thanks, Trang. Jon Nevett from Donuts. First, I want to commend ICANN and the staff on the hard work of getting 182 -- I think it was 182 delegations to date in about a four-month period. I think that's great. And, you know, after a lot of fits and starts to have that happen in a

four-month period is great. Trang, you put up a slide that said the goal for the London meeting was 200. So I'm hoping that we could do more than 18 in the next three months.

And a couple ways we could get there, I think -- and to add some efficiencies -- because right now we have a backlog due to category one contracts being signed, backlog with predelegation testing. How do we make that more efficient? We had -- Russ, your slide said we had 266 PDPs already, all of them passed. We have the same wonderful registry backends being tested over and over and over again. There's got to be a way to make that more efficient to increase slots, reduce the review for the same ones again over and over. We've had 100 pass.

You know? The next 100, presumably, will pass as well.

And that our backlog is creating a backlog for everyone else as well. So, on behalf of everyone, especially the category one folks, to the extent we could get that more efficient, that would be wonderful.

The other thing related to category one is there's a race to delegation based on the name collision proposal. Now, if that proposal that we'll talk about with Francisco in a little bit, it doesn't change, there's going to be a lot of pressure to get these through to delegation, at least get this backlog out before we get to the new methods. So, again, congratulations on getting it done. And whatever we can do as a community to get it done more efficiently now that we have the learnings of the first group would be most appreciated. Thanks.

TRANG NGUYEN: Thanks, Jon. Actually, we ran over time by one minute. And there's another session in here starting right now. So Jon -- so, if you can be quick, we can try to get your questions and answers.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. I think for next time you should think about the format of the session and the room. But, anyway, the question is on the code of conduct exemption, this week or on Sunday it will be the six-month anniversary of when Neustar submitted its code of conduct exemption request. Six months. You finally decided to post it for public comment this past week.

Well, thank you for doing that. But, again, it's a long time coming. It's something that should have been, if it had to have been posted, a long time ago. But, actually, on the posting of it, if you look at the process document on the code of conduct exemption, it implies that it would only be posted for public comment if they wouldn't -- if they didn't satisfy number one and two of the three criteria there. So are we to read from that, number one, that all the code of conduct exemption requests didn't satisfy one and two before they went out for public comment?

And the last thing really quick is, when spec 13 comes out, please don't make it go through this excruciating code of conduct exemption request in order to satisfy spec one 3. So, when it does get approved on Wednesday this week, hopefully, or whenever the NGPC gets together, please have your process in line in order by that day so that people, because they're waiting for that spec, can get in, sign it, because that's the backlog. The reason you have only 200 by London is because the

brands, which are a lot of applications, are waiting for that spec. Thanks.

TRANG NGUYEN: Thanks, Jeff.

Chris, you have a question from remote participation?

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Yes, I do. This is from Rubens Kuhl, NTAG vice chair. For Francisco Arias and the ICANN legal team, regarding non-technical aspects of a name collision, aren't applicants that already signed their agreements eligible to use the alternate path to delegation instead of wildcarding the whole zone? Since the mechanism is already in the agreement, isn't the line between ones that can and can't use APD the signing of agreements after framework is approved?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: I think I can answer this quickly. There is also a provision in the agreement that says that, once the framework is approved, the registry will be -- how do you say? -- subject to that framework. Thank you.

TRANG NGUYEN: Amadeu, do you have a quick question?

AMADEU ABRIL i ABRIL: Yes, I think it's for Cyrus. I thought I heard the voice over there, another group from CORE. Now on behalf of a number of EU-based registries

that will offer registrations to third parties, mainly individual third parties being concerned, geos but not only geos. And the question here is about the public output of the WHOIS data for those individuals. And we've been trying to deal with that since, you know, January 2013. Last thing we heard from Cyrus was that something would be published probably before Singapore as -- for a procedure to get a sort of waiver or am amendment process for spec 4 and the WHOIS output. But we haven't seen anything.

Cyrus, do you have any update on that or any dates of when we can really talk about that?

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you, Amadeu. Let's you and I actually go to this corner, and we can speak. Because the next session is supposed to start here, like, 10 minutes ago, if you don't mind. I'll be happy to update you on that, if you don't mind.

TRANG NGUYEN: Thank you, everyone.

 [Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]