

Transcription ICANN Toronto Meeting
New TLD Applicant Group (NTAG) Meeting
Monday 15 October 2012 at 13:00 local time

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.

Coordinator: This is the operator; I'd just like to inform all participants that this call is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. Go ahead, you may begin.

John Nevett: Thank you operator, welcome to the meeting of the new (TLD) applicant group (Intag). We were going to go around the room and introduce everyone. But based on the size of the people here I think (unintelligible) present company excluded. Based on the number of people in the room we figured that would take too long.

So essentially we are just going to launch into the meeting. My name is (John Nevitt), I'm from (unintelligible) and the share of the (Intag). And I wanted to at least introduce the officers. (Tim Switzer).green the treasurer. (Bill Dozier).strategy Vice Chair.

Woman: (Unintelligible) Remi Group, Secretary.

John Nevett: Thank you. So we formed the (Intag), I guess it was about six months ago when we decided that new (TLV) applicants needed a voice in the ICANN process as a group. And we thought as a group, we would be stronger than

individual applicants raising their hands on policy issues. So we got the group together and it's been incredibly successful in the growth.

As I mentioned, in the last meeting, we now have approximately 80 members and about 900 - representing 900 strings. And more than 50% of our members are one applicant members, and more than 75% have five or fewer applications. So a diversity of business models. We have (GEOS), (BRANS), (IDM)s, large portfolios and everything in between.

So we've been growing every week. We are open to every applicant. So any applicant who wants to join who hasn't joined yet. We are under the (unintelligible) of the registries stakeholder group, so essentially once we have contracts that's where we figure we will end up anyway. And they helped us create an interest group under the registry stakeholder group. And (Intag) is an interest group and you have to be a member of a registry stakeholder group, and then you can join (Intag).

There is a \$500 annual fee and again every applicant is eligible. So I encourage every applicant in the room, who is not currently a member, to join and help us have a voice in our futures here at ICANN. We've been really active and prolific. We, I think, have done more than any other stakeholder group for a constituency that I can recall.

This is my 25th ICANN meeting I think, we've had what? Six letters and position statements in the last six weeks, seven weeks? Something like that. And it's not easy to get a consensus of a group this size, with different business models, but we've been really good about tackling the issues that we can tackle. And there are certain issues that we just won't achieve consensus, and that's fine, each applicant is obviously always free to voice an opinion or make a statement on their own.

So something like matching or metering, that might be a little more difficult based on business models or different interests. It's harder to get a

consensus of something like that than it was not having a clearly defined objection period for example. Which was one of our last statements.

So we'll have some quick business of the (Intag), just to move forward, and then we'll have some (unintelligible) of discussions. And I'd like to thank ICANN for sending representatives to talk about our guidelines. Guidelines that they're under in dealing with applicants. So (Sam) thank you for coming.

And so we'll just go through the agenda, the agenda is up on the screen.
Yep.

(Tim Switzer): (Tim Switzer), just one more thing referencing the (Intag) and what we've been doing. Also, every two weeks we have a conference call, regular agenda set and it's the off week when the registry stakeholder group is not doing their calls.

So we can have regular calls on a weekly basis as well.

John Nevett: Thanks (Tim), and (Bill Dozier) has been incredible about getting out a monthly newsletter that many of you have probably received numerous times. Either by mail or even by person here, and we have copies up here if anyone wants. Maybe we should leave a stack over down there so people can peruse that while we're having the meeting.

Anyone is free to participate in the meeting, it's open to all. So if you have any questions or comments or want to get in the queue, just raise your hands and we'll get to you.

So, if nothing else we'll move forward. We have minutes that were circulated from our last call. (Krista) has circulated, are there any comments, thoughts, questions from the last meeting on October 10? If not, any objection to approving those minutes? Okay. Those minutes are approved.

Next item of quick business, we have a number of charter or amendments to our charter. We originally had one year terms for the officers and we reduced those to six months, based on the short duration of our - hopefully short duration of our organization as we become actual registries. As well as we knew there would be a lot of growth in the organization, so we didn't want people that were joining late to be bound by elections that were held with the smaller group.

So we would like to reduce the officer terms to six months from a year. And we need a certain number of people to vote, a certain number of members to vote for that. And I think we're six votes - we have unanimous support but we're six or seven votes short.

So if there are any members in here who are willing to vote, please let (Krista) know, raise your hand, send an email, please do something so we can get that order of business done.

Just so everyone in the room knows, voting goes, every applicant has an equal number of votes. Regardless of the number of applications they have placed with ICANN. So (unintelligible) same number of votes as .green, and we thought that would be the fair way to do that for this organization.

And then assuming that we have enough votes for the charter amendments, we will have new officer elections in the next month or so. The terms under the amended charter, again assuming it passes, will end at the end of the year. So sometime in late November, early December we'll have open elections for new officers.

We'll move onto number three on the agenda, which is ICANN communications and support. One thing we've asked for in the number of our communications with ICANN was more information, and better information. And these monthly webinars are helpful for dashboards.

So in between the monthly meetings, you know, what's the status of initial evaluation? How many have been done? And instead of getting stats never, now we're getting stats once a month which is great. But we're asking for it a little more regularly than that.

We've also asked for a liaison from ICANN, and they've been really helpful in working with us on that. And so you heard from (Carla) and other ICANN staff members who are helping us out and working with us.

And then we also asked for, we were under - we were informed that there were guidelines that ICANN staff and ICANN board members had in their interactions with applicants. Dos and don'ts. And we were never informed of the details of that.

So we've asked ICANN legal to come and just give us an overview of what are the do's and don'ts and I think it would be helpful for both the staff and board members, as well as for us as applicants. We don't want to put anyone in an uncomfortable position. We want to know what our rights are, but, you know, we need a little more guidance on this. So (Sam) is going to give us an overview. Thanks.

Sam Eisner: Thanks for inviting us. I'm (Sam Reisner) I'm a senior counsel with ICANN. And (unintelligible) October 2011 we announced and gave some details about guidelines that we had just introduced about staff interactions regarding the new (GTLD) program.

And just to clarify these guidelines are directly applicable to staff. They can be advisory in your dealings with the board, but the board has its own separate code of conduct. It doesn't necessarily (unintelligible) like new (GTLD), but these are good guidelines to keep in mind when dealing with the board.

The focus of the rules and the goal of the rules are really to reduce an appearance of conflict of interest. To uniform communications to applicants and the community as a whole regarding the new (GTLD) program. (Unintelligible) of conduct for ICANN employees.

And so we can see this really as a tool for all of us to use, so that neither ICANN employees or any of the applicants get caught up in any sort of suggestion that there's been improper influence, or improper access, or preferential access among any applicants. Or more particularly, access to information that is not uniformly available to applicants.

I know the new (GTLD) team has been working hard and we just heard (unintelligible) in the applicant update session about how they're attempting to put out information. Try to think about how they can give information to the group as a collective whole. That's part of the underlying message of this work.

So (unintelligible) really is that we want to make sure that the communications between ICANN employees and not just new (GTLD) applicants, but anyone else who is trying to talk to us about the new (GTLD) program. Because we know that there are those who are very much in favor of the new (GTLD) program. You know, everyone sitting in this room mostly.

But then we also have those who are not so happy about the program or about specific parts of the program. And so it really is about lobbying in any instance related to the new (GTLD) program., if it's for or against. You're really asking for information about the program.

We want to make sure that uniform information is given and that we can help control the channels of communication. Because not everyone in ICANN even when (unintelligible), know everything about the program. Or they might not be the correct person to talk to on the issue that you're discussing.

So, one of the first things that we did is set up a chain of really who are the appropriate people to discuss matters with about the new (GTLD) program? So, you know, if you have communication inquiries you go to the communications department of ICANN. If you have legal related inquiries, those go to the legal department of ICANN.

And then we have a lot of the content owners, and for those of you who have attended ICANN meetings or a (team) gets up and speaks on various items within the meetings related to the new (GTLD) program, those are really your main holders of content, right? So even if you came to speak to me about a specific issue, I don't know everything about the program. So I would try to get you to the right person. Because we do want to make sure that everyone has access to the right information when we're giving it to you.

If it is something that I have information about, what I would then do is try to bring in one of my colleagues into the conversation. That way we make sure if someone were to come back later and say, "Oh, well you told me this or you told me that." We have just a second person witnessing the conversation. It's not about needing to create a defense really, but really it's about making sure that we have an adequate record of knowing what we're talking about.

It also puts a conscious reminder in the ICANN employee's head that we shouldn't just be having one off conversations about the new (GTLD) program. The issues that we're discussing here are far too important (unintelligible) to be opinions or conjecture of any individual employee. And so we do want to make sure that you are, the information we're giving you is correct. And done in a really protected manner.

One of the ways that you can (unintelligible) is if you have a question that you'd like to ask someone about the new (GTLD) program, one of the things you can do is say, "Can you grab one of your colleagues, I really want to talk to you about something." And it doesn't necessarily have to even be a colleague who is involved in the new (GTLD) program.

We encourage all the staff to, you know, they need to just grab someone by the arm and pull them into a conversation to do that. We want to keep the channels of communication open, we just want to keep them open correctly.

The other side of (GTLD) rules (unintelligible) conflict interest. Has to do with meals, gifts, expenses. So we do have a policy that applicants or anyone else who is interested in (mobbing) in the new (GTLD) program should not be giving gifts to ICANN employees. Even if they are of a very small amount. We just created a (unintelligible) line rule, no gifts.

In terms of meals or expenses you guys may recall, for those of you who are (unintelligible) meeting. There was some community backlash about we introduced there called the no Coke rule, or the no Coca Cola rule. We created another (unintelligible) rule that - as we entered into the new realm of new (GTLD)s and the heightened focus on conflicts of interest and ethics (unintelligible).

It made sense to just draw a line. That we're not going to be able to accept or really it's discouraged to accept even cokes, or coffees from you guys. We encourage ICANN employees (unintelligible).

So there are some exceptions to this though, if we're at a meeting and we have coke out and it's generally available to everyone, we're allowed to drink it, right?

But it's really about those types of interactions that we don't want ICANN or you guys called into question for it. It's not just about protection of ICANN, it's really about protection of the program that we've all worked so hard to develop.

So, you know, if something happens that you wind up buying a coke for someone, the world won't end right? But it's just something to be conscious

about in your interactions. So if you're out at a meal with an ICANN employee, they're not trying to offend you if they say, "Let me pay for my portion." It's just what we've asked them to do.

So if you have any questions I'd be happy to talk about anything else.

John Nevett: I've got one on Adobe, (Catherine Douglas). (Catherine)? Okay, (Tim)?

(Tim Switzer): (Tim Switzer), so just to really kind of (unintelligible) what you've just said. I know for the most part, ICANN wants to funnel questions on the (GTLD)s through the customer support process. But what you're saying is, if in fact we do want to call a member of the staff. We can call them up with that question and it will be handled. But that can happen? Is that what you're saying?

Sam Eisner: So, say you have a question that you feel you really need to pick up a phone and talk to someone about. What I would suggest to do is send an email and say, "I have a question for you. It's about the new (GTLD) program. Can we have a call?" and that way the person on the other end knows to grab someone and bring them in for the call.

John Nevett: (Tina)?

(Tina): (Tina) (Unintelligible), so this is both for (John) and (Sam) I think (unintelligible). I think it would be really nice if we could document the communication that goes from (Intag) to ICANN. I know (Sam), I think you were talking about this communication link generally from any of us to you guys. But from (Intag) as a whole, I think we need to have it documented.

So either it will take place on one of the calls, or it will be, you know, on some archive email list that all of us would have access to.

John Nevett: Yep, all communications from (Intag) are documented. We have a Web Site where every (Intag) communication to ICANN is published. And we also

have, as I mentioned, (Bill) has been putting out a newsletter. So any communications that come out in that month, he's linking to it and talking about it in there. So I think we have that part covered from an (Intag) point of view. (Krista)?

(Krista): Yeah, this is (Krista). Just building on that, ICANN has also put a general correspondence on its correspondence page. Some of it is on the new (GTLD) correspondence page, and some of it's on the correspondence correspondence page.

John Nevett: Okay. Any other questions for (Sam)? Anyone, don't be shy. Okay. Thank you.

Sam Eisner: If there are things that you feel that you need clarification about. (Unintelligible) we want these to be workable rules that don't keep ICANN staff from doing their job. And don't keep you from actually seeing the information that you need. So clarify at any time, we're willing to.

John Nevett: Okay, we have two last minute questions. (Adrian)?

(Adrian Kiddersh): Hi, (Adrian Kiddersh) and I'm who I'm representing, but anyway. (Unintelligible). Quick question, we're going to party tomorrow night. We've invited all ICANN staff. I think it's fantastic that you're bringing this in. I will personally make sure that they don't drink for the evening.

Sam Eisner: If it's a party that's open for general consumption, we are allowed to drink in it. So thank you.

John Nevett: All of (Adrian)'s parties are open for general consumption. (Krista)?

(Krista): Thanks, just a quick question. (Sam), you mentioned that some of this information came up in Dakar, where could we access that. Because that was a long time ago and I don't remember.

Sam Eisner: We were actually trying to figure out earlier today where the discussion happened. I think some of it was included in (Rob)'s opening remarks at Dakar. And I know that we had either at the public forum or possibly at an ethics and conflicts session. I believe that (Jeffrey) got up and gave some explanation about it. But we can take a look through and see if we can find it and send you guys the link.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Hi (Sam), may I ask a question regarding a completely different topic? But as you are ICANN legal, perhaps you can answer. When it comes to contractual negotiations with the new approved applications, (unintelligible) by ICANN legal (unintelligible) associations.

Sam Eisner: Okay, this is one of those questions that I am not fully able to answer for you so we'll get that one over to legal to get better information on the policy about that.

Man: (Unintelligible) with the question, if you prefer. And I do (unintelligible) ICANN has already subscribed in (recent) years.

John Nevett: Just for the record if everyone, this is (John Nevitt), if everyone could just say their names before they speak that would be helpful. (Dan)?

(Dan Howard): Hi this is (Dan Howard) also with ICANN staff I'm a deputy general counsel and I work with (Sam) and to answer (unintelligible) question, we're expecting it could be up to 1400 contracts. Many of them will just be accept the basic agreement, that will be done. But we don't know if it will be tens or hundreds or lots that will be negotiating them. So ultimately they will all be negotiating with ICANN.

We have a small legal team who can't handle (unintelligible) at once. So we will bring in outside firms, but I won't say right now it's any one firm, we might use different firms. But we're shepherd in the whole process managing them.

John Nevett: Thank you (Dan). Okay, no more questions. Thank you again (Sam), appreciate it. And thanks for coming.

Next thing on the agenda is the applicant survey. So one of the workgroups, we set up so far, eight or nine workgroups. One of the workgroups relates to an applicant survey. So before I turn it over to (Jacob Malthouse), who is coordinating that project, I wanted to do a little survey here.

How many people are applicants in this room? Does that make sense, that's the majority. How many people are members of (Intag)? A big chunk, that's great. And those of you who didn't raise their hand on the second time that raised your hand on the first time, see (Krista).

So (Jacob).

(Jacob Malthouse): Thanks (John). So, well, (Jacob Malthouse) with bigger and we're a .eco applicant. And this process has been ongoing for some time. We began coordinating - began while coordinating comments or response to ICANN's initial request for (unintelligible).

The number of applicants expressed an interest in understanding the views of the applicant set as a whole. And as we started to discuss as a group, and this is one of the things (Intag) has been very useful for, it became clear that there was a common understanding of the size and scope of the new (GTLD) process as a whole - the fact that there is over 1100 applicants for new (GTLD)s. Many of them represent large entities in and of themselves.

There was potentially a wealth of information to be gleaned from reaching out directly to that subset of the community. And understanding what their

perspectives are on the process so far. And actually you can see where the value is from this type of push research. Which ICANN just did with the clarifying questions, understanding which questions are good and which ones aren't and why, and surveying those groups.

So this is basically an extension and grow out of that process. On the team we had (Elaine Cruz), (Yasine Olmer), and (Tim Johnson), and myself. And we worked to collaborate and pull together a three page proposal that was sent to ICANN on, I think, October 5. That's right (Krista). And it did achieve consensus within the (Intag).

Basically the goal was to understand the opinions regarding implementation of communication issues around this process and to help better inform the community as to the feelings of applicants as how it's gone so far and how it should go in the future.

So that's the background and I'm happy to turn back to the chair for any updates from ICANN on the process going forward.

John Nevett: Thank you, if anyone from ICANN staff wants to maybe weigh in on, I don't know maybe (Curt) or (unintelligible).

So we sent a letter related to surveys of applicants and how that could help the process. I'm just wondering if maybe you have a response.

Man: Sure. So we want to support your efforts and so we just want clarity and we can do it in this room or outside. It sounded like, remembering the letter, it sounded like what we were just talking about. Would the (Intag) provide the content of the surveys, and we would sort of be the administrator of them.

Or rather would you be looking for ICANN to write the comment. I have a few concerns of the (unintelligible) create some content and not fulfill your needs and create a survey and waste our time, and you know.

John Nevett: (Jacob), do you want to respond? Or?

(Jacob Malthouse): Yes, I think in the proposal we envisioned a dialogue back and forth. So we extended an offer to assist ICANN as desired, as a group, in crafting survey questions. There were a number of example questions that were put forth in the proposal so I think we would be well open to assisting ICANN in developing the survey going forward.

Man: And then, you know what, there's alternative solutions and I don't particularly like these things. But there's wikis, and you know, other forums where we could help establish a wiki or create a wiki on the (Intag) wiki on the ICANN Web Site or something like that. Where there wouldn't just be a survey but it could be sort of interactive for you to correspond.

So if you want, we'll make it more active and (unintelligible) and I will take it with (Jacob) and whoever else...

John Nevett: Yeah, that's what I was going to suggest.

The group that worked on the survey, get with you guys. Set up a meeting if you have time. And hopefully here and if not shortly after the meeting and see what we can do together. Just remember every minute not spent evaluating applications...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Hi (unintelligible), happy to point things out with you and then I think essentially I think the content is good we just want to explore, is this the right mechanism to do it. So...

Man: That sounds like a volunteer to me.

John Nevett: Thank you very much. Okay, welcome (unintelligible).

So next on the agenda we have some timeline issues. The first issue, I'm going to skip to B actually. We had asked in two different letters for an intercessional meeting for especially for the (GAK) to get together and they said they needed a face to face meeting to provide their advice.

So we had asked for ICANN to support an intercessional meeting for the (GAK) to get together where they could discuss the (GAK) advice on specific strings and to the extent any advice would be forthcoming. We as an applicant community would know about it earlier.

So that's an outstanding issue. Other people have recently raised the idea of knowing that the clearing house still has some issues to work through and URS has some issues to work through, and there might be some other - one or two other issues to work through before we can go live with (TLD).

Maybe we have an intercessional meeting during the six month lag during this meeting and the Beijing meeting, and perhaps ICANN can sponsor an intercessional meeting where we can work through these new (TLD) issues, so some kind of new (TLD) summit.

There is some precedent for that. Two years ago we had an intercessional meeting with the (GAK) in Brussels to work through the scorecard issues. So I know there are some people who have been talking about that and that's a suggestion. We have not taken a formal position as (Intag) on that type of intercessional meeting, but in two letters we have taken a position on an intercessional (GAK) meeting. So I suspect we might be able to get a consensus on that.

Because we're all incented to move this forward as quickly as possible. So, I throw that out there. If there's any discussion we can have it. If there's any response we can have that. If not I suspect there will be a proposal in our next correspondence asking for that, maybe coming out of this meeting.

(Adrian)?

(Adrian): Hey (John), (unintelligible) to do better in December and have it in California?

John Nevett: Yeah, I mean location and timing. December, January. Somewhere in the six month lag, you would think month three or four.

(Adrian): Did you get where I was going?

John Nevett: Yeah, I get it. I apologize to my friends in the Southern hemisphere.

(Adrian): No, no. Normally I am anti-American. On this occasion I was being (unintelligible). But it might well, if you're going to do one might well - if you're going to do one why not try to link it up so it incentivizes everyone to kill two birds with one stone, that's all. I was actually serious.

John Nevett: During the drawing period is what you're thinking. I thought I said winter at some point and you got offended by that. I thought I said winter, or summer.

(Adrian): You're right I would have got offended, especially if you said fall. Because what the hell is that?

John Nevett: (Unintelligible).

Man: I'll shout. (Unintelligible). Hi, I just had a question, can you just maybe clarify what your goals would be? What would you hope to achieve in that with the (GAK), in that intercessional meeting?

John Nevett: Well, yeah, the goals would be a number of goals I guess. The first goal in our prior conversations, the (GAK) sent a letter, as you know, that said, "We need a face to face meeting in order to work through these advice issues. And we won't be able to do that, essentially till Beijing which is the next face to face meeting."

So we can provide them the opportunity to have that face to face encounter before that and perhaps move the goalposts - football euphemism - a little closer. Goal one.

Goal two, we know that we have issues in implementation still outstanding. We had a URS webinar not that long ago, we had to trim our clearing house small meeting in Brussels not that long ago. So there's still issues to be worked out, and we all know that this community works more efficiently and more - I think more effectively when there's a meeting upcoming and people know there is a deadline and have to get things done.

So the goals would be, provide that incentive to get it done quicker. And have a face to face meeting where we can roll up our sleeves if necessary. And get those final things through the process. So I've got a few. I've got (Adrian), (Ken), and (Jeff). (Kris) if you could call them out.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I get the meeting for you guys, that's fine, I just want to be clear whether you're suggesting that there is an intercessional (GAK) meeting. Or if you're saying an intercessional meeting (unintelligible).

John Nevett: We were suggesting an intercessional (GAK) meeting where they could do their work, at the same time we could do our work.

Man: Cool, thanks.

John Nevett: (Adrian)?

(Adrian): Yes, and I just wanted to add to that. The reason why I think we're asking ICANN to offer an intercessional forum for the (GAK), especially after hearing (Curt) today with respect for the timeline for new (GTLD)s. That a link to that advice is published. So now that is a key driver for us. So we're a little - at least my company is a little nervous now that we've seen (GAK) throw out timelines before. Promising that they're going to hit their timeline this time.

But I think it's a good insurance policy to try and give them as much face time as possible. So to respond to (Chris), I think that's probably one of the goals of this group. To insure the (GAK) had every opportunity to succeed, given that we're all dependent upon them.

John Nevett: Thank you (Adrian). (Unintelligible).

(Ken): Yes, (Ken) (Unintelligible). It's my understanding, and if I'm incorrect please let me know, my feeling is that the (GAK) would like - if the (GAK) would be able to do something like this - I'm assuming they would prefer to have a meeting away from any possible distractions in terms of lobbying and so forth.

So, would the group be amenable to recommending to ICANN that if necessary the intersession would be held (unintelligible) to allow them to optimize the time period to move forward. Thank you.

John Nevett: Yes, I mean if you're talking about new (TLD)s the only operational role the (GAK) has is to provide early warnings or provide advice. So if we have a meeting separate or together, whatever is more efficient, from a community standpoint - I don't think that would be objectionable. (Jeff Neumann)?

(Jeff Neumann): Thanks, (Jeff Neumann) with (unintelligible). We have an application in for .newstar. With respect to the clearing house, and I know we may talk about it

more in subject (D), but I would just say that we need to resolve that within weeks. Waiting till December or January is too long, too late. And so we'll talk more about it a little bit later, but I just wanted to throw that out.

But any intercessional meeting in the winter or summer would have to be focused on other topics that clearing house would have to be resolved way before that.

John Nevett: Yeah, probably - certainly at the high level. But there might be some details that still need to be worked out. Presumably you would think that may, if not then great. We'll talk about other issues. There'll be other URS and other issues. (Tim)?

(Tim Switzer): (Tim Switzer), I guess I would just add for what's been said already. But I support this intercessional meeting on both fronts from the (GAK) and the new (GTLD)s. As we all know there are a lot of topics right now that are still kind of in play on new (GTLD)s. There is this big window, six months plus really, between the ICANN meeting.

So the idea of getting together, and we can really kind of take it as almost as a super webinar. Where it can be a webinar, but it can be where folks can participate remotely. I think as we all know, getting together face to face we're much more productive and I think there are a lot of topics that I think, again in the spirit that (John) said, trying to keep things moving forward.

So just a voice of support for that.

John Nevett: Thank you. Any other comments on intercessional meetings? Okay, moving on, objection filing. So just the lay of the land there is there was an announcement that the objection period would end on January 12, 2013. There was a letter from one constituency that said, "We would like that extended."

And then this group, on behalf of the applicant community - on behalf of this group said, "We don't think the objection period should be extended and that the January 12 date is more than enough time to lodge objections against applications that have been out there and known since - I guess it was June?"

And then we got the ICANN announcement last week that said the objection period will be extended till March. So a bit of a split the baby type proposal. We're not going to go as far as request it. Which was after initial evaluation, results were all done. But we are going to extend it a couple months just to give potential objectors a little more time in figuring that out.

So that's where we are now. So as a group, the question is whether we should or need to respond to the March 12 extension, the 60 day extension. (Chris)?

(Chris): I'm sorry I don't want to hijack your meeting, I just want to come back to this (GAK) thing again because it's really important. I have a concern, I think you need to be really careful. There is no formal process in this detailed (process) for (GAK) advice on specific new (GTLD)s.

The (GAK) (is to provide) some public policy matters at any time, okay? So the formal processes are that there is ability for a government to launch an early warning, that's not a (GAK) early warning that's a government early warning.

There's a process for governments to object if they want to object. And some governments might choose to try and take a string into the (GAK) and have the (GAK) come out with consensus advice that that string should not be granted.

I would be very concerned about doing anything that seems to be making that a formal process.

John Nevett: Actually...

((Crosstalk))

(Chris): ...(GAK) has a veto.

John Nevett: Well (Chris) actually, that's not really right. Because in the guidebook the formal rule for the (GAK) to provide advice. There's actually a higher standard that's given, let me finish, there's a higher standard in the guidebook that says, "Any (GAK) advice on a specific string that's provided in the timeframe," and the timeframe is actually defined as during the objection period. Which might end in January, it might end in March, we don't know.

But to provide any advice, there's a high standard that says that ICANN would follow that advice. So it's actually in our contracts with ICANN, what we call our application agreements. We paid money and signed up for this, there is actually a formal role for the (GAK).

If they choose not to do it in that timeframe though, however, we may as a community say, "You shouldn't get that high standard. The burden of proof should switch back." So that's where we are. We don't want to go down that road, we just prefer that the (GAK) provide it's advice in a timely basis as required in the guidebook.

(Chris): And I agree, and I'm not suggesting that they shouldn't do that. I'm (unintelligible) there isn't a process for it. So I'm just a little weary about creating one that's all. But I absolutely agree, there - I know that's what the guidebook says. I just don't want to - and I'm not saying it's a bad idea, just a little flag in case we end up with a problem because of it.

Man: (Unintelligible) (Chris).

John Nevett: Any other, so (Tina)?

(Tina): We're back on objection timing right? So to me that you're asking for feedback on the proposed extended timeline. So for me, I think that it's completely tied with the proposed lottery, right? So I don't - because that has to do with when ICANN can release the initial evaluations. So for me, I don't really see much of a difference when that deadline for objections finally is. Unless we at the same time talk about the release of the initial evaluation in the lottery.

John Nevett: Yeah, essentially they decoupled those two issues to make it clear that, for example, if the objection period ends before initial evaluation results are published. Applicants would then have the ability to withdraw and get the higher refund amount.

So there is an incentive for applicants to know that they are being objected to by a certain segment of the community and then have the ability to make a decision based on that objection, or not.

So, you know, we have to certainly argue that the seven month period in the guidebook was the right way to go. And having that before initial evaluation results are published, makes more sense from an applicant stand point, and even from an objector standpoint. Because then they have the more - I guess there is more likelihood that they're, that the applicant that they are objecting to will withdraw because of the higher refund amounts.

(Tina): So maybe I misunderstood (Curt) this morning, or earlier today, because I thought this proposed extension would still be prior to release of initial evaluations...

John Nevett: That's correct. It shouldn't matter. The only question is in that two month period, could those objections be resolved in those two months. And not move on, you know, if you have 30 days to reply to an objection and then it's

got to go to some hearing or something, there's a lack of certainty for applicants in that point. Where once initial evaluation results are published, then you're moving on along the process.

So we can get this done before that whole process starts with pre-delegation testing and the other factors that go into weighing and reviewing the applications. If we can do this earlier, we're better off as a community. But you're right, it's a 60 day period and it's all pre- IE results.

(Tina): Okay, so that makes a lot of sense to me. So I have a different question for you then on it. How do we work as a group into making, like do you guys draft up a suggestion based on feedback? Or, you know, and then result on it or how do you go?

John Nevett: Yeah, what we've been doing is if it's a formal request for comments, we draft up the comments, put it on the list, and actually have a formal vote. If it's a letter, what we do is draft up the letter, put it on the list and try to get consensus. If anyone objects then we'll put it to a formal vote.

(Tina): Okay, thanks.

John Nevitt: Alright, I've got (Jordan) and I (unintelligible).

Man: Thanks (John), so I think it's probably worth saying something about this timeline in the new proposal. I think the extension of the objection period really doesn't make particularly much sense to me. I was actually personally not troubled by the request to extend it, but the rationale for extending it in the first place, they wanted to go after the initial results were published. So they wouldn't have to file objections if, in the event the application didn't pass in the initial evaluation.

This extends the time period, which makes us unhappy, does not actually achieve the goals of the people that requested the additional time, it doesn't

seem to serve any function, so, you know, if they're going to change it (unintelligible) as opposed to what we have right now. Which is just an extension of time which takes certainly away from us without addressing the concerns of the people asking for the extension.

John Nevett: One of the arguments they used in extending it, or asking for an extension. Was that they needed more time to prepare, which you can take or leave depending on your perspective how long it should take to prepare an objection. (Amadio)?

(Amadio): (Amadio) (unintelligible), from (unintelligible). We don't have hard feelings about when this should end. Generally March, I mean why not. As (Jordan) said, one of the main goals was for some people to have that extended being the publication of the evaluations. Again, we don't have hard feelings about that because that was the initial intent (unintelligible).

But we also had the impression that 99.9% of the applications will pass evaluation. So it doesn't change at all.

Where we have a specific point (unintelligible) and many of our customers agree that they still (unintelligible). Is that it's one specific case, in which objection periods should be extended. And it's a case of community priority, that is, when you have community priority of this community (unintelligible) and all of which are not.

That at the same time some people (unintelligible) perhaps considering making an objection. But it doesn't make a lot of sense to make an objection before the community publishes the result. But you cannot object anymore when the result (unintelligible) doesn't work the way you expected. Be that the applicant or a third party.

And if you have (unintelligible) which aren't many cases, it really makes sense it is needed to extend the time frame. On the other thing, I really would

not spend much time proposing the extension between January and March, because that doesn't change a lot. And if some people believe that preparing an objection (unintelligible) community (unintelligible) objections and leading the (leading the public) into thinking that objections are hard to prepare and to answer, granting a little more time doesn't change a lot.

John Nevett: Thank you (Amadio). So instead of extending the objection period, perhaps we encourage ICANN to get the community evaluation panel to announce those results earlier.

I have (Jeff) and then (Yasmine).

(Jeff Neumann): Thanks, (Jeff Neumann) again. Yeah, I would sort of agree with the previous two speakers on I'm not sure - you can say in your letter that you would like to date earlier for the objection period but I'm not sure you're going to get anywhere with that.

I think what you have to be most concerned about is, are the comments that are going to be sent in from other saying, "I thought it was two weeks after initial evaluation results came in."

So I think you want to counteract that and instead of asking for that objection date to be moved into January, or back to January, focus on making sure the date stays in March. As opposed to two weeks after.

So a more positive way to spin it saying, "I recognize that others are asking for more time. And therefore, we're okay with this date so long as you commit to us that you're sticking to this date no matter what."

John Nevett: (Yasmine)?

(Yasmine): Thanks. (Curt) if you could provide some clarity on (unintelligible) with the objector and applicant (unintelligible) phase once before or after the initial

evaluation results. Because I think you mentioned during our webinar that we're in (unintelligible) objection. They may elect to (unintelligible) dispute resolutions stage, or as to the normal process, they would have to (unintelligible) dispute resolution phase after they finish evaluation results.

Man: (Unintelligible). I think the objection process has pretty strict timelines, right? Whenever an objection happens (unintelligible) to happen now, or the day before initial evaluation - the first initial evaluation results are posted. That starts an automated clock that sets in time, you know you have to answer within a certain period. And then there's the reply and then there's the adjudications.

So the timeline starts from the instant the objection is filed and the applicant wouldn't wait until the evaluation results are posted.

John Nevett: Okay, any other comments on objection filings? Okay. If not we'll move onto C, I guess is initial evaluation. Now obviously we have this new proposal, there will be a session on that - is it Wednesday? Wednesday, thanks (Curt).

So there will be a session on that Wednesday, we'll get a little more guidance on the draw and how that will work. And any concerns with any aspects of that proposal. So I'm not sure if we should take a lot of time in this meeting to talk about that, but I think certainly our first meeting after this or maybe on the list, we should be discussing that.

And if there's any major issues that people want to raise now about the draw proposal before that session on Wednesday we can do that. Feel free to come up and raise your hand, we can do that. Otherwise we'll reserve that issue to Wednesday as a (unintelligible). (Jordan)?

(Jordan): I'm just curious if we do reserve that conversation for Wednesday and we think it's appropriate to develop some sort of (Intag) position, presumably

that's not the right forum. We would have to wait presumably till our next call before we really got into that (unintelligible)?

John Nevett: Yeah, we'd have to do on the next (unintelligible) call. But it's kind of hard to formulate a position, we could, we have a lot of ICANN members here - thank you all, actually for being here. I should have said that earlier. But (unintelligible) questions, feel free to raise them or we can wait till Wednesday. Or if there's some burning issues we could raise them now.

We have one hour left in this meeting. We only have a two hour meeting, (unintelligible) where they have a full day on Tuesday. So the question is whether we take the time and ICANN staff members, if you have any questions for this group. We are looking for any guidance or any initial input, feel free to raise that as well. Okay.

(Curt): So, so this is (Curt). So the paper includes like a use case or an example, but I would encourage you to go through some scenarios and kind of test how you understand the process and see if there is any sticking points or something that's not described. You know, if we have to flesh out with additional detail or make additional decisions.

And I think the best way to get out that might be to do your own scenario testing or example testing. You know, if an application reaches New York at 3 pm on Tuesday and (unintelligible).

John Nevett: So we set up a group, it was Team Two, for (unintelligible) and metering. And it sounds like maybe that group should reconvene and get together to do that kind of analysis. It might be helpful way to go. If anyone wants to join that group, feel free to I guess let (Krista) know and (John Tullman) is the coordinator. I don't think he's here in person but he just sent me a text so I think he is online. And he's the coordinator of that group.

(Amadio) and then (Jordan).

(Amadio): Sorry, (unintelligible) call once again. I want to discuss about the (unintelligible) issue. I don't like it. But I am hopeless about changing that at the point of the (unintelligible), anyway, most specially I think we will not manage to all agree on what's the best way to do that. But I would like some meeting from now that (unintelligible) proposal to at least have some specific rules like this (unintelligible) some applicants.

And make it very clear that they only use the cases where we only have no direct or indirect customer interest or partner or whatever. But we need to do something to get some kind of priority, absolutely relative to applicants from places like Africa, Latin America, and as (unintelligible) perhaps the Far East and the Pacific where things a little bit different.

But we need to do that in name of all the (unintelligible) in article two of the (unintelligible) bylaws. The core principles that are in the ICANN bylaws. Now repeat, I feel comfortable saying that because we have no (unintelligible) no stake there. But I really think that as a group at the very least we should say that.

John Nevett: Okay, (Jordan).

(Jordan): Yeah, I was just going to say, and I think maybe - I don't know if I'm just repeating what you said (John) or maybe rephrasing slightly different. I want to make sure we're all on the same page. This (unintelligible) exact sort of issue that (Intag) was created to engage in, so it seems inevitable to me that we're going to want to make some sort of statement (unintelligible). Sometime this week to make progress, I'm not sure we need to do it in a room of this size.

But to the extent to whether it's Team Two or some set of people that are interested in working on this issue, maybe can identify them here and those people can arrange to spend some time working (unintelligible) while we're

here and get something ready for the group to consider by the time we have our next phone call.

John Nevett: No, I think that's a good idea. If Team Two can get together perhaps and if anybody wants to join Team two and be part of that discussion, that would be great.

This is the kind of issue though, in the past, that we will have a hard time getting consensus on some issues. You know, everyone might have a different perspective on should someone go first. Should geographic diversity play a bigger role, should (IDN)s play a bigger role, should (GEO)s play a bigger role and what not.

And we, historically, in our short history, have had a hard time reaching consensus on who goes first on these type issues. But we should try. Okay. Yeah, sure, so Team Two is comprised of - currently, and again anyone can join. (John Towland), (Tom Brachy), (John Stile), (Tim Switzer), (Richard Tindle), (Jordan Buchanon), (Amanda Fessendim) and (Anthony Vancouver).

If anyone else wants to join that group, with (John) not being here perhaps (Jordan) would you be willing to take the reins?

(Jordan Buchanon): Yeah, I'm glad to interim help out while (John) is not around.

((Crosstalk))

John Nevett: So contact (Jordan) if you want to join that group. And hopefully we can get together right after the session on this issue and see if we can reach consensus on something. Thank you.

Okay, next issue on the agenda. The trademark clearing house URS. So we have just issued a comment, is (Elaine) here? (Elaine)'s here, great. So we

just issued a comment on the clearing house, and I know that tomorrow -
tomorrow or today?

Today, tonight is the deadline - at 5 o'clock? No, but what time is the
comments due on clearing house issues? Is it...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

John Nevett: (UCC) midnight. So we have just a few hours. It's a couple of hours. So
apparently (Philip) if you can hold on one second. There's a problem with the
chat room that people here, at least I cannot see chat on the Adobe. So I
apologize to anyone dialing in remotely who is trying to get in a queue or
saying something on the chat. We just can't see that.

So if we can rectify that, that would be great. If not you might just have to do it
by email or something like that. But again, I apologize but we just don't - I
don't see the chat room in here. (Phil)?

(Phil Corwin): Yeah, thank you (John) I'll be brief. (Phil Corwin) council of the internet
commerce association. I just wanted to make sure people in this room were
aware, we - there are members who are not just the main portfolio members.
But we have many members involved in various aspects of the new (TLD)
program.

That would be useful for establishing some principles for evaluating proposed
subsequent changes to those at the clearing house and URS. And we
published this past Wednesday at both the internetcommerce.org Web Site
and at (circleid.com) one dozen principles that we will be using to evaluate
any proposed subsequent changes and of course some of those changes
could either delay the launch of the program or depress registrations.

So I just want to make everyone in the room aware that that's there to the
extent that you're trying to use one of the forms for discussion, I have gotten

some very positive comments back from some individual applicants and wanted to make sure you all knew it was out there. Thank you.

John Nevett: Thank you (Phil). (Jeff)?

(Jeff Neumann): Thanks this is (Jeff Neumann), I just want to give you an update on some of the recent developments in the trademark clearing house. As (John) said, or I don't know if he was the first one to say it or maybe it was (Tim). There is a community consensus model that's been circulated around the ICANN community in the past several weeks. This was in response to the original model that was posted by ICANN on how the interaction works between the trademark clearing house and the registries and registrars.

It's not on how the clearing house deals with trademark owners, that's kind of front end stuff. There's plenty of sessions on that, and frankly that's also being discussed within the community. But that's not the primary concerns that we have.

So a bunch of us, ARI, Newstar, and VeriSign and a number of others have gotten together and wrote a community consensus - used to be called alternate model, but it seems like this model has more support from the community. So we've now changed it to the actual consensus model.

As you may know there was a letter that was submitted from ICANN staff saying that they had a concern with the notion that this community consensus model had a live query component to it. Meaning that the clearing house could be put in the path of the registrations. And that was something that they had a concern about.

I'm actually happy to note that there has been several meetings this week with high level staff members, as well as some board members, and they wanted to reassure us that nothing is off the table at this point. That the session today will help to flesh out some of the issues and encourage to

participate, which really needed are comments from the intellectual property community and the business community.

Because there are some concerns that we feel like we've addressed in the community consensus model that may not have been addressed in the ICANN model. And in order to kind of test our theories, some comments from the intellectual property owners, and business constituency, and others would really greatly help us in our cause.

But I do want to say again that I'm very hopeful in the discussions that we've had nothing is off the table. That there were initially some misunderstandings from ICANN staff as to how our model actually worked. And when we talked to them about the mitigation techniques that we put in there to lessen the concerns, I think some of them were more comfortable.

Again, it's an ongoing discussion but I'm actually happy to report that the model that we have proposed, that the community, a lot of the community is endorsing is not off the table. And encourage the dialogue to continue, and hopefully at 5:00 today.

John Nevett: Thanks (Jeff), thanks for all your efforts on this issue on behalf of a lot of us. We really appreciate you and the other folks that are working on that community proposal. (Richard)?

(Richard): Yeah, just wanted to clarify what (Jeff) just said for everyone's benefit. I think what (Jeff) said, so I'm just going to (flatten) that real quick. What you're proposing is predominately about technical implementation. So it's more about how the trademark clearing house works, rather than what it does in terms of inputs and outputs.

(Jeff Neumann): That's exactly right, there's no changes to the guidebook on the policy. It's really just the interaction between the clearing house - so clearing house registries, registrars, and ultimately how the registrant gets the notice to

acknowledge a claim and how that acknowledgement is transmitted back through the registrars, through the registry, and back so that the trademark owners can be notified if a registration goes through.

So it's kind of all the backend processes, but nothing about changes to policy or anything like that. The areas of concern that we sought to address in our community consensus model was the notion that was expressed by intellectual property owners of making sure that the data that's within the clearing house is sufficiently protected and secure against data mining and others.

Because even if the information individually, the trademark information, could be obtained in a public manner. It's the collection of all of that information in one place. Which could be considered more of a trade secret than intellectual property can express to us and to ICANN, that the release of the bulk copy of all of the data would be of concern.

So all of that still needs to be flushed out and tested with the IP owners and the businesses to make sure we understand the concerns correctly. And that our model, the consensus model (unintelligible).

John Nevett: Okay thank you (Jeff). So I encourage everyone to go to this session today. You said at 5:00? And file comments if you could as well per (unintelligible) instructions.

URS is the other issue. We, you know, in (4D). We had a - oh right (Karen). (Karen Lintz) thank you.

(Karen Lintz): Thanks (John), this is (Karen Lintz) from ICANN staff. I just wanted to respond to a couple of points from the discussion that we just had. One is to actually clarify the public comment period that's open right now. So, initially there were two explanatory memos posted. One on proof of use and one on the matching rules for the clearing house.

And those are really both independent of what technical model you use on the registries side. But that's really what the comment period was aimed at. It's not a comment period, you only have till today to comment on the model. The model, you know, the proposals (unintelligible) people have been discussing.

In the weeks leading up to this meeting have been discussed in the community. They're being discussed at this meeting. So it's not, you don't need to, you know, comment by today to have input into that.

The second thing was just to say that, again, in reference to the session this afternoon. There was a letter sent from ICANN with a concern about one element about the live query piece of the proposal which we thought was a key element that we wanted to respond to as quickly as we could.

But I think that the aspects of the model are to an extent separable. And what we wanted to communicate in the letter is that there are improvements that we see can be made to the existing model that's out there. and that's really what we wanted to focus on during the session, so I just wanted to add that thanks.

John Nevett: Great thank you (Karen). (Jeff)?

(Jeff Neumann): Yes, just to respond to (Karen) there will be discussions on both of the models at this 5:00 session and so it's not just, I was assured that there would be ample time to discuss at this session as well as the session on Wednesday, not just how we can make the decentralized. The ICANN proposed model better, but how we as a community can address all of the concerns whether it's the centralized or decentralized model that ultimately is selected.

So I look forward to a constructive dialogue.

(Karen Lintz): Sure, but the way it's set up. To just kind of prime it a little bit. Is not sort of a model A model B let's compare. It's more about, you know, actually along with the alternative proposals there was a list of issues that was submitted. So we, you know, for example, customer support or how do you do a registry specific sunrise? So we're kind of looking at trying to separate out those issues and talk about those.

John Nevett: Thanks (Karen), (Jeff) do you reply or...

(Jeff Neumann): No, I agree with (Karen). There are some questions that will be addressed at the 5:00 session that applies no matter which model is selected. So there are issues around (land rush) and other things that registries do when they launch and the timing of when notices go out. So I would really encourage everyone that's got an interest in this (unintelligible) feedback.

And if there are a few minutes at the end of this I can go into the scenarios to give people a couple hours to think about it to come to that meeting with thoughts on it, which may help. But I'll leave that to you all.

John Nevett: Well why don't we hold that, (Amadio)?

(Amadio): This is just about the clearing house but not about the (unintelligible) of the clearing house but about the agreement with the clearing house. There's something I ask it twice to the board and it got silence only as an answer.

But there were rumors around saying that somehow the providers of the service were explaining to ICANN that because of the (unintelligible) protection directive, they would be the owners of the database. And the only answer we can provide was future registries (there's no way).

We cannot (unintelligible) which means not only can we get the (unintelligible) of them, but we don't have any contractual or factual (unintelligible). Because they are the owners of the database.

And we do have that directive, but we also have something called contracts that solves issues. And I don't know whether (unintelligible) can expand on that information, but it seems that beyond the (unintelligible) asked future registries and the registry agency should have a very clear stance about that. We want the provider but not the owner of that system. This should be ICANN's.

John Nevett: Okay, (Ken)?

(Ken Stutz): (Ken Stutz). Looking for a little clarity. I saw what appeared to be some semantic gymnastics with regard with what we are going to be accomplishing this evening. I would hope that what we're going to be doing is looking at the most effective, not (unintelligible) moving forward. Not trying to just take a plan which was originally presented to us by ICANN. And make that selected plan work more effectively with respect to what they originally gave us.

John Nevett: Okay, thank you . So from an (Intag) perspective, we already have comments in the queue on this and sent to ICANN. We'll encourage everyone to make these comments and these points at the actual session related to the clearing house and if we after that session think that we need to do a follow-up from this organization on the clearing house, then we'll do so.

So why don't we close out the clearing house issue at this point and then we can talk about that later at the later session.

URS, as everyone knows, we had a webinar a week or so ago about URS issues with a healthy dialogue with (Curt) and (Amy) and others. And if anyone has any comments, questions, on the status of the URS there is a session on Thursday.

We don't, as a group, have any comments yet on URS issues since the webinar. But after Thursday perhaps that's something we'll discuss and whether we want to weigh in as an (Intag) organization on URS issues. Okay.

Next issue is we have a working group on the 1000 per year limit on route delegations. And I think we have representatives from that organization or that working group here, (Wayne), and (Richard), and (Krista), and others.

If you guys can give a report of where we are from an (Intag) perspective on dealing with that issue that would be really helpful, thank you.

(Richard Tindle): Thanks (John), this is (Richard Tindle), and so we've had this group together for the last three weeks and I'll get the members to put their hands up quickly as I read their names, as we haven't all met face to face yet. So (unintelligible).

(Alex Stamos), is (Alex) here. (Wayne McCaron) is here, put poor (Wayne) up so everyone can see who he is. (Kristin Pavoc), (Chris Rice), (Michael Young), (Warren Kumari), and myself.

So in the last three weeks we've focused mainly on trying to understand the problem. Understand the issue, and that's mainly what I'm going to talk about today. Rather than (unintelligible) solutions to it. We'll talk a little bit about solutions but predominately want the entire group to understand this issue.

The first question is why is it an important issue? By the way I didn't need glasses when the program started but then the program started and I certainly do now.

So, in a nutshell the issue effects the time in which your (TLD) is likely to go live. And how much it effects that time depends on your draw number in the draw. But if you have a high draw number than it's this issue of 1000 limit per

year could mean a six to nine month delay, in our calculation, from when you go into the root and go live.

And so it's a potentially significant issue. Depending on how urgently each of you wants to get into the route. I'm going to talk about this in a non-technical way, as I think most of the people listening are not technical. I am not technical. But also, it's not really a technical problem. It's really a resourcing and coordination problem rather than a technical issue. So I think it's a very important point, it's not really a technical issue in terms of (unintelligible). It's about resources and coordination.

So we'll talk about ten minutes, I think hold any questions or comments to the end. Unless I say something that is (patently) wrong in your view, in which case please jump in. We've been working on this three weeks and so it's possible we have things incorrect.

So let me start with what the guidebook says, the guidebook says that no more than 1000 (TLD)s will be delegated into the root annually. That means go live on the internet annually. The guidebook also says that the weight could be less than 1000, if we find in practice that the entry of the new (TLD)s adversely effects (DNS) performance.

And so this whole system that we're going to talk about that inserts (TLD)s into the root. It also looks at the effects that they have on the various parts, and if the effect is some sort of negative effect on performance then the 1000 could be reduced.

But there is a hard upper limit, so that phenomenon doesn't work in the other direction, currently. If there is a problem we'll reduce it, if there's not a problem the guidebook currently does not allow us to increase the rate beyond 1000.

The guidebook does not however specify the rate in any given 12 month period at which those 1000 are entered. So the 24 week that we see in the current proposal is simply a mathematical (derivation) of 1000 divided by 50 weeksish. The guidebook does not say 20 per week.

Where did the 1000 number come from? So ICANN asked its technical advisory groups can the DNS system handle 1000 new (TLD)s a year? And the answer of the technical advisory groups was, "Yes it can. As long as you have a system in place to monitor the effect of the increases and throttle back if any problems emerge."

We think that it is possible if the question had been asked when it was asked several years ago, can the system handle 2000 per year. It's possible that the answer could have been yes. And (Curt) please jump in, because you're the one asking the questions if I misspeak on that.

It's important to note that when that question was asked a couple years ago, it was influenced by the concurrent, the potential concurrent, implementation of that time of two other things. New (TLD)s were one of them. The other two were (IPV6) implementation and DNS (sec) implementation.

So when the question of 1000 was asked, the folks that were answering it thought about it in the context of three things happening. (Unintelligible) new (TLD)s. Today, if we were to ask the question again, it would really only be in the context of one of those three things because DNS (sec) and (IPV6) had already been implemented.

So a logical conclusion from that, we think, is that if 1000 was acceptable two years ago. Concurrent with (IPV6) and DNS (Sec) then today, without those two additional factors it seems logical that a higher number would be responded to affirminitely.

So where did the 20 per week number come from? As I just said, it's just a simple calculating saying 1000 per year divided by approximately 50 weeks per year. That 20 per week number, now in the current draw proposal, now flows through to the other (sticks) in the process which are contract negotiation and pre-delegation testing. As well as the root entry, which I'll talk about what that is in a moment.

So that 20 per week number has now flown from a 1000 into other parts of the process as well.

So now I'll go into our understanding, the groups understanding of the actual situation and problem. and as I said earlier, we may be in error in some of the things I'll say here. We don't think we are, but it's certainly possible. Part of this session's purpose is to get feedback from people. If we have got things wrong, we want to get feedback on that if we've made errors in either fact or conclusion.

So there's really two parts of the system that we're talking about here. Two parts of the technical system that we're talking about. The first one is updates to the root zone file, and that's the process by which a registry initiated change, a registry initiated change to a (TLD). And the insertion of a (TLD) within the root for the first time is considered a change.

So two ways a (TLD) can make a change, the actual insertion of that (TLD) into the root. And then any subsequent changes that the registry might want to make to that (TLD). They would both be changes if you like, to the root zone file.

And the root zone file is the master file of all (TLD)s that function on the internet. So when an update or change is being made to the root or zone file, there are four participating entities in that.

The registry, of course, initiates the change. I'm not counting them. But then after that request is made the participating entities are (Iona), which is part of ICANN, the US department of commerce, VeriSign, and then the 13 root name server operators located around the world.

So they're the four sets of entities that manage this process. Again, it will go from a registry operator, us, it will go to (Iona). It will go to the department of commerce. It will go to VeriSign, and it will go then to the roots of all operators.

So that's the first thing we're talking about in a technical sense. Changes and updates to the root zone file. The other thing that we're talking about is the actual query load on the root service.

So this, by this I mean (unintelligible) look up queries that handled by the (13 root server operators). This not changes to the file, this is queries from internet users. And so that load is increasing the time as a result of increasing internet usage. And it may increase faster that (load of traffic) may increase faster as a result of new (TLD)s as well. But the important point here is that it's already increasing rapidly.

The ability of the root service to handle an additional load is already an issue. I'm not saying it's a problem now, it's just something that (post guides) need to be aware of and our systems need to be able to deal with. New (TLD)s may add to traffic risks.

So let's talk about the updates to the root zone file. Not talking about traffic file we're talking about the actual file. The master file of the internet. The master addressing file of the internet. So the management of that system at the moment is largely manual. It consists of relatively manual communications and interfaces between the four participants that I just spoke about.

The growth of the internet, and the number of changes, and certainly introduction of all (unintelligible), that's going to put significant additional strain on the ability of that system to manage. There is no doubt in our minds, in our subgroup that as we look at these two technical components, one the changes to the file, the other one the actual amount of (unintelligible) on the surface.

The first of those two will certainly be effected by what we're all doing here. The second one, the track load, may not be effected. That's really a factor of how successful all of our (TLD)s are.

So in that first system, which is largely manual, (lona), the department of commerce, and VeriSign are currently working to automate that system and build in systematic efficiency and quality assurance measures.

So there is a project underway at the moment, between those three parties to automate and improve the way that the root zone file is changed. Now we don't know details about that project but we're trying to learn more.

The second technical issue is the one of queries load on the root server. This is a result of user traffic to our (TLD)s. And as I said before, this is increasing all the time. Root server operators need to resource up to meet that load. The root server operators are a diverse group, so some of them - one of them for example, is VeriSign. So they are very well resourced to handle additional load as it occurs.

Other operators are less resourced and they may face resource challenges in meeting additional loads. But that part of the problem, in our view, isn't really a new (TLD) problem as much as an overall internet usage issue. In our view it's really more the former issue that the 1000 relates to and that is the issue of updates and changes to the root zone (file).

So that's really a statement of the problem as we see it, again I think the most important conclusion that we've reached so far is that this is a resource and administration problem. Not a technical problem. And so, we didn't want to talk too much today about how to fix the issue. Fix as in the goal of raising that number of 1000 and accelerating the rate of entry.

But we do have some (unintelligible) which I'll put out now. You know, one of this would be for ICANN to ask the technical advisory groups the question again. We can ask the question again, can the DNS system handle 2000 (TLD)s per year? And they may say yes. We can ask them how far can the system handle 5000, and the answer could be yes.

We think that, and in fact talking to some of these people, we believe the answer from some of them would be yes. It's important to bear in mind this is a - there's not sort of one entity in charge of this whole thing. It's sort of a collaborative, decentralized thing as the DNS is. So some might well say yes I can handle more than 1000 per year. Some might say no.

Our sense is that some would say yes to more than 1000. Our sense is the ones that say no, we can't handle more than 1000, that the primary reason if they were to say that would be that they currently have inadequate resources to scale up to what they need to do.

So, again, not a hard technical barrier to doing this. But rather sufficient resources from each of these people to be able to meet the higher load.

So that's kind of a summary of where we're at (John), and maybe we can open it up to questions and comments.

John Nevett: Yes, we have a question online already. (Liz Williams) asks, "(Richard), is there a definition of the problems that may arise and how they would be handled? Is there any possibility of foreseeing problems now and addressing before predelegation testing?"

(William McCort): (William McCort) here, most of the problems are going to be around the scaling stuff, (Ianna) and the NTIA are working on a process to automate the system they have in place now. It was a nine month program (unintelligible) so I think that will take care of a lot of those issues. And then it will be mostly the feedback of how successful they are at pushing the changes out to see whether or not we can actually accelerate it at that point.

The other real changes will be more of a question for the root server operators who is running into resource (contention) already, in terms of overall growth. Which we can certainly ask the question.

Man: (Unintelligible) let me add something there that I should have perhaps mentioned earlier, the size, the number of (TLD)s and the size of the file is far less important to these folks than the frequency of changes. That's what's really the issue at stake here. The 1000 number, in a sense, is a proxy on how many likely changes they think they are going to see.

At the moment, for example, there's 300ish (TLD)s in the root and I believe there's about 440 changes to the file per year. So I'm assuming, this is an assumption that (unintelligible) math in their heads about 1000 and what that would mean in terms of the number of changes. But to illustrate my point, if there were 1 million (TLD)s in the root but there were only a limited number of changes per year, then that would be much less impactful.

This is about the frequency of change, rather than the number of (TLD)s. Please step in if I'm wrong.

John Nevett: (Jordan)?

(Jordan Buchanan): Yes, so two questions. The first relates actually (unintelligible) particular topic, have you guys talked with folks about the effect on (caching) in

particular, what that would happen as a result of fragmentation within the root? And everyone's confident that's not a factor in root scaling?

Man: Yeah, a couple years ago there's been a couple studies done. ICANN released one this summer that was done by the technical groups and then about three years ago (unintelligible) did a study for ICANN about scaling the root for exactly those reasons. The introduction of new (TLD)s plus (IVP6) and DNS (Sec).

DNS (Sec) actually had a bigger impact because it changes the size of the responses. But there are studies basically, while yes there are some limits when you start hitting millions of (TLD)s, but sort of the difference between 300 and an (unintelligible) bigger 3000 is negligible for that footprint. And mostly also because if you look at the distribution of query types and queries it's so heavily weighted towards (unintelligible) already, that a lot of the other stuff is just not (unintelligible).

Now being changed, if somebody is very, very successful in this but that's sort of what we're looking at right now.

(Jordan Buchanon): Great, and the other question I have is actually touches on the other fact you mentioned, which is DNS (Sec). I don't think you guys mentioned the DNS (Sec) record insertion key signing and so on as part of the delegation process right now. But my understanding is that that process today, getting key signed in for use in the root are basically it's complete. It's not just manual, it's face to face?

Man: Yes. Well I mean (unintelligible) extent, it depends on the policy of the registry...

(Jordan Buchanon): ...but I'm talking about delegating into the root itself. So those keys have to be signed by the root keys right?

Man: Yes.

(Jordan Buchanon): And all that signing today is done basically face to face is my understanding.

Man: Correct, but again you're looking at in the case of the new (TLD)s of the vast majority of them are being handled by existing registry providers who already have those relationships in place.

(Jordan Buchanon): Sure, I'm just wondering if there has to be one face to face meeting per delegation in order to actually cause the key assigning.

Man: That's a good question, I'm not sure how the process works (unintelligible).

John Nevett: Okay (Tim)? I'm sorry (Richard), did you want...

(Richard Tindle): No, (Krista) is capturing all these questions this is great feedback.

(Tim Switzer): (Tim Switzer), I guess to kind of get this directly, potentially answered as far as where we are, let me ask (Curt), I mean this issue has been out there for a while, is the 1000 a year set in stone? Not being looked at? Is it being looked at today? And if it's not being looked at today, could it potentially be looked at? What's it's status right now.

(Curt): So, I'm not the expert in this...

((Crosstalk))

(Curt): Clearly the 1000 a month number was arrived at over a long period of discussion as a way to open the...

((Crosstalk))

(Curt): So 1000 a year was arrived at after a long period of discussion, that was part of the negotiating that was done to launch the process. I think what I've heard that you'd want to confirm is that the best way to increase that rate if you're going to explore it is through what you just said. As you delegate and monitor and see no effect. And see the ability of the delegating parties to handle a load, that's the avenue toward increasing the rate not from 1000 a year from something else per year.

But just increasing the per month rate because of what could possibly be done as (unintelligible). And I'm repeating that from input in public sessions I've heard from members of the technical community, that the proof will be when we start delegating. We'll see what happens, we'll see what happens to the root zone and we'll see how the permissioning parties feel of the load and can build on that.

So, you know, you can (unintelligible) do something now and send some queries to the technical community and see how that goes. But what I've heard from that, we should see how - we should monitor how the delegations go and see if there can be an increase with them...

Man: So if you started at 20 a week and started ramping up to 30 or 40, that doesn't mean you're going to stop once you hit the magic number of 100 in 9 months or however long that takes. So the batching model, or whatever it's called is, you know 20 a week or 80 a month or something like that. It's not going to get bigger than that without, you know, some big acceptance from all the people on the technical community that you just described.

So it's sort of (baked) in that it's going to be 80 something a month.

John Nevett: (Unintelligible).

(Ken Stutz): First of all, thank you (Richard) for dumbing it down for people like me. I'm a little confused about something. First of all, it would appear to me based on

what (Richard) said and discussions we've had, that the ultimate - won't say problem - but this is going to end with the root server upgraders.

And we're talking about it depends on whether or not they have the resources. Well maybe what we need to do is be a little bit more proactive. Let's engage with the root server operators, let's find out whether or not they have, in their opinion, adequate resources to scale out. If they don't let's identify the problems and see if there's any way we can provide resources to them.

Because in discussions that I've had with some of the root server people, it's not the primary operator but basically now - now I'm getting over my head so help me out. But these guys are relying on, I guess you would call like (any cast) to help people broadcast this out.

And they're concerned about the potential in their own individual networks of this being able to be managed efficiently. So maybe we need to do a little more discussion with these guys number one.

And number two, let's be very careful about the way we discuss the use of the data. On one hand we're talking about the significant increase and traffic on the internet over the last two years. On the other hand we're relying on number that were probably developed, studies being done using data that's three years old.

Let's try to bring it up to a level where it makes more sense so we can argue that we're not dealing with historical data that's out of date. And at the same point in time, let's try to engage this group of 13 people and find out (unintelligible).

I'm not worried about VeriSign, I understand that and a lot of the operators have more than adequate resources. But if there are issues somewhere, here's the way I figure it. In education they tend to teach down to a level that

they feel they are understood at. If the root server operators work at a system where they will skill it at a level they are comfortable with, that level may very well be significantly below the resources of the guys that we're always using as examples.

Let's find out where that level is, see if we can get that level moved up to the point where everybody suddenly becomes a lot more comfortable with whatever number we have. Thank you.

(Richard Tindle): (Unintelligible). So everything you just said made sense to me, okay. And I think the goal here would be for this group if we agree on that sort of approach and solution that we do it as a group. Because I think it would be more effective I think.

Another thing for everyone to be aware of, however, is that the root server operators aren't under contract with anyone as far as (unintelligible) collaborative thing absent agreements. So there's no contractual relationships that I'm aware of where you can exert pressure other than by contract. It's got to be a kind of voluntary, work together kind of thing, is my understanding.

If I'm wrong about that, please, someone jump in.

(Ken Stutz): Can I respond very quickly. I understand that there is no contractual relationship. But that does not mean that there don't exist the opportunities for good lines of communication. And I appreciate the fact that maybe stockholders somewhere, I won't call them (unintelligible), but these guys are on top of these issues.

People like (Larsing), they know what's going on out here. And then maybe it's a matter of not just making assumptions based on past behaviors, but enhancing communication with these people. That's...

John Nevett: Thank you (Ken). So, you know, this group that we have, this work team. The next steps are to do a little more outreach and then to see if there's some kind of statement that this group can make based on your outreach I presume, is that right.

So we should be looking for, if there's no other comments on the issue, we should be looking for the group to continue its work and continue its outreach and then come back to the larger organization with perhaps a draft of a statement or something we should be doing as a whole group.

(Richard Tindle): Yes and as with all the subgroups of (Intag), like (John) said earlier, if anyone wants to join this group and contribute to it please feel free. If you're an existing (Intag) member or if you're planning to join and you're knowledgeable on this topic, please let us know and join the group.

John Nevett: That's great, thank you (Richard). Okay, so we have about 15 minutes left for any other business and I wanted to open it up for any dialogue or any questions. Or anyone, especially perspective members or, you know, existing applicants who aren't members of (Intag) might have about the organization. If you have any questions, any feedback, anything that you've heard today that you like, don't like, feel free to come to the mic and talk through it. (Keith)?

(Keith Drazek): Thank you (John). (Keith Drazek) with VeriSign, I'm the alternate chair of the registry stakeholder group. I just wanted to take a minute to commend you all and congratulate you on the excellent work that you all have been doing, that the (Intag) has been doing over the last several months. I think the energy and the expertise that you as a group have brought together here and quite frankly have contributed to the registry stakeholder group as a whole has been very valuable.

And I just wanted to basically say that we really appreciate your participation, your input, look forward to continuing to work with you. Thank you.

John Nevett: Thank you very much (Keith), that's very nice and we look forward to looking with you as the new chair of the registry stakeholder group. So congratulations on that. (Tim) and then (Jeff).

(Tim Switzer): (Tim Switzer), just one comment that I probably should have mentioned earlier. Just a little bit of housekeeping here, there is an (Intag) budget. We do have an approved budget as a subset of the registry stakeholder budget, so that's just informational for those of you that weren't aware of that.

I would also encourage those of you that have been working with (Intag), that may have had incurred any legitimate (Intag) expenses to please - I remind this every two weeks, I'm just reminding again here in person to please, you know the process. We've sent it out, please submit that to me. Thank you.

John Nevett: Thanks (Tim). (Jeff)?

(Jeff Neumann): Thanks, (Jeff Neumann) again. I'm also one of the counselors for the (GTLD) registries stakeholder group and I thought (Keith) would make it but I'll make a pitch. You are all observers to the registry stakeholder group as well, and so we have a meeting all day tomorrow where some of these issues will be discussed, some of the ones we talked about.

But also kind of a steady state registry issues, which although may not impact you at the moment, will certainly impact you in the next few months hopefully, we'll be optimistic. So, I know you have lots to think about now but I encourage everyone to take the opportunity to come to the registry stakeholder group.

Listen, participate, because you will be with us shortly.

Man: (Unintelligible). How big is the room?

(Jeff Neumann): It's the biggest room for the stakeholder...

((Crosstalk))

John Nevett: Okay, thank you (Jeff). (Dirk)?

(Dirk): Yes, we have a quite smaller room. (Dirk) (Unintelligible) from .berlin. We are meeting with the applicants for geographical names, top level domains at 3:00 at (unintelligible). And you are welcome if you are a geographical name applicant to join our group there.

John Nevett: Thank you (Dirk). (Bill).

(Bill Dozier): Took an email from our friend (John Tole) with .irish, and it kind of hits on what we're about with (Intag). This is a great group and a lot of participation and (John)'s comment was it's just good for him to hear some input from the European applicants, and obviously, he and all of us would like to hear more from both the European applicants and everybody. And then also input from other ICANN regions, because we want to get as much input and as much membership as we can.

And then he also adds, as well as participation regarding the upcoming (Intag) executive elections. And I don't know if I agree with that or not...

John Nevett: Thank you (John) and (Bill). Any other comments, thoughts? Any other business? (Krista)? Okay, so we'll call the meeting adjourned looking to - one, I'm sorry. One last reminder, if you're a member please vote on this charter amendment so we can get the necessary votes to get this issue done and the terms and everything else.

But thank you everyone, a copy of the newsletter is in the back. Thanks for everyone for coming, I appreciate it and we'll see you at the next one. Bye.

END