ICANN

Transcription ICANN Hyderabad

GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group Face to Face Meeting

Thursday, 03 November 2016 at 13:45 IST

Note: 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.

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar

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

Avri Doria: My name is Avri Doria. And this is a good thing to remind you, that whenever one talks, they should remind us of their names. So I'm Avri Doria.

And this - today's meeting is a face-to-face meeting of the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group. We'll go through the agenda in a second but I wanted to mention first of all that there's lots of seats around the table. Invite people to take those seats, have a nice comfortable table to lean on.

This meeting is not a traditional one of our working group meetings in that it has participants that are members of a group. It's basically a conversation about the topics with everyone that's here. So just wanted to make that point to people so hopefully people will feel free to participate, to talk, always mentioning their name at the beginning.

So if we can go to the agenda page - who's got the slides? Thank you. So there's the agenda page. So first, we'll do the welcome and introductions. Then we'll talk about the PDP Working Group's working status. And we've invited a bunch of people in to give us updates on the CCRT -- RPMs, PDP and other groups who are doing work that basically coincides with the work that this group is working on. Much of the work that's being done by others feeds into this group at some point.

Then we'll go into talking about the four work tracks that we've got going on. We've got - basically we've divided the subject up into four work tracks. And each one of those, the leaders of those sub-projects will lead those sections of the meeting.

Then we'll have any other business, and time permitting we'll have a parking lot. The reason we've got a parking lot is it's expected that a lot of topics that'll come up that we may not want to go down those roads at the time we're talking because they'll sort of be off topic.

But in general, nothing is really off topic if it has to do with subsequent procedures for new gTLDs but it may not be part of the work track discussion.

So we're going to set that up and if we've gone through everything and we still have time, we'll go to those issues. Otherwise, we'll go to those issues in our working group meetings after this. Okay.

So the welcome and introductions. I'm Avri Doria. I've introduced myself. My co-chair is Jeff Neuman.

Jeff Neuman: Hello.

Avri Doria: You forgot to say your name.

Jeff Neuman: My name is Jeff Neuman. We'll just go down the list of all the work tracks as well.

Avri Doria: Okay. So okay, we've got our staff on this side. And there's - yes, you should say your names.

Steve Chan: Steve Chan.

Emily Barabas: Emily Barabas.

Julie Hedlund: Julie Hedlund.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And then going down this way with our subgroup leaders.

Michael Flemming: Michael Flemming, Co-chair for working track 2.

(Rubinsky):   (Rubinsky), work track 4.

Sara Bockey: Sara Bockey, Co-chair for working track 1.

Christa Taylor: Christa Taylor, Co-chair working track 1.

Avri Doria: And we've got Robin over there.

Robin Gross: Hi. Robin Gross, Co-chair, work team 3.

Avri Doria: Okay. Have any of our other work chair - work track chairs that didn't get introduced? Fantastic.

So we've got quite a team here bringing you this information. So hopefully we'll get into some good conversations on it.

Okay, so moving on and there are still some seats around the table.

The PDP Working Group current status. So should I talk about the CC1 stuff or? Right, okay. So basically the first work we did and hopefully most of you have taken part of - in this is we had a Community Comment 1.

This is the successor to the old constituency comment that used to start PDPs. But now we go out to the whole community and ask all of the SOs, ACs and all the stakeholder groups to contribute comments to the beginning.

Now what we did is -- because this is such an extensive PDP with I think, what, we've got 38 subjects or more at the moment -- we basically decided to divide in two parts. The first part, Community Comment 1, or CC1, is basically six overarching issues. And we got comments from many of the SOs and ACs and a few of the stakeholder groups, though not from everyone.

And what we're doing now is basically going through all those comments one by one and basically trying to answer the questions that were asked.

And those were questions dealing with -- let me see, do we actually have that here, no we don't - so dealing with do we even need more gTLDs, do we do rounds, do we have categories or kinds of TLDs, how many TLDs can someone apply for, how do we get more community engagement in TLDs and, you know, the tradeoffs between predictability and flexibility. Did I miss one? I think I missed one, if I remember.

We're not going to spend a lot of time on that. In fact, we're not going to spend much more time on that at this point. So those discussions may come up in their relation to the work track teams. That is ongoing work in the group.

We've reached out. That is work that can be found on our Web site, on the Wiki site.

And basically we're doing the standard thing there of going through it comment by comment, discussing it once in the group, discussing it a second time in the group, coming up with draft answers. And then at some point, that will become the first part of the draft recommendations and - but that comes later.

And then what we also did was we established four work tracks to look at the detailed subjects of the new program.

Now one thing to remember at the beginning of this about the new program is that we have a policy, we have an application guidebook. All things being equal, if we changed nothing, then that would be the way we would continue. And as there is an existing policy, it can be changed but there is an existing policy. There is an existing application procedure. It can be changed but it is an existing application procedure.

So everything we do is built upon that base. And everything goes back to that and looks at that policy and says, does this policy work, what is defined well enough, do we need to say more than we said, are these application procedures working according to the policies, etcetera. But we're always going back to that.

This is not a blank sheet exercise. This is not a PDP where we're starting from nothing. This is one where we're starting from experience and policy and an application guidebook. Okay. So I guess I go to the next slide.

A timeline. We have a timeline. We have schedules. So the next thing…
We've done a CC1 and now we plan to do a Community Comment 2. The Community Comment 2 will be built on questions that come out of the various work tracks, the various sub-tracks that we'll be talking about today.

In fact, the questions that we'll be talking about today are some of the first elements of questions that may actually appeal - appear in that CC2, in that Community Comment 2.

So that - we intend to get to that by the beginning of 2017. And that will be sent again to all the SOs, the ACs and all the stakeholder groups and constituencies.

Hopefully we'll do a little bit better this time at getting responses to all of our questions than last time. After a fair number of deadlines extended, we have managed to get about half of the answers we should have gotten but at least it was enough for a substantive conversation. A lot of these issues though as you'll see today are really nitty gritty issues that we need to…

In June of '17 we project finishing all of the work tracks. In August the - all the work track work will be brought to the full Subsequent Procedures Working Group and will be either accepted by them as a draft recommendation or it will take more work. But by August we want to have a draft recommendation to send out.

That will be published in October. Then we'll do public comment and by July of '18 we plan - hope to have a full complete final report that can then be basically become the subsequent procedures. I won't say next round although I did say I wouldn't say next round.

So it's a long range schedule. There's a lot of pieces. It's subject to variability and change and we'll see - we have two other pictures. If you look at two other pictures in the next two slides, you'll see how complicated it is.

A lot of these work tracks contribute to each other's work track so there's a lot of connection between the subjects that are being talked about. And as I said before, the CCTRT and the various RPM groups, the community and territory

names working groups, etcetera will all be feeding in information to help us complete this.

So the next slide shows a different view of the timeline, pretty much the same thing showing the various tracks working and how they come together.

And then going to the next slide, just to show you at the top level, here is a breakdown. And you can see that there's a fairly long lead that already passed by.

Then there's this chunk in the middle with all the colors. That's the place we are at the beginning of now which his all the parallel work of the work tracks. And then there's the tail in the schedule which is the movement from a draft recommendation to full.

So and this is just a one-page synopsis of the schedule. It's really quite long, quite detailed. Steve is the keeper of the schedule and has worked with all the work tracks to build it.

Next is updates on the other gTLDs. Now I see the first one of our guests just walking in just in time for the - a star just in time for the - and you can come right up here. We've got two seats that - up.

So I'd like to introduce Jonathan Zuck, Chair of the CCTRT, the Consumer and Competition…

Jonathan Zuck: Exactly.

Avri Doria: Yes. …review team, thank you. Please fill in the rest.

Jonathan Zuck: I will.

Avri Doria: So you'll basically give us an update on where they are.

Jonathan Zuck: What I'm going to do is I made a few slides that I was going…

Avri Doria: Do you want to have them updated or? Send them to Steve.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes. Can I send them to Steve?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Jonathan Zuck: I should have done this before.

Avri Doria: While Jonathan's doing that, I don't know if we have - who we have that's going to talk from the various RPMs and other work groups. But if you could send your slides to Steve, then that will help us not take this…

    While we're doing this, are there any questions on the first stuff I talked about in terms of the schedules, in terms of the way we're organized, in terms of…

Jonathan Zuck: E-mail.

Avri Doria: …what's going on with it all? Does anyone have any questions or comments on that? I should have stopped to ask for questions before. I want to get people to start talking but I see no one has a question at this point.

    I should also introduce, you know, our liaison from the council who has just come in. And we have (Cheryl) who came in who is one of the work track 4 leads as part of the introductions.

    So yes, I didn't introduce Paul. I just said there he was.

    How we doing?

Jonathan Zuck: I'm sorry.

Avri Doria: That's okay.

Jonathan Zuck: I can start talking. I was just going to forward it all.

Avri Doria: Could actually just give…

Jonathan Zuck: Yes. Okay so, thank you. I'm Jonathan Zuck and I am the Chair of the Affirmation of Commitments Mandated Review on Competition, Consumer Choice and Consumer Trust. We've also been entrusted with looking at the application evaluation process to judge its "effectiveness." As with everything inside the ICANN world, the definitions do a lot to determine how we interpret these mandates but - and also the effectiveness of safeguards.

So that was sort of our mandate in toto. And we get referred to as the CCT Review which is the Competition, Choice and Trust and often forget about some of the other parts of the review like the application evaluation process which I think is where there's actually in many respects the highest level of overlap, if you will, with your work here in sort of examining the process itself of bringing new strings to life.

I will say that just some high level findings for our group are that there's not been a lot of time that's passed and so it's very difficult to really judge the competitive effects of the new gTLDs on the market. The year in which we're looking at was the year in which these strings were being delegated and so they weren't fully delegated until sort of the end of the study period. And so it's difficult to assess, to make really dramatic statements about the competitive marketplace.

Instead, what we're finding are reasonably positive trends with respect to competition and consumer trust with some hiccups that deserve some attention.

So, I mean, some statistics of interest in the competition arena for example are that half of the new gTLD registrations are -- maybe I need to phrase that a different way -- of the new generic top level domain registrations, half of them are new gTLDs. So they represent about 50% of the growth in the overall gTLD marketplace and about a third of the growth in the TLD marketplace as a whole.

So a lot of what we did was look at different slices of the market, if you will, and in some cases include CCTLDs to see what the impact of that is. So if you include them, it's about roughly a third for each which is kind of a convenient set of numbers, at least in the near term. I don't know if that'll sustain itself.

But right now what we're looking at is, in terms of the growth itself, about 50% of that is - comes from the new gTLDs which I think is a positive statistic for the notion of competition.

Obviously the overall impact on market share or on another sort of geekier economic calculation we're doing called concentration are - is going to be minimal, right? In other words, it hasn't completely caused an upheaval in which now the new gTLDs represent half of the registrations that are out there.

But interestingly enough, they do now represent 9% of them which, you know, we leave that for the community to interpret. But in the space of a year after, you know, whatever it's been, something like 25 years, it's put a 9% dent in the market share of the legacy TLDs which I think is fairly impressive.

So again it's nothing that blows you away in terms of your competitive analysis but there are some indicators that suggest that things are headed in the right direction.

Looking at things like consumer trust is somewhat problematic because it can be difficult to measure, which is why we ended up doing a series of surveys through Nielsen, a pair of them a year ago and then a pair of them recently, one that was end users and one that was registrants, both a year ago and recently, to try and see if there was a significant delta, if you will, in consumers' perception of the DNS to - and their overall trust in the DNS.

And again the numbers are not dramatic by any means but it seems safe to conclude that at least perceived trust in the DNS has not eroded as a result of the new gTLD program.

And again there are some positive indicators because for example, when we start to look at consumer preferences, there is a belief that having a better understanding of a meaning for a top level domain is a consumer preference. They like the idea of being able to predict where they're going based on the top level domain. The kind of taxonomy, if you will, seems to have some appeal.

The idea of having some restrictions on who can buy which types of domains, the .bank example that comes up so frequently or .pharmacy is also something for which there's some consumer preference.

So at this point, most of this hasn't made it to them yet to have an impact on their trust. But in the expression of their preferences it suggests that some of these innovations are headed in the right direction toward enhancing consumer trust, right?

So that's sort of the - makes it a little bit difficult to interpret some of the data that comes from Nielsen. But you get the idea that if in fact the promise of this restrictions and of this taxonomy is realized over time that it will have a positive impact on consumer trust.

So because of the difficulty of the subjective measure of trust, we also started to look at little bit at the notion of trustworthiness and were - in an objective sense where there are things put in place to improve the trustworthiness of the DNS in the form of the safeguards and in some of the mandatory public interest commitments, etcetera. Did they - were they implemented effectively? Did they look like they'll improve the trustworthiness of the DNS?

And this is another area where there's been so little testing of these things, it's going to be difficult to make definitive judgment. But for the most part, it looks like they were implemented as prescribed and that they were prescribed in such a way that they are in fact enforceable. In other words, they're not so strangely worded that it'll be difficult to interpret down the road.

And so both - again those are sort of positive indicators in the context of consumer trust.

So the overall issue that we face throughout our review has been with the paucity of data. There just hasn't been enough data made available to do a lot of the research that we want to do, both in competition and in trust.

So for example, compliance doesn't keep track at a granular enough level about what safeguards were involved in a particular complaint, right? So you end up with very correlative data rather than causal data because you don't have that level of granularity.

So some of the recommendations that we're going to be making for ICANN and for future review teams is that ICANN collect more data up front and continuously so that more data is made available to future review teams.

We don't know much about pricing. We had to do screen scraping basically to find out retail pricing because we got zero results back from a survey of registrars. They're not required to share data in their contract and so

therefore we got none. And so we had to do screen scraping of a sample in order to study that data.

We didn't get information on actual wholesale pricing. So we're operating just based on the caps and making an assumption that everyone is pricing at the caps. So having an understanding of whether or not there was an effective impact on pricing is difficult in the absence of data.

So I think probably our number one most prominent recommendation is going to be about the collection of more rigorous data on the part of the organization so that better analysis and more nuanced analysis can be done in the future.

So this is sort of the areas associated with the competition and trust portion.

And what I wanted to focus on with you and what I brought more slides on at the beginning of this is the notion of the application evaluation process. And so we - as - when we convened at first in Los Angeles in January, we tried to figure out what aspects of these things we wanted to focus on.

And in large measure what we were looking for was discriminatory aspects, confusing aspects of the application evaluation process, artificial barriers to entry in the process, etcetera that particularly like countries in the global south was a - why were there so few applications from there and were there things innate in the application evaluation process that might have led to low applications from the global south. And things like that were some of the questions that we were asking.

And so we looked at - created two different types of surveys. And one of them was a survey of applicants conducted by Nielsen who took the 1,900 or so applications and reduced it down to about 512 actual applicants and fielded a survey.

And as yet, that survey is still sort of undersubscribed. There's only about 45 of the 512 that have responded. There's a pretty good distribution in terms of whether they succeeded or failed in their application, etcetera so there's some interesting information to be derived there.

But as soon as you start parsing to create what we call cross-tabs, then the numbers get very small and very difficult to rely on. So in other words, for general like satisfaction with the program, 45's enough. But as soon as you want to say satisfaction by folks whose string went into contention for example, those numbers become too small.

So we're going to try to work throughout this meeting to get more of the applicants to fill out this survey and engage in this particular process because we think that that's undersubscribed at the moment. But that's one of the surveys that we did.

The other that we did that's a little bit crazier in a way is tried to ask everybody who didn't apply for a new gTLD string why they didn't apply. And so that's - you know, that's an interesting challenge when you think about it, right?

And, you know, and so to try and tackle that, what we did is we hired AMGlobal. Many of you know Andrew Mack - oh, who's here in fact -- and so if you didn't know him before and now you do.

And we had him look at the cohorts, if you will, of the applicant pool that did apply for new strings, in other words, you know, built a - kind of a breakdown of the types of entities that applied for strings in the global north and then went out and sought out similar types of firms in the global south to try and gain an understanding of hey, you know, why didn't you apply. And there are some interesting results associated with that.

As you can see now that the slides are up and I'm done just spinning for you here, I'll go through them. You can see that we tried to conduct a fact-based review so there's a number of different surveys.

You can see the two sets of Nielsen surveys. There's also two sets of economic analysis. And all of those have been released and are available for study. And in fact the second economic study is currently in the process for public comment. So take a look at that.

And then the study to which AMGlobal did is also available very recently but it's available on our Wiki. And in progress there's an applicant survey and a DNS abuse survey.

So do I tell someone next slide or can I go next slide because… Next slide. So these are Andrew Mack's slides. So he'll be able to answer more questions for you but you can see that he ended up - we had set a goal of sitting down and interviewing 30 of these cohorts in the global south. And in order to get enough variety, there's an emphasis on Latin America.

There ended being 37 of them that got interviewed. And you can sort of see the sector diversity that exists in those, you know, what I call appli-can'ts because they didn't apply and that's how I entertain myself in the long video conference calls that we have for the CCT.

All right, next slide. So just a very brief summary and this doesn't do Andrew's study justice by any means. I definitely recommend reading it and looking into the findings and the conversations and the nuance of the study as presented.

But sort of in broad strokes, if you will, some of the findings are that there was a real problem with awareness, that a lot of people hadn't heard about the program or if they'd heard about, they had a lot of misinformation about the

program. And so they didn't have sufficient detail to make a good assessment about whether or not it made sense to apply in the program.

So that's a - that's something that we've heard before, that the outreach program didn't get to everybody that it needed to. And part of what Andrew did was look into how best to reach out to folks.

And, you know, one aspect of that is like their professional associations and conferences that - you know, different sectoral conferences are still a very important component of information gathering in the global south that we need to take into consideration.

So looking at different outreach tools, building better, more clear and straightforward instructions I think would make a lot of sense. And we talked about for example, you know, identifying lists of people that could help you for example in the application process and trying to, you know, make it easier to come in through the front door of that process.

The second thing that the study found is that a lot of folks didn't understand what the potential business model was for having a new gTLD. So their first reaction is oh, I don't know why I need to have my company name as a top level domain. So everybody went immediately to the notion of brand.

And then I think after a while, folks on Andrew's team started talking about some of the other potentials and they started thinking oh, well maybe that would've been interesting but I'd need to know more about what the business model might look like, what my way to market might look like, etcetera.

And so this notion of understanding the underlying business model of the new gTLDs is something that looks like we might want to address as well, again if we're trying to encourage more applications from the global south.

Cost and complexity. The perception was that the cost was too high. And sometimes the perception of the cost was even higher than the actual cost.

And again this came back to not having enough information. But in some instances it's tied back to the business model question in that while there were certainly entities that could have afforded the costs, it was a higher bar to justify those costs in the global south and therefore it made sense to help with some of that business model complexity as well.

And so, you know, building a sort of consistent and ongoing program for outreach seems very important.

There was also this notion of, you know, whether or not -- and this will be open for some debate -- whether or not ICANN should be in the role of better educating the communities about the new gTLD program so that potential applicants might realize that there could be a market available to it.

I mean, we're already dealing with things in the - you know, the First World problems of, you know, my wife's .gallery e-mail address is rejected by half the Web sites that she tries to type it into because I thought I was being so clever signing her up for a new gTLD and she can't make airline reservations.

But, you know, imagine again if - in a community in which there's so little understanding, it's going to affect people's ability to believe that there's a business model for them to follow with the new application.

So those were some of the findings and some of the recommendations surrounding those findings. Again, I think it's been very instructive and it's worth taking a look at the reports in greater detail. But those are just some of the high level findings associated with that.

I might just pause here if you've got questions because we do have access to Andrew Mack, if you have questions about some of those findings as I've summarized them, for better or for worse.

Avri Doria: If you have questions, please come to the microphone and then introduce yourself and ask your question.

Jonathan Zuck: Do people have to wear a costume if they come down to the microphone like The Price is Right?

Avri Doria: No. Halloween went by.

Jonathan Zuck: Right.

Avri Doria: They just have to come to the microphone and introduce themselves.

Gabe Fried: Hi, my name - hello. Is this on?

Avri Doria: Please.

Gabe Fried: My name's Gabe Fried. I'm curious, in terms of acceptance whether or not one of the pieces of data you have access to is how many of the domains on the new gTLDs actually are lit up.

Jonathan Zuck: So one of the things that we spent a good part of the day talking about is parked domains. And NTLD stats has reported that something like 65% of the -- according to their definition of parked -- 65% of the new domains that have been registered are currently parked.

And so that's a combination of just receiving a 404 error or something like that or, you know, getting to a page that, you know, says under construction or something like that. So their sort of global definition of parked is their number is at about 65% right now.

Gabe Fried: Right. But that includes dark pages so.

Jonathan Zuck: It does.

Gabe Fried: So - and if you turn one on, it's parked for a while. And then you turn it on and that number doesn't change so the… I'm just trying to get a sense of whether or not there's a better mechanism for determining acceptance in terms of live sites and whether or not that's technically easy to do or worth doing.

Jonathan Zuck: Acceptance by end users, you mean? Is that what you mean by acceptance?

Gabe Fried: I mean, it seems like the ultimate litmus test of marketplace acceptance of new gTLDs is whether or not people are bothering to actually turn sites on on these domains and leave them on so active sites getting traffic, etcetera.

                   That would be - from a business perspective would make sense for the registrant if they were - made the decision to do it, it was getting traffic and then they would either turn off or redirect whatever they had historically been using or maybe it's a brand new site.

                   I'm just trying to get a sense of like can we get granular to say okay, well with all the live sites, this is what the growth rate looks like on the new gTLDs. And then I'll stop asking questions.

Jonathan Zuck: Well, I guess my point if I understand you correctly is that, you know, roughly 35% are live sites at this point. And so, I mean, there's a lot of difficulty in trying to parse usage because for example, sometimes things are forwarded. And so that could be temporary. It could be a marketing campaign.

                   And unfortunately the real test of adoption is whether or not you change your business cards or the logo you've got on the side of your van. And right now,

that's beyond our capacity to measure. And so we're trying to look at other proxies for measuring that.

But right now a very high proportion fall under a parked category and are therefore not seen by end users from that standpoint. It's only about 35% that are pages.

Tell me how much I have and I'll - you want me to leave now, is that it? I can go. So sorry, next slide. So this is too many slides probably.

But I also recommend taking a look at the Nielsen survey when it's out. This is very preliminary findings. The open-ended questions have not yet been coded but this is the - these are some of the findings associated with it.

One of the things of interest to you is that 50% of those surveyed said that staging and rounds is an effective approach. So that was an interesting result from the applicant pool.

So this is the survey of people that applied and includes people who made it all the way through and also people that dropped out. There was certainly a correlation between dropouts and dissatisfaction with the process.

About half of the people have agreed to have a more detailed conversation with the researchers from Nielsen and they provided a little bit more color. And that may be worth going to directly because the time is short.

So other lessons of -- maybe three slides down, Steve, sorry - yes, so here we go, so some additional insights from these follow-on conversations.

There was - a lot of people said that they had technical problems, outages, digital archery, didn't present ICANN well, changing process and timelines was frustrating for those who played by the rules. If you worked hard to meet a deadline and someone else doesn't, that should be to your advantage.

Rules or process changes or shifting guidance undermine credibility, plurals linguistic reviews, etcetera.

And there was a perception by a number of applicants that ICANN didn't have a sense of the real cost associated with some of the delays in changes to the program.

So there was certainly a fairly high degree of frustration by folks. And so there was only one applicant who said that they were very satisfied with the process. The best - the majority were somewhat satisfied but it still outnumbered the dissatisfied. So the most were either somewhat or very satisfied but there was only one that said they were very satisfied.

I'd be very interested to meet them. But these are all anonymous. Because it's certainly a characteristic of the ICANN community to be dissatisfied so I don't know what to read into that.

This survey is still in process and we will make it public as soon as we can. But those are some of the things that we're exploring.

And I think with that, I guess I'm probably out of time. The slides after this is what I talked about at the beginning, the competition, etcetera.

So check out the AMGlobal study. Check out the surveys from Nielsen and the two reports from the analysis group. Provide comments on the second phase two report from the analysis group. That's up for comment right now. And keep your eye open for this latest applicant survey because it will be really relevant to your work.

Avri Doria: Thank you. But please hold on one second. I see one hand up. And by the way, I do recommend that anybody that uses the AC room, you've got the hand up feature there that's really quite handy.

So Alan Greenberg, you have your hand up. You had a question you wanted to ask.

Alan Greenberg: It's handy but a long time lag because it was on the last subject, on the issue of parked pages. And you said there's also a lot of redirects. Was there any attempt to at least sample some of the redirects and see how many of them simply pointed to their dotcom or whatever as opposed to really being - using it?

I know you can't study all of them in an automated way but one could do a random sampling of 100 or 200 or whatever.

Jonathan Zuck: I don't think that we have done a random sample of redirects. And what I meant by redirects was to dotcom pages. And - but we haven't tried to look at that directly.

What we're trying to evaluate in our team is to try to not boil the ocean and we're looking in particular at whether or not the high degree of parked domains distorts our competition analysis.

In other words, these wonderful statistics we have of about 50% of the growth, if that's all speculation -- and speculation doesn't necessarily do renewals -- then does that distort the competition picture for example? Those are some of the things that we're trying to look at.

We're trying to look at whether or not there's a higher degree of DNS abuse in the gTLDs, right? And if there is, we may need to go back and look at whether or not that is somehow associated with all these parked pages as well.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Thank you very much for that. And I expect that you'll be reporting on this further at other meetings during this meeting.

Jonathan Zuck: That's right. We have an engagement session tomorrow morning. We
                   welcome you all to come for a more detailed presentation and to get your
                   feedback.

                   And then there's a number of other - there's also a session -- (Elisa) is in the
                   room and may be able to remind me when -- but there's also a session where
                   the research teams are going to be reporting out. Do you remember when
                   that is?

Avri Doria: I'm sure it's on the schedule.

Jonathan Zuck: It's on the schedule. So there's a research report session as well where
                   Nielsen Analysis Group and AMGlobal will all be giving more detailed results
                   of the studies that we commissioned. (Elisa), do you want to?

(Elisa):   It's Saturday afternoon at 3:15 pm.

Jonathan Zuck: Saturday afternoon, 3:15.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay?

Avri Doria: Thank you very much. Okay. Alan Greenberg, I assume that's an old hand.
                   Thank you.

                   Okay. We're going to ask for an update from the RPM team but was told that
                   they hadn't quite understood that I was going to ask them to do that. So I'll
                   pass that by unless afterwards they would just like to stand up and make a
                   couple comments.

                   But I've also asked Heather to sort of give us a quick update on the UCTN,
                   which is -- I learned this today, I don't know if I have it right -- the Use of

Country and Territory Names. That one's fun. So if you could please tell us because that's definitely one of the issues we'll be dealing with in terms of reserve names and such. So please.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Avri, very much. I'm Heather Forrest for the transcript. So very briefly, this - the CWG USTN -- and Avri's gotten it 100% correct, well done -- has been in existence and doing its work since 2014. And the group rather coincidentally I'm sitting next to although now the empty chair of one of the c-chairs and a colleague from the CSNSO, Annebeth Lange.

The group has come to some interesting conclusions which is to say that we don't think that in - the format that we currently have which is a cross-community working group that's chartered by the GNSO and the CCNSO -- it's really the ideal environment in which to tackle these issues.

Some of that -- let's say particularly those of us from the GNSO -- have pointed out that it's a concern let's say -- while we have a natural outlet in this PDP for the work that we're doing -- there are certainly concerns that perhaps this PDP isn't the best place for this activity, this discussion to happen.

Nevertheless I'm delighted to see Annebeth and others from outside of the GNSO in the room today to have these discussions and participate in the PDP because I think it's important, Avri, as you say irrespective of what the CWG concludes we have this on our agenda in work track 2.

So you'll see here just a very quick overview slide of where we are in our work. And I would encourage you if you're interested in this issue and if you're participating in work track 2 to focus in particular on the last dot point there which is the progress report and draft interim report. You'll see them available, the link there.

These documents highlight where we are to date, essentially very high level summaries. We had a discussion that centered around two-letter codes at the

top level under 3166-1 and moved on in our discussion to three-letter codes and found it very difficult to come to agreement and found that this really wasn't a discussion that just the GNSO and the CCNSO should be having.

We've had some great support from some ALAC members and not a lot of participation from the GAC. And I notice we started off our agenda this morning at 8:30 in the GAC room with a session on geographic names and a proposal on geo names.

And it continues to concern me -- if I very, very briefly pull of my chair - co-chair hat and speak personally -- it continues to concern me and others that we have different initiatives happening within the community all on overlapping topics.

So hence the group is at a point where we're deciding that we think it's best that our work take a different from. What we're proposing in the draft interim report at the link you see here is that we wind up our work and find a more constructive way to engage the community as a whole. Thanks, Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And yes, I was - Jeff and I were both at that GAC session this morning. And definitely there is an interest in finding a way to pull all these threads together because it would be very unfortunate for us to make it all the way through this PDP and have dangling threads. So hopefully we will indeed find a way. And I very much appreciate you bringing that up.

Any questions on the UCTN update that we just got? Okay, no. Okay. Just wanted to ask.

Is there any possibility of just saying a few words about where the - yes, please, Kathy, if you'd come to the microphone. Just a few words because one of the things is we will be importing a lot of the words and work that's being done in the RPM group into some of our work so, you know, very much appreciate you jumping in and giving an update.

Kathy Kleiman: And just a quick question. Is Phil Corwin in the room? Okay, wanted to check.

So hi. Thanks for the opportunity. I'm Kathy Kleiman. I'm one of the three co-chairs of the Rights Protection Mechanism Working Group which will be meeting Monday at 11 am for an update and also just a working group session. So please, please join us.

We didn't have our co-chairs - we have a co-chairs meeting where we meet with the Subsequent Procedures co-chairs and it got canceled so we didn't have that coordination moment for today.

But very, very briefly, we're looking - our work has carved out a piece of the Subsequent Procedures Working Group area involving the rights protection mechanisms for new gTLDs.

Specifically, we're looking at the trademark PDDRP, the post-delegation dispute policy. We're looking at the trademark clearinghouse with its sunrise period and its trademark claims notices. And we'll be looking at the URS, the Uniform Rapid Suspension. So that's phase one of our work, taking about the first year and a half.

And then we'll be going on to review the very first consensus policy of all, the UDRP, the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy, which goes back to 1999. And we'll be looking at that, kind of the foundation of domain name dispute policies.

So phase one now and phase two coming up. But phase one is designed for the new gTLDs to feed back into the procedure of this working group so we can go forward together with a new applicant guidebook or whatever we choose to call it which has the comprehensive rules including the right to protection mechanism and the many, many issues being dealt with here. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Wondering if there are any - I see a hand up. Paul McGrady, please. All I saw was the Paul.

Paul McGrady: Paul McGrady for the record. Just a point of clarity, Kathy. When you say that the RPM review phase one will feed back into this process, we're not - am I understanding correctly that you're not saying that the phase one review is limited only to new gTLDs?

In fact, things that come out of phase one could affect all gTLDs but for purposes of this, the reason why it's broken up into the first phase is to help speed along the subsequent procedures. Is that right?

Kathy Kleiman: Thanks for the clarification. Yes, one of the questions that's on the table, that will be on the table as part of the Rights Protection Mechanism Working Group charter is whether some of the rights protection mechanisms created for new gTLDs should be extended into legacy TLDs.

But for right now, as part for creating round two or whatever we create, we had agreed that we would look at everything created in the new gTLD applicant guidebook and that includes all the rights protection mechanisms for new gTLDs.

So you're right, they could be extended to legacy TLDs but it's also a milestone that has to be reviewed and crossed before we go into future rounds of new gTLDs. Thanks again for the clarification.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Were there any other questions? Yes, Kristina?

Kristina Rosette: I'm Kristina Rosette, Amazon registry. Could one of the co-chairs pull up the slide with the timeline on it because I have a timeline question for Kathy and I don't know whether she saw the slide when we had it up earlier?

Avri Doria: The timeline for this group. Could you?

Kristina Rosette: Yes.

Avri Doria: The timeline for this group.

Kristina Rosette: Excellent. Thank you. Kathy, looking at the timeline that this PDP working group is working on, do you all anticipate in RPMs that you all are on the same track? Are you going to overlap? Are you behind? Are you ahead?

Kathy Kleiman: I don't have our timeline right in front of me but it looks to be similar. We may be - we're working on the same period. We're not going to extend past the end of this working group. And we'll probably end earlier.

Avri Doria: Yes. To add to the answer, we do have - even if we did perhaps miss the last one but we do have periodic sort of sync meetings between the various groups to look at where we're at in the schedules, to look at where we're at on things to try and make sure that we're not, you know, missing schedules by a lot. So it's one of the things we are trying to sync for. Don't know how successful we'll be but we are working on it.

                  Okay. I do not see any other questions on any of that. And that will be sort of the wrap on the update of related work. Very much appreciate that. But just wanted to see if there were any last questions to go before we move on to our next section. No? Okay.

                  So the next session is we start getting into talking about our work tracks. We have as I said four work tracks. The first one basically looks at overall processes, support, outreach, things like applicant support. The second one is shortcut. Legal regulatory is looking at contracts and such. The third string, contention, objections, objection procedures, etcetera. And four is international domain names, name collision, topics such as that.

We'll get more in depth on each of them as we move through this discussion but just to give you a quick map of the four that we're talking on.

So I'll - we have on each of them -- okay, let me move ahead to it -- basically each track leadership has selected topics for discussion today. And this is just a selection of topics.

It really took a bit of time to figure out which were the two subjects that were in some sense ready for discussion, most - right, most in need of getting more input.

One of the things that we're working on a lot in this PDP is trying to get more people to talk about the stuff, more people to give opinions and such. So we're going to try and spend an equal amount of time on this, allocated initially about 30 minutes to each of these topics.

We'll be taking a break after the first one but, you know, and then we'll see if there's topics to go back with, are there topics in the parking lot or what have you but really allocating about 30 minutes to each.

And basically Jeff and I are going to read through the things, giving a little bit of background now. And then the team leaders will take over the discussion on their particular topics. It's a dialogue. It's to exchange ideas. It's to look at issues. It's not hopefully just a lecture, not just me talking, Jeff talking, them talking.

So but just to give you a read-through first of all of the issues so you see kind of what's coming.

So for work track 1, what went wrong with applicant support program in the 2012 round? And we could see there was a program, it came in, it looked like a nice program and then almost no one applied for it. And of the people that applied for it, only one got it. So that doesn't seem like a successful program.

So what went wrong with it? Were issues related to the guidance in the Joint Applicant Support Working Group final report? What were the implementation and timing issues, the scope of the report, systematic issues or a combination of multiple factors?

There was a lot of work done. And this was the group called Joint Applicant Support, or JAS. A lot of effort went into that. There was a report. Then there was - a fair amount of time was taken to actually convince anybody to take that report seriously. Then the board did an implementation with staff. Then we argued about the implementation for a while. Then finally it came out and it was barely in the nick of time or is that another way of saying it was late.

So those are some of the things that we're looking at in that one. But going back - so part of the work is going back to the JAS report. I don't know if any of the members of that group are here at the moment. You know, I see at least one. I was also in that group, another one. So, you know, so part of that is going back to that, looking at its recommendation, seeing where we are.

So how can these issues be improved or resolved? Is there a need for such a program in future rounds -- always asking that question. Just because it was there in the last round, just because we thought it was important, is it still important?

Some of us might argue quite vociferously that it was important and that it still is. Others might say eh, you know, it's not that important, do other stuff, there's other ways to deal with it.

So those are some of the issues we need to tease out in that one.

The other question is from Registry Service Provider, RSP, accreditation. And I'm trying to follow that rule that says when you utter an acronym, try to spell

it out the first time. Some people say you should actually do it the first two times but.

So from RSP or Resource Service Provider accreditation to third party certifier, what's the most effective method to meet the needs of RSPs, registries, registrars, applicants and possibly registrant and end users?

The whole RSP issue came up as the way the application guidebook and application process is. Even if there was an RSP that was supporting 20 different applications, it had to get fully tested each and every time. Does that make sense? Is there perhaps reason in doing it that way?

Or is there perhaps another way to do things, a way of actually doing some form of -- and I don't want to pick a word -- certification, accreditation, pre-testing, you know, gold star service provider program, something? Is there some way to do that? And what makes sense? How do you do that?

Do you create a new kind of contracted party if you contract to these people? What kind of problems and issues are there? Is it a good idea? And if it's a good idea, how do we do it?

How would existing RSPs be treated differently than new RSPs? You know, we have many RSPs now that they're out there that they're functioning. Are they grandparented in? I didn't say grandfather. Are they grandparented in?

Or do, you know, does everybody have to get - do you have to get tested every year? If there's a testing, etcetera, how should this kind of thing work? What are some ways to ensure the best practices are attained to ensure security and stability?

Okay. That's work track 1. I'll - I've been talking a lot so I'll hand the microphone over to Jeff to talk about work track 2.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman for the transcript. Work track 2, as Avri said, deals with legal issues, regulatory issues and issues on the contract.

There's really three topics that we've put on the agenda for - that have specific questions for this session. The first one is on the base registry agreement, and so some have pointed out that there may be a need to have multiple base registry agreements depending on the different potential categories that a top level fits into, so each having its own unique needs.

Examples that have been mentioned our brand registries, geographic TLD registries, community registries. So one - the first question basically asks whether we should have one single base agreement and have specifications are addenda that deal with unique characteristics for whether there should be multiple base registry agreements based on the category in which a TLD is.

The second set of questions revolves around the reserve names issue. And when we say reserve names, we have to take a step back because reserve names actually are several different categories of issues.

The first one is about reserve names at the top of, other names that were reserved at the top level that were set forth in the applicant guidebook and therefore not eligible to be applied for, those included names like single and two character strings.

It also included certain things that were reserved because they were related in some way to ICANN or IANA functions, things like ICANN itself. You can't apply for dot ICANN. You couldn't apply for dot GNSO. It couldn't apply for dot IANA, those dates and names.

Should we keep those reservations please? Should be given them? Do we had a couple now that we have a couple of the acronyms out there like PTI because of the post-transition IANA, which actually doesn't stand for that anymore.

I forgot exactly what it stands for. So that's one set of questions on the names that are reserved at the top level. Specification of the registration - or the registry agreement talks about names that are reserved at the second level, and so for that, as the names like the majority of two characters.

Like - or, I'm sorry, they include two character things that are initially reserved. Some of us now have procedures on how to release them. Some of them, at this point, don't have any procedures like country names were reserved the second level, names of the International Red Cross, the International Olympic Committee.

The registry is also permitted to reserve a certain number of names or promotional our operational purposes. That's 100 names. Should we keep any of these are all of these? Any changes needed?

Remember, as Avri said, if there is an existing policy on it, which there is not existing policy at all of this, but if there is existing policy for the guidebook says that there's a certain role in place, and we can't come to consensus that the default is what's in the current applicant guidebook.

The third set of issues deals with the continuing operations instruments. If you remember, that was set up for the 2012 round, the fund, what's known as the EBRO, which I will - the Emergency Backend Registry Operator.

That was put into place in case the registry failed technical operations, the registry field from a technical perspective. We still need this EBRO function? We've yet to see a situation which an EBRO has been needed.

Do we keep that is that it's not in case there is a failure? If so, are there other ways to find it and then requiring a letter of credit or what ICANN has turned the continuing operations instruments?

Many applicants that participated in the 2012 round, obtaining one of these COIs, or letter of - letters of credit, according to the roles of the applicant guidebook was not an easy task.

So is this something we still need? And, of course, there are certain registries like brand registries that may not need an EBRO for their very nature, so that's one of the issues as part of work track two that we hope to address. And I'll go back to Avri on work track three.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Jeff. This is Avri speaking again. Okay, work track three, we believe we have three questions. The subsequent procedures, we often call it sub pro for short, so the new gTLD subsequent procedures, working group is discussed at length to one of the introduction of new gTLDs is going forward basis should be rounds, like the 2012 round, on a first-come, first-served process.

A number of proposals emerged including a - including A, starting with one or two rounds to handle the demand and moving to a first-come first-served process.

Now, some of those questioned whether there was pent-up demand and some people have said, pent-up demand, you kidding? There are at least 10,000 names waiting in the wings.

So that was one thing to consider, is you know, to what degree is there really pent-up demand? But if it is there in the thousands, is that really something that can be dealt with in a first-come, first-served process or in around?

Or - and therefore, we started talking about a hybrid approach whereby there is a predictable schedule of rounds per year giving more predictability when public comments and objection procedures are held.

One of the problems that people have posed about first-come first-served is that means that the people don't want to object to things or want to, you know, trademark protection or want to do it many sorts of rights have to constantly be - pay attention, that it's always in front of them.

That it's always - and if there are ten thousand of these things coming, you know, at them, that means that basically - so one of the ideas was basically, well, maybe you do windows, where a window is open for three months, let's say the first quarter of the year.

Then you go into an objection process for three months. Then you have another window after that, so you have to windows the year, and that's just an example.

But basically everybody would know that second and fourth quarter were the times for objections and that the rest of the time was application and processing.

So that's one of the hybrid models that have sort of been suggested. So looking at this, looking at, you know, we want to get away from having a round and then stopping for a while because it was such a big round, we're so exhausted, a lot of things went right or wrong with it.

We need to review. We need to revamp. We need to decide when to have another round. So we do want to avoid that but also looking at the first come first served, if there is too much demand, that might not be scalable.

That might be really hard for ICANN to scale up for one onslaught like that, and so trying to find a solution there. Continuing - whether or not applications for future new gTLDs are accepted and rounds or other batch groupings versus being accepted in an open and ongoing process will impact, among other things, string contention process and objections.

What are some foreseeable impacts to string contention and objection processes with either choice? How should these factors be weighed? Should the community decide first which application acceptance methodology will be used in subsequent procedures and then deal with the downstream issues?

Or should the effects and resolution of these issues such a strict attention be fully dealt with in order to drive the application methodology? At the moment, we're looking at the issues but really that is a question that we have to face.

In order to determine what role the independent objector will be, if any, and subsequent applicant procedures, it is necessary to both review what happened during the 2012 round and what has happened in both the community and the world at large since the 2012 round.

For example, what was the community's impression of the role, the independent objector, IO, played in the 2012 round? Did it live up to expectations?

Did the IO act in the community's best interest? Has the level of awareness within the community and consumers risen to the level that an IO is no longer necessary?

Part of the reason that we had an independent objector was, well, with this new round, no one is going to know how to object. There's going to be lots of people that can't afford to object or, you know, it's just the process is really too complex for them to find their way through, so let's entrust somebody to do it.

But when the process went on, was everybody really trusting that it went well? What an ongoing application process necessitate that in (IO) be a place to ease the burden of constant vigilance on the part of the community and consumers? So that was work track three, and I'll pass it back to Jeff for the reading of work track four.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. So work track four deals with the technical and operational issues as well as issues around universal acceptance and IDNs. So the first question deals with showing competence either before - or during the application process or at some point before the registry agreement is signed.

So the question reads, should technical competence be shown during the application process are only required to be shown prior to signing a gTLD agreement? And then the same question with respect to financial competence.

The next question is on IDNs, so in this past round in 2012, it was, you were not allowed to apply for a single character IDN which, in some languages, a single character could represent a full word, thought, idea or phrase.

So the question reads, should single character IDNs be allowed and languages where a single character could denote a word or phrase? The third question is just a general question on whether the questions asked and the application guidebook, which was actually asked in an annex to module two, whether the questions were the right questions to ask to judge technical competence and financial confidence.

And then what suggestions do we have for improving the criteria on the evaluation processes? Was the way the questions were asked aligned with the expectations of evaluators?

Were the thresholds for passing appropriate? So there were some questions on the application that were scored, some that weren't scored. Was that the right way to do it?

And then there were, as many that participated, there were a lot of what they called clarifying questions which was to clarify for the evaluators what the applicants said in their application.

And so how can we make the questions more clear in the coming rounds or application windows so that we would lessen the need for these clarifying questions?

And were their issues that applicants had in terms of consistency in the evaluation results? And then finally, we're going to talk about name collisions. During the 2012 round, it was determined that certain strings be prevented from moving forward. The three were dot home, dot corp and dot mail.

Are there additional high risk strings that can be identified prior to the launch of subsequent procedures and what is the methodology that should be used to determine what constitutes the high risk strings?

So instead of having a process where applicants submit applications for the strings that they want and then only months or in some cases years later find out that that's not eligible, is there a process that we can use to determine beforehand which strings are high risk and, therefore, if there are any strings that are high risk, to exempt them out of the procedures for however we introduce new gTLDs?

Avri Doria: Thank you. Okay, so now we've had a read through. I'm not going to open the floor for questions on any of these at this point because that's what the next two hours are about. We will be taking a break in the middle of that.

So at this point, what I would like to do is turn over the - so rewind back to four work track questions, work track one, and basically through the floor over to the co-leaders of work track one. I'm not sure who's going to go first. But please, the floor is yours. In fact, this is what we do it every meeting, basically say work track one, who wants it?

Christa Taylor: For the transcript, it's Christa. Would you like me to reread the questions? Do want to just give me - give a little bit of background?

Avri Doria: I would say that - and anybody can read the questions themselves. We read them once, so I would say more talk to the question and try and get people to talk to you.

Christa Taylor: Perfect. So at any point, if anyone has any questions or any insight that they would like to provide on work track one, please raise their hand or just come up to the mic.

We're really encouraging some feedback in here because any feedback is really insightful. It gives us kind of new areas to go down different avenues, create more ideas and to create the momentum to go forward with.

So just a little bit of background on where we're at today and, say, the (teaser) question number one is certification, and do we use the word certification? If we do, how do people get that certification?

Is a grandfathered? How do we look at it? Does it matter how many TLDs they have? How does it matter on the volume of potential - or registries that they have, their volume, brands versus, say, generic?

How do we deal with those types of things? And if we do go ahead with the certification program, how are the costs going to be looked after? Is it going to be an ICANN recovery type thing or will it be more of a third party body where fees are paid into there and how does that work?

Is a based on volume? Is it based on a yearly fee and how do we encourage best practices? Those are some of the kinds of items that we've already discussed but we're always looking for more insight and more feedback on that.

So if anyone would like to add some more thoughts or feedback on that, that would be wonderful. So I'll open up for feedback.

Avri Doria: I don't see any hands yet. Okay, I'll ask a question said she went with the second, first - second question first. We'll get back to that one. But what we're talking about this RSP program and, indeed, it does seem to matter whether we call it certification or something, and every once in a while the notion came up of having a contract with these people.

And is that something that is reasonable? Is that something people are talking about it do end up creating a new kind of contracted party by doing this or, you know, is a similar to an RAA that has been signed?

Is it just testing? And as such, so I really - you know, I worry when I look at this and sort of say, well, what, are we creating yet another contracted party? Is that what we want to do? Is that the right way to do this or is it something a little more standing back from it?

And so the question that I also ask to folks, when you're looking at something like this, what do you think we're looking at?

Sara Bockey: Yes, during our discussions, Donna often actually put forward some interesting ideas and we asked her to kind of give us an overview of your proposal as a - this is Sara Bockey, by the way - as the starting point for this conversation because she did have some good points and ideas and I see she's come up to the mic, do Donna, if you would like to speak, that would be fabulous.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Sara. Donna Austin from Newstar. Avri, I think one of the concerns that we have when we started talking about RSP accreditation was the idea of a contract and what does that mean? Do we have another contracted party with ICANN?

So the way that, you know, we thought about this is, rather than go down the track of RSP accreditation is the only option, we wanted to look at what are the other possible solutions are the ways that we could potentially break this down and look at it.

I see I'm sideways at the moment. So what is up on the screen is it's a short deck that I put - that we've put together to look at some of those other options. And what we're trying to do is break it down to the five or six questions that we're trying to - or the problems that we're trying to solve.

And one of them is, you know, this continued (predictive) testing and it's not particularly meaningful once in RSP has gone through it, you know, the tenth time. It's not really bringing up anything new so how do we get around that accreditation - sorry, the repetitive PDT testing?

In terms of the application process itself, you know, there was a lot of repetition and that, too, because what seemed to be happening is that the RSPs themselves are actually responding to the questions in the application that would - to (go to) technical competence.   So how do we get around that?

(Steve), could you flick to the next slide please? I'll try to read it from here. So what are the options available to satisfy ICANN that an RSP is technically confident to manage the operation of multiple TLDs?

So, you know, I think the - we've thrown around a few numbers about how many applicants we potentially get for the next round. If it is something like 10,000 and you still only got - you're not going to have 10,000 RSPs.

You're going to have a subset of RSPs to look after that, so how do you measure the confidence in terms of the TLDs that they'll be managing? One

of the - you know, if I go back to accreditation, one of the concerns we had about accreditation is that how can you a credit for an unknown quantity?

So you would know going into a subsequent procedure or a subsequent round how many registries a registry operator would be - sorry, how many registry operations and RSP would be supporting until you get to the end of that kind of application process.

And another problem was so how can ICANN and the RSP engage on that as a security and stability absent a contractual arrangement? And I'll go through some ideas we had on that.

And then one of the other issues that has come up, which is a necessarily relevant to this group, is how can the process to swap out RSPs be more streamlined?

So that's an immediate problem that is creating some challenges, if you want to swap out your backend or, you know, if you want to take control of another registry operation, how do you go through that process because it still - there's a cost involved because of the PDT and the fact that you have to go through that again.

So, (Steve), next slide please. So there are three ideas that we've come up with and that's ICANN proven providers, ICANN certified providers and ICANN post-applicant certified providers.

The next slide, please, (Steve). And I'll just say that, you know, RSP accreditation isn't something that we necessarily disagree with that we want to go through the process of understanding the problems we're trying to solve before we get to that as a - and maybe the solution.

It may be one solution, but we just want the opportunity to explore some others that might be out there as well. So the ICANN proven providers

actually goes to something that Avri said about how do you grandparent in, if you have a new process, how do you grandparent those in that have already been through the process, so those RSPs that already provide services to the TLDs that (are in) operation now?

So we're referring to that as ICANN proven providers. And we're basically, you know, proposing that they've been through the hoops already so there's no need to go through that in a subsequent round.

And in the registry operator wants to use a proven provider, they'll tick that box that, you know, it's been through the hoops before and that's we want to use.

And I'm just going to go through this quickly. People can read through these at their own leisure if they have nothing else to do. Pre-certified providers, so that's a little bit similar - well, actually know, it's the next one that similar - so this one is - ICANN would actually - this is probably similar to accreditation, not really understanding what we mean by accreditation.

But prior to any subsequent round, you could develop specifications that a new entrant who wanted to get into the RSP game could actually pre-certified themselves through a process that is designed by whoever this group decides should - what the specs should be your however we manage that process.

So the - an applicant could actually tick the box that they'll use a pre-certified provider and that would negate - they would go through something that is akin to PTD once. They wouldn't have to go through it again.

And I make it - the registry operator wants to use a new entrant (unintelligible) the pre-certified providers, then they can take that box. Next please, (Steve). And the third one is, ICANN post-application certified providers.

And this is more about, you know, there might be a single applicant who just wants to run the backend themselves and they could choose to go through the process once they get to the - so the technical component becomes part of their application.

They would fill out the questions, undertake PDT if they actually got through the application process and then they could do the PDT kind of in the way it's done today.

So there are kind of three options that would - we think are worth exploring but there hasn't been a discussion within the group about that. (Steve), next slide please.

So the next ones are really about, you know, how are the solutions addressing the problems that we're trying to solve? I can't read that so I'll just skip through it.

But it's pretty much - the first one is about the application process and if you have these three options, it's kind of a tick the box. And with the PDT repetitive testing, if you have these options available, then you should only have to go through PDT ones.

Next please, (Steve). How can ICANN and the RSP engage in matters of security and stability absent a contractual arrangement? Some of you might be familiar with something that the ccTLDs do with ICANN.

They don't have a formal contract but they have an (extension letter) or a framework of accountability, I think it's called, so that could be something that, you know, maybe worthwhile exploring.

The RSP should be nominated by the registry operators, the technical point of contact. So if there are any technical issues that - where ICANN (or)

compliance can send about security and stability that that is the first point of contact that they go to in those cases.

And the other ideas that the RSP will maintain - will remain accountable to the registry operators through the provision of services in accordance with the SLAs and the registry agreement.

So the RSP still has a contractual relationship with the registry operator, not necessarily ICANN but will still be responsible for the SLAs. Go back one, please, (Steve). Thanks.

Options available to satisfy ICANN that an RSP is technically confident to manage the operations and multiple TLDs while also ensuring security and stability of the DNS.

So if you're an ICANN proven provider, we sort of think that by the time an extra round kicks off, you're going to have rounds on the board anyway based on what you've achieved in the last four or five years.

And if there have been any serious problems with the performance that you service that ICANN should have identified those and been dealt with anyway. Pre-certified and post applicant certified providers may be subject to additional testing once it's understood how many registry operators they'll be supporting.

And then the other idea is that all RSPs can voluntarily submit to annual performance testing of some sort. Obviously all the stuff around technical capabilities and stuff would have to be designed or agreed to at some point in time.

And then on the last one, which is just something that is more immediate to what's happening now, is about how do you swap out your backend? It's probably something that needs to go to a working group.

And I think outside of this group, and I think it's something that - I don't know if Francisco is in the room but I know there's another session this week being run by Francisco Arias.

I think it's more directed at that immediate issues and what we're dealing with here in the (terms of) next round.   So if anyone has got any questions, I'm happy to answer them are out just step aside and (you know), sit down.

Avri Doria: Thanks. I just wanted to point out one thing that we have had a conversation at just an abstract level with Francisco and the group about trying to sort of bring the requirements that can talk about here into their view, so that if they do create a program it's not a program that needs to be revised and that so that we can somehow find a solution if that's, indeed, what we're going to do, that satisfies both requirements.

Donna Austin: Yes, it may well be that that work could overtake what we're doing because it's immediate - is an immediate need but who knows?

Avri Doria: That wasn't the impression that I had from talking about schedules but I may be wrong. Okay, I so we had a couple of people in line and so I would say first we'll go to the microphone but we also had (Jeff) and I think it was Michael. I don't have it in front - but please.

Mike Palage: Hi. A quick question for Donna.

Avri Doria: Introduce yourself, please.

Mike Palage: So here's a question I would like to ask the group. Have you thought about just allowing an applicant for a TLD to say I will use, and then let them select at the end once they've actually gotten their contract as part of the pre-delegation testing?

Because if you look at it, it's incredibly inefficient if an applicant - just suppose there are ten applicants for a single string, those ten applicants may or may not have to pay for those answers upfront which is kind of always the money.

If you just let them, and their applications, say we will use an accredited provider, and then after they signed the contract with ICANN before they engage in PDD testing, they'll say, "Here's my contract with an accredited provider."

And what I think is interesting here, and Donna, this goes to your point, you - when I was working with a number of applicants, it was incredibly frustrating. The backend providers kind of have the power and then negotiation because you needed those questions or else you couldn't apply.

To me, I think if you really want to talk about consumer choice and competition, it empowers the registry operator to shop and pick its backend provider after it has its contract in hand and goes to the point that you raised.

Backend provider A may sign on for 100 contracts but may only get five or may only get ten. Once you have your contract in hand, you can then assess, in the marketplace, what backend provider would be best for you.

Now, I know most backend providers want to lock their clients in sooner as opposed to later, but if we are trying to think about consumer choice, it's an interesting way of saving money, streamlining it and empowering registry operators to choose that after the fact.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And that was Mike Palage, the band that did not identify himself before he spoke. I don't know. I thought, Donna, that I had understood you that it was just out checkbox but perhaps you wanted to amplify on that.

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks, Avri. Donna Austin. So, yes, I think it is a checkbox but I think to Mike's point, it's a question for this group about whether, you know, I think we

have had some discussion about the fact that, because of contention sets, whether it's - it works if the applicant identifies the RSP is up front door whether they do that once they know that they've secured the TLD.

So Mike, I think that's a conversation that we have - we did start to have but we haven't finished that conversation yet.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Next - and I was - I've only talk to you on the phone, I think, but Francisco.

Francisco Arias: Hi. This is Francisco Arias from staff. I just wanted to mention that, Monday, as Donna has said, there is a session on RSP certification at 3:15, so you're interested on the topic, please come join us.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I have a bunch of hands up. I've got Jeff Neuman, Michael Flemming and Paul McGrady. So, Jeff, please.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. Thanks, Donna. I think there are a lot of elements of that proposal that I really, really like and I think are helping us to move forward with the subject.

I think - I'm a little unsure at this point as to the designation or the difference between - or why we need to segregate approve and provider from a pre-certified provider.

I think that whatever processes developed for certifying, I'm not sure that necessarily there should be a distinction. I think that, yes, you've been proven to have operated an existing number of TLDs but I think in order for fairness and, you know, nondiscrimination, we might just have a precertification process which existing providers could fly through really quickly because it's done everything before.

I think designating someone as a proven provider creates some sort of implication of preference which I think we need to, as community, kind of avoid just from a fairness standpoint.

But I think that - I like the distinction between more the voluntary nature of you could become pre-certified or wait until after an application is accepted. So that's one.

Two, on the issue of - you had - I think it was the second part where it was having the - oh, it's right here. It still up - having the RSP serve as a technical point of contact with the exchange of letters, I think that's probably the way it should happen in terms of communications because obviously if there's a technical problem, the backend operator is the one probably that's going to solve that are needs to be consulted.

Though, it's interesting from a liability perspective, because you know, it's the registry operator, the one who signs the agreement with ICANN that's on the hook for any breaches caused by the registry service provider.

So it's an interesting dynamic we need to kind of examine a little bit as to, yes, I understand there's an exchange of letters with no liability, is the proposal, but that we're putting liability on the registry operator for issues caused by the registry service provider.

So we just have to work through this. I think it's not insurmountable. We can actually work that out to figure out how that works. I thought - but I think that's a good start for a proposal.

In on your proposal for - yes, when I envision in terms of this group is working out the policy of whether we should have this precertification program and then consulting a group to work on what the criteria should be, whether it's, you know, how it's dealt with outside this group and whether people from this

group want to volunteer for that. I do see that is detail oriented that doesn't necessarily need to be done by our subsequent procedures.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Jeff. I think there is a - there's a slight distinction between the proven provider and the pre-certified provider. And it probably is a little bit nuanced and maybe at the end of the day when you get to the application process, it's not going to matter one way or the other which one you choose.

And I think maybe to Mike's point, you know, if this group decides that you just have to tick the box to say you will use a certified provider, but that you don't make that known until the end of the day because, you know, the possibility that you don't get it approved as an applicant or that, you know, you're in a contention set that takes a long to resolve, that doesn't make sense to identify that up front.

I think that's probably an important discussion for us to have. On the, you know, (extend your letter) stuff, I'm not a lawyer. I'm just trying to be pragmatic and work out some things that we can look at.

And given that the exchange of letters has been used within the CC community I just thought it was good place to start. So, you know, let's try to - I don't know, move on and not have to go throw these questions again. Let's try to make some progress. That would be great. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I've got Michael Flemming and then Paul McGrady and I want to draw line under that one so that we can get to a little conversation on the applicant support. So, Michael.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, Avri. Michael Flemming for the record. I have one statement and then one clarification - question of clarification for Donna. First of all, I kind of wanted to echo what Jeff said on the ICANN proven providers.

To me, the notion here from the title of proven providers is something that kind of creates an unfair process for people - for new RSPs that want to jump into the game.

I know from the 2012 round that there were a lot of RSPs out there and they have a lot more experience now in these past four years but in future subsequent procedures, I think that you'll probably have more RSPs that want to get out there.

And having the title of proven provider may kind of push that sense of competition or give an unfair advantage in a way. And then the - maybe I'm not correctly understanding but ICANN pre-certified providers and ICANN post-application certified providers, I'm assuming that we would only choose one or the other or do we have both - is the idea to have both kind of coexisting?

Because to me they seem - they serve two different very - two very different purposes and pre-certified for me would be, prior to application and then, post-application would be to actually say, hey, you're running your TLD now and you actually have the experience behind that you actually run it for a year and so you're actually certified post-application as well. So that's just - that's my clarification point, so thank you.

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks, Mike. With the - so the post-application one is to acknowledge that you may have, you know, registry operator that wants to run its own TLD but it's not going to go through the process of getting the infrastructure in place first until they know that they have the TLD.

So it gives them the opportunity - it's similar to the process that each applicant went through in the 2012 round and that you had to respond to the technical questions to prove that you had some kind of technical competence and then go through the PDT after you were successful in the evaluation process.

So it just leaves the door still open. And with the - I guess the nuanced difference between the proven provider and the pre-certified provider is that a proven provider doesn't have to do any more PDT or to prove to ICANN that it can actually do the job.

But if you are going to be a new entrant, you still need to prove to ICANN that you can perform certain tasks with some kind of, you know, reliability. So it's just, I think that the distinction that I'm trying to draw here is there are RSPs that have been through the process and do have runs on the board.

If you want to be a new entrant coming in, you are still going to have to prove that you can perform the job and - but it's not supposed to be an inhibitor to a competition. It's just recognizing that you don't have the runs on the board that a proven provider does, is that makes any sense.

Avri Doria: Yes, and Paul.

Paul McGrady: Paul McGrady for the record. As I'm listening to this discussion, and as I've participated in it over the last several weeks, this seems to me to be an area where we could introduce an enormous efficiency into a fairly inefficient system.

And I would think this would reduce the application time for processing and also reduce cost. But I don't know that we've ever asked staff whether or not they agree and whether or not they have a view on how much this would speed up the process and how much it would lower application fees for the next round.

And so I'm just throwing that out there is an idea. Maybe we should make sure this actually will be efficient as we get closer to a final recommendation on this. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I guess, Donna, you've got a response.

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks, Paul. So I think staff actually did a report that's kind of (unintelligible). I think they grew over time and I think that's where the notion of RSP accreditation was something that they supported because of the efficiencies that would come out of it.

Now, it didn't get into the cost recovery model and whether was going to reduce fees but certainly I think from, you know, ICANN's perspective, they felt that RSP accreditation would provide efficiencies within the application and evaluation process.

And it could also serve to overcome some of the, you know, the reality that there were only, I think, it was 12 or 13 RSPs that were doing the bulk of the registry operations and that the PDT did not take into account how many TLDs the RSP was actually supporting.

So I think they wanted to find - they were interested in finding a way that they could test for that as well and I think that's why they thought that RSP accreditation was something that was worthy to, you know, kind of flesh out a little bit more and see what could be done about it. So I think to some extent, staff has done that work.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Okay, so what we heard from the CCT just going to the other - the applicant support, you know, we arty got some feedback that sort of said, you know, developing economy applications lagged.

And perhaps applicant support as part of the process, but I wanted to give it back to you to quickly go through that. We've almost reached the break time but I wanted to give a little bit of time to get more discussion on that.

Woman: Yes, so you heard (Jonathan) talk earlier on some of the insights there from AM global consulting and obviously there are a bunch of concerns around

there. So, so far to date, the discussions have kind of gone around mostly kind of focusing on the AM global consulting aspects of things and why it did or did not work.

And if we actually going kind of take a quick (boo) at that, we have a whole bunch of people that didn't find out about the program until it was way too late.

And if they did find out about it, it was through their personal networks or they didn't find out through the proper sources and they didn't have the right information.

A bunch of them had - there was some negative publicity that made them more weary of it and I think one of the most interesting comments were from two participants that, quote, "There were too many products on the market and that too many were not liable, making them more skeptical about participating in a future new gTLD round," end quote.

And then finally, they had some advice for future rounds and that was clearly have a better outreach program, better communications, increased focus on timelines, improved market conditions, how-to seminars and details on application and running costs.

And while we always - the program was really focused around the application cost itself, there was nothing really addressed around the ongoing costs. So, again, I'll - and want to be the person talking here.

We're really here to get your feedback again and get different points of view on it. So I'll open up the floor to any other insights or thoughts that we can add to the conversation going forward.

Avri Doria: Thanks. I want to make two points. One, there have been some comments in the chat that we didn't necessarily get addressed here. They'll all be retained

and fed into the work process, so you don't want to speak, feel free to write a comment there but it won't necessarily get right out depending on the time.

Paul, I'm assuming that's a new hand or is that an old hand? Okay, I see (Mary) has a hand up. No, that's an old hand for (Mary) probably telling me earlier that there were people with comments that I should read out. So does anybody have anything to say about this? Not at all? You have a comment, please?

(Steve):   This is (Steve) from staff. I just want to note that not everyone in the room - physically in the room is necessarily in the AC room but I've been trying to drop some of the links to the reports that have been mentioned by Donna. I'll - in a second,

I'll put the one that was just mentioned by Christa. I'll try to get all these into the AC room. So it's helpful if you login, if you want to have access to these links, so just a procedural question - statement. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Yes, it is useful and there is a good conversation going on there about, you know, accreditation and cost of implementation and such. But - so what do people think about the connection between applicant support and developing economy application and the other issues that were brought up? Please. Remember to introduce yourself.

Vanda Scartezini: Vanda Scartezini for the record. So some of those - I have the opportunity to - following many applicants in Brazil and I would like to make some points about the underserved regions here.

And most of them really would like to have some kind of support like Donna said, you know, accredited people that they can just address. The idea of Mike, I believe will help a lot because most of them have no real clue about what to do and then they want to participate but they certainly will need some

time to select the correct support and have this list (good) and not to pay in advance for really respond to everything before.

It's something that is - also will help. But the most important part of my (unintelligible) and Latin America was the idea that most of them would like to have a chance to enter in a new round because they have no information from the first round.

There was no real promotion in our region to - for the first round so it was more one by one people that you know, so we got some - few only applicants. So I do believe that the idea to have more facilities for those in the regions and maybe just make some solutions for those regions - could be interesting for both sides.

May be other - in the United States or Europe or more developed areas will not need more facilities. They are aware about what they need to do but maybe most of those suggestions could be applied in the next round just for those regions. Just some thoughts about - thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you, and thank you for linking the two sides of the question. I've got Rubens. I've got (Jeff) and then I've got (a hand). Okay. So - and then I'll draw the line (Andre), because I know that be time to take a break. So, Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks, Avri. Rubens for the record. I would like to point out that most - I hear a lot about the program - applicant support program not having achieving their goals and serving underserved regions.

But that could be some correct decisions by perspective (hedged) operators to not ask for support because applicant support was only about offsetting in the (initial phase).

And if they look at the ongoing costs or the ongoing demand they could reach or their ongoing sales capacity, considering there are - there is a very low number of (ICANN connected) to registers and Latin America and Africa, they could just have made the right sound business decision not to apply.

So we shouldn't just take for granted that, if the applicants part program work groups have more. We might have not.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, this is Jeff Neuman and maybe it's a question for Vanda Scartezini. Is our goal with the applicant support program to ensure diversity both of the frontend operations as well as the backend operations or is it just to ensure diversity along the frontend?

The reason I ask that is because the accreditation program doesn't necessarily mean that it's - will have more operators, more technical backend operators in the global south.

It just means that we will have potentially more of the frontend of the registries in the global south. And so is that also something we should be considering?

Vanda Scartezini: Well, I believe this is a process that will take time to get those regions to be completely, you know, balanced with the others. So that is the first step to go through this process and this is the front end, that is important now, and certainly they will develop some facility for those backend in those regions. But to allow them to start the process, we need some facilities for the front end. That's my point of view.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And I have one more at the microphone, please.

Man: Hello. I'm from Argentina, from the IPC. Well, in my perspective, I am a
              (trade) lawyer - in my perspective, along the time I could check that basically
              the problem is an economic problem because the size of the economy of - I
              speak basically about South America, is the size of the economy is really
              smaller.

              The cost of the round - the previous round was really high for the capacity -
              the economic or financial capacity of the companies that we have in South
              America.

              On the other hand, basically the typical potential applicant is a brand owner of
              the region. In this case, maybe they have a more global perspective because
              there are some trademarks that come from South America and that are
              global.

              But these people, these companies, have no knowledge about the system of
              a domain - the gTLDs. For this reason, I think that it will be important to have
              a kind of a roadshow or some kind of special attention to show the new
              round, it could be in a trademarks meeting or in business meetings that we
              have in the region.

              And on the other hand, for other kinds of applicants like you should know that
              in South America there are many companies that are state owned. In this
              kind of a governmental (unintelligible), the way to attract them is not in the
              same lines that the private company can be attractive. That means that
              maybe ICANN should also pay attention to this part of state companies that
              are very big.

Avri Doria: Thank you. At this point I want to say we've really just touched the beginning
              of some of these discussions but - well, except with Donna's proposal. We
              did go fairly deeply. I want to encourage those of you that are interested in
              the topic to get involved in the work track where a lot more discussion will be
              had.

And I want to thank you for bringing up the issues and for continuing to lead that. At this point, I would like to say that we're on a 15 minute break. We will start exactly at 15 minutes which is on the hour, 4:00 pm, and (Jeff) will be chairing the second half of this meeting. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: This is the one minute warning, so if everyone could please take this time to get back to your seats so we can start this up. It's already two minutes past when I said I was going to start.

If everyone can start making their way back to their seats, we've got 45 seconds. If your name is Avri Doria, you can come up to the front. Okay, this is Jeff Neuman. Do we have to check to see if we are starting the recording? Did we stop it or - we're good. Okay. Thank you. Got the thumbs up.

All right, this is Jeff Neuman. This is the second half of our session. We just finished going through work track one. We're going to have a discussion period on some issues with work track two.

Given how long the work track one went and we didn't quite make it through or have an equal amount of time, I've asked Michael Flemming to kind of prioritize some of the issues for work track two which is a big category. So I'm going to hand it over to Michael Flemming who's going to give a very brief - important for us that you come to the mike or speak your mind, thanks.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, Jeff. Michael Flemming for the record. Oh, so I'm the coach here for Work Track 2. We have another coach here for the Buckingham list, unfortunately unable to be with us today.

However, for the first topic, mainly we've kind of nicknamed this one, Registry Agreement, our single registry agreement versus category-based registry agreements.

Kind of some background knowledge is that there's been a lot of talk for additional a lot of support for category-based registry agreements. Those geared towards Brand TLDs as well as those for community. TLDs verifications - the list go for categories goes on.

Geographic TLDs is one of the bigger ones as well. Initially we had a lot of support in this area and after moving on towards discussion, we found that there was actually - that it's kind of divided actually at the current time. There's a lot of pros and cons for keeping the single-based registry agreement, but at the same time we haven't been able to grab the core discussion points at this point, so what I have done is we have - we've asked a lot of groups actually. The Brand registry agreed for example as well as the recently formed gTLD group to kind of offer their position on this issue.

So I just want to kind of open the floor. I know that some of the groups have already discussion, or provided their position to us. But I'm just going to leave this - give them time to kind of provide what they have to say.

So I'm going to open the floor and it looks like Martin Sutton from the BRG, Brand Registry Group, is already well to jump on this exciting conversation.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Michael Flemming. So I think this is a - it does get quite complex in terms of some of the questions that evolved out this debate that have been had. But I would like to obviously focus more on the brands because that's what I'm familiar with.

And I think just to address some points on here that in this 2012 realm, the marketplace evolved quite considerably and we saw more diversity which is great.

So we've actively encouraged that. I think with the introduction of Brands, we saw a significant number. So I think where we can identify collectively a proportion of registries that have a distinct model, and where the existing

base agreement doesn't reflect that model, we should be learning from this process and adapting that agreement for future application windows.

When I look at Brands themselves, there's a lot of differences that need to be drawn out. I think some are very familiar, but the current base agreement was built on the traditional model of distributing and selling domain names.

That isn't the case with Brand TLDs - it's very much a closed environment, it's for their purpose and they all see registrant themselves. So a lot of the protective provisions put in for registrants do not apply within the Brand TLD Registry.

So, there are some examples, at least - there's probably quite a few more in terms of distribution of domain names as well, the provisions account for, so where there is some distinct differences, I would prefer that there would be a base agreement that reflect that for that particular category.

It does need to be well defined though, and I do think that needs to be a substantive volume to account for that deviation for the base agreement.

Michael Flemming: Thank you Martin Sutton. We also have Alan Greenberg with his hand up as well as Susan Payne and then (Stephanie) - I'm sorry, I'm not seeing the last name. I'm sorry, Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I just want to make sure I understand. In the current - in this round, the first round we did not have categories. We dogmatically refused to have categories. But we did have different - I don't remember what the word was - classes or something.

You know there were community TLDs and there were various ones and the registry agreements ended up to reflecting that and reflecting the GAC advice on certain TLDs where there were certain safeguards that had to be added for some TLDs.

So really what we're talking about here is not that we're going to have tailored registry agreements but we will have the stock registry even when we start with each one will be tailored, so there will be less specific tailoring as we go forward.

The net results is the same, I think. It just amounts to how clean it is to create the final agreement for each TLD. Do I have that correct - my understanding or am I missing something?

Jeff Neuman: Let's go to - sorry this is Jeff Neuman - let's go to the other speakers, I think they may answer some of your questions. And one of the questions I want to throw out after as well is, you know, aside from being a different type of TLD, what are some of the - I mean you did mention some of the provisions that you would have.

But how does that outweigh - ICANN - one of the arguments that's been raised of ICANN has a contract management function and how does having separate agreements.

How does that counterbalance with the need of ICANN to do contract management. That's come up in our group.

So maybe Alan just reserve your question to see some of the other arguments I expect to hear and then bring it up again if it doesn't get answered.

Michael Flemming: Next will go to Susan Payne.

Susan Payne: Thank you, Susan Payne (unintelligible) for the record. Yes, I think I'm probably going to come to the point that Alan was just raising. I think it does make it cleaner. In the first round - again talking about Brands because I

thought I've got a bit of experience on dealing with some of the Brand applicants.

We ended up either effectively having the base agreement and then having to carve out certain sections of it so that - so that we were able to do it in Specification 13 that were inapplicable or to create, you know.

It's under the definition of what a Brand is and then sort of say, if you're a Brand then this provision around termination doesn't apply.

And I think it would be cleaner to recognize that from the outset. And it maybe that there are other catch (presets) that have the same kind of concern.

I don't think we're talking here necessarily about some whole new contract that is completely different. You know, there are also sorts of things in the contract that Brands and others don't like, but if it's something that everyone would be saying is relevant to them. No one likes the indemnity provisions.

But there is no particular reason why Brands have a special place - I don't think I'd make a relation to those, but there are some provisions which really don't make a great deal of sense.

If you're a Brand registry that's not selling names to the public and so there isn't this kind of protection of the third party registrant issue in the same way and therefore it makes sense to have tailored amendments to what otherwise is a the standard base agreements.

And we've just actually had tailored amendments in three (discurrent) prices. For things like, you know, people making an application for a code of conduct exemption or for specifications that seem to apply.

So to the extent that it requires some management from my current contracting functions, they've been having to do that anyway. But at least

we're all acknowledging out front and you're applying for the right form of applications, using the right registry and not having to argue afterwards about things that should or shouldn't apply to you.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, Susan Payne. I have Stephanie Duchesneau and then Annebeth.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Stephanie Duchesneau at Google. This may be a detailed point at this stage in the conversation, but if we're looking at this in terms of registry models, I would encourage us to at least think about whether we should be broadening the scope from Dot Brands to also include applications that are otherwise or (FCC) exempt.

Because while there are some distinction between the two, I think the business models and the considerations that have been brought forth, things like the lack of (unintelligible) and necessity for the same registrant protection, the considerations where the registry and the registrant had the same entity, and having a different model around the sale or non-sale of domain names apply in both cases.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, (Stephanie). Sorry for butchering your last name. Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Annebeth Lange from (unintelligible). So I'm a sitting guest here. I am the co-chair in that the (UNCP) with (Heather) and I'm sorry I wasn't here when you talked about that issue.

I had to go out for a while. But I have two comments to discuss in the Work Tract 2, if I may. The one thing you have been discussing here about categories. I think it's a really good idea. It was placed over the in 2009 in Seoul by (Trump Chapel), and we discussed it over and over and tried to find a solution because already then we saw that GTLDs are no longer generic TLDs as such.

You can't say that the brand TLD is actually a generic name. So it might be other considerations in both perhaps in the applications, rather than also in the context. That doesn't necessarily mean that you should have different contracts for every applicant - of course not.

But perhaps more categories than we have today. As we say in the CC world - one size doesn't it all. There are different considerations that I think that the whole community would benefit from.

It would be less conflicts afterwards and what we try to do is to make this process now to go faster than it did the last time. The next question - my question is - you're talking about consensus when we talked about the applicant guide book in 2012, that that is default from the times that you can't find a better solution or a consensus for a new way to think.

So then the next question will be consensus from whom. I know that this is a PDP for the (genocele) and ultimately will probably be the (genus) of council.

But the view from the last rounds that even if that was the case last time, it took several years afterwards with different views from the rest of the stakeholders and Heaven and I know that how difficult in the (first) community working group to find a consensus for a common framework with the geographical name.

Actually, we have different opinions and that go from the left to the right - very different. So, I think the whole community would benefit largely and get this process much quicker in place if we could try to find a consensus that some have to give from all parts. That's what I wanted to bring into the process. Thank you.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, Annebeth. And I'm going to close the que now. Next we have Paul McGrady then Kristina Rosette and Martin Sutton as well.

Paul McGrady: Paul McGrady for the record. I think that there is an important about the word - generic - in this context. It's an old word, I assume it's an engineering word.

The global domain's division has already renamed itself. I think that (Genius) though should consider renaming itself to the global names for the organization and let's go on with getting rid of that word which makes no sense in our context anymore.

I don't know who you suggest that to, but whoever is in charge writing the by-laws in the room, let's think about doing that. Alan Greenberg used a great word - he said we dogmatically refuse to recognize categories.

Dogmatic is a great word for that because sometimes the dog might can get in the way of reality. There were in fact categories in those categories manifested themselves.

We wasted a lot of time dogmatically not recognizing categories and the Specification 13 negotiations were slowed down by months and months which has delayed the program.

Everybody can play into the dot brands aren't out there implementing well. We were slowed down by months and months by dogmatically not recognizing categories. So hopefully we won't make that same mistake in this next round.

And again, even the concept of less tailoring presupposes that everybody will end up wearing the same suit but it'll just fit slightly differently. I don't think that that is the case.

I think we can all get our suits tailored at the end, but there's huge difference between a tuxedo and a track suit and you guys can decide who's in the tuxedo and whose in the track suit.

But again, this notion of at the end of the day we'll start at different places but we'll end up in the same brown suit. I don't think that that's necessarily the case and I think that that's some of the old thinking that may slow down this process again for Round 2.

And then lastly I can't argue manages more than one kind of contract. Right, we've got registries, we've got registrars and even if we weren't living in that world where ICANN wasn't managing different types of contracts, they're incredibly intelligent people and I can't staff who are more than capable of doing that.

So I don't think being concerned about whether or not staff can keep it all straight should be an issue. Staff does a great job keeping it all straight. Thank you.

Michael Flemming: Okay, thank you, (Christina).

Kristina Rosette: I'm Kristina Rosette, Amazon Registry, and I would just say that I come at this from a slightly different perspective because we have contracts that are your standard registry agreement.

We have contracts that have Spec 13 and we have at least one contract that has the Code of Conduct exemption. What I'm really kind of not clear on and I will need some clarity on this to really get it is what do you get from separate different registry agreements that you don't get from a standard registry agreement with specifications.

And I guess what I'm also looking at from the perspective of an applicant who is in the space to innovate our business models have changed - are changing - will continue to change.

And just to pick up on an example that Martin Sutton gave, spec 13 specifically says, "For example, that only the registry operator is the affiliate's words framework licensees can register domain names".

If I decided the outset that Amazon Registry Services, Inc. is going to be the only registrant, and then two years later I decide, well you know maybe I want to let the other Amazon affiliates register names too. What's the process for that?

What's the process if later on and I decide I want to also have trademark licensees. I'm just - I'm very leery of creating this scenario where every time a registry wants to change its business model within the permitted confines of the registry agreement, that they're going to have to go to ICANN and amend their registry agreement because they had to pick at the outset - I want this one.

Whereas now we kind of have for lack of a better word kind of this sushi menu. You know, you can have your standard registry agreement and if Spec 13 applies, you can have that and if Spec 9 applies you can have that.

And that - I guess it just gets back to my original point. I don't get what the problem is with continuing with that model.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Martin Sutton. So my point wasn't to respond to that initially but I think one point that I would raise from Brands that are coming in that don't have the diversity of models that perhaps somewhat like Amazon will have.

Still have to go through their internal contractual process and to have to try and redefine the core contract like referring back to those specifications, when the core contract doesn't really reflect the model that they're entering into where it is very much the provision is based on taking the registrant, distribution of domain names.

It's going to make it far more simpler for them to go through the process, adopt a registry agreement more tailored to their model and not scare them off and put them into lengthy negotiations which is what we saw with some of the negotiations with respect thereto in the first place.

So then there is just one example of why it might be smoother for those that don't have the diversities beyond the Brand registry. And the other thing I was going to mention was that the Brand Registry Group who are actually trying to prepare an agreement that interjects this Spec 13 language.

So it looks and feels much more like it's designed for a Brand to look at so that we can see how simple this is hopefully. But it doesn't detract away from what all the provisions are existing in the document already.

So it maintains a very same sort of format, language but actually it integrates the Specification 13. So hopefully that will make it a bit easier to digest and understand what we're talking about here and it's not negotiating a brand new contract that could take months and months of negotiations with ICANN.

Michael Flemming: Thanks Martin Sutton. Alan I didn't even que - we close and we're going to get onto the next issue, otherwise we'll never get through this whole thing.

Alan Greenberg: Real quick, all right real quick. Just to summary, before the new GTLD process, we had what - 15 roughly 15 registry agreements. Each of them was written by hand completely. You couldn't hold them up to the light to see the similarity.

ICANN naturally reacted to that and said we want a single agreement and now has an extensive amount of redlining for each particular agreement. It sounds like what we need is something in between - whether it's a Chinese menu - pick one from column A and one from column B.

But essentially a standard contract which is - you can then omit and/or delete certain sections based on the category and, you know, you don't have varying text if it's all the same, but you decide which sections are applicable and which are not.

So I think this is the case of pendulum swinging and we need to find one in the middle.

Michael Flemming: Thanks (Allan) and in the original policy was that there would be one base agreement, so that's what we're exploring is the notion of changing that.

This has been a good discussion on the base agreement and it's interesting because the tone of this discussion was a lot different than the past discussions that we have in the working groups.

So I'm glad and look forward to see what Martin Sutton has and the BRTs going to propose. I know that there was also a geographic TLD proposal but I do not try see anyone from that group here right now.

So what's that - no - oh, (Derrick) is here. No - oh there you are. Sorry (Derrick) I didn't see you back there.

(Derrick): But we haven't finished that yet now. So I can't tell you anything about it at the moment.

Michael Flemming: Okay, (Derrick), and then - I would suggest also keeping in mind, you know, what Christina said. I thought that was a pretty good summary as to what do you really get from having a separate agreement.

I think that's a good question to answer and, you know, this group - we obviously are not done on this issue by any stretch.

So if you want to go onto the - we're going to go a little out of order of the way that the questions are phrased from earlier.

Man: So Michael Flemming in again for the record, thank you.

Michael Flemming: So I wanted to kind of touch up on the continuing operations instrument and where we are at with this at the current time. Honestly we haven't even touched on this in the core group.

Our bi-weekly meetings at the current time - it's a completely new subject with no initial discussion at this current time.

However, I think this is the best opportunity for us. So I'm just going to echo the three questions that we're asking. Do we still need the emergency back in registry operator function? If so what are their options - are they to fund the (everall) functions and also at some point.

I'm sorry - there are for some registries the continuing operations instrument does not really seem to provide much of a - well how can I say this - it's best not to have it for example or it's not necessary to protect the public interest in some ways if it, for example, it's for a Brand GLD or for TLDs that have an exemption to the Code of Context for the (Era).

So I'm just going to open the floor, answer any of these questions. Christina go ahead please.

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, Amazon Registry. I was actual in private practice during the application round and I - so I'm coming at it from that perspective. I think in my experience and that of many of the other folks that I talked to that were outside of the industry advising new applicants.

The problem was that the requirements were extraordinarily challenging to meet because of the way in which they were drafted and I know that there

had been from time to time during the application process, discussion about the possibility of saying, you know, we're going to sit down and figure out for the top 20 countries from which we got applications and from which we anticipate we'll get applications or whatever number.

Here is the standard COI language that will be acceptable to us. And you can change that number to 30 countries or 40 or whatever. But if you have a standard model that has in fact been reviewed in consultation with the banks that are actually being called upon, I think you're going to really cut out all a good part of the friction that this process created.

You also have a situation that I think others in this room might be able to speak to more aptly where, you know, the applicant itself was a financial institution then that put it in even a more awkward position.

I guess where I'm going with this is that I'm not convinced of the need to eliminate the COI requirement quite yet, but what I do think is that if it is retained, the process for getting one has to be a lot less painful than it was last time.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, I have Rubens in the que as well.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl for the record. On the question on why the TLDs require (everall) or not - some points for me to look at. One is that not all Brand TLDs have created equal - there are Brand TLDs that are used for their registry owner, some that are owned by registry related (parches) like dealers, channels, (unintelligible) so forth.

There are some brands TLDs could even give domains to their customers and it makes every one of their customers a possible (hedgment), so those three conditions require possibly different protections from (unintelligible) with respect to including (everall).

Also if there was currently used also to address main collision issues. So if (hedge) operator doesn't comply with ICANN request to solve a main collision issue, ICANN plan B is actually treating (unintelligible) activation. So that is independent of whether (hedge) to fail or not. Because (Hedge) didn't comply with these options. So there is more to it than just (considerate). That's what my point.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, Rubens. Martin Sutton.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Michael Flemming. Martin Sutton, I'm - so just (absorbing) some of the comments about experiences in the round. (Our) was an applicant and for a fun entry she should say that this hurt pretty hard all the way through the process for what was relatively a low value piece of paper.

So I would echo that that the thought doesn't need to be revisited as a whole to see how better it can be, administered or different forms of a COI can be applied.

In terms of the Brands, Rubens' got some good points there. I think understanding fully the purpose behind that because I think the underlying purpose was more about registrant protection.

And even if you hand out as a Brand, lots of domains to your customers is like me as a bank handing out bank accounts. As soon as I failed, it all closes down anyway.

So that would just be another element of what be wound down. So I still then see that as a registrant issue, because it will still be there that the brand TLDs as the registrant.

So I still think that there is certainly a large scope to explore the brand TLDs further to see how relevant that is. Does the purpose actually get addressed

for dot brands or is it irrelevant. In which case, can we remove those irrelevant components.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, Martin Sutton. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, this is Jeff Neuman. So now that we have a couple of years of operation under our belt, yes we're been against the role that (everall) was expanded but none of that funded by the TLDsv--that's funded by ICANN.

So the fact that it was expanded - I don't see as truly relevant for our purpose because we don't - TLDs don't really fund that. I guess my question is - why are we making an assumption that the COI is the only way to fund.

I know Paul - I remember the meeting where Paul McGrady had proposed different type of insurance type model. Didn't go over well. Already McGrady opposed the insurance model pointing out that the dot brands would be applying in a much better risk position than did old school generic terms, second level (TOB) salesman.

So just would like to correct the record before it spins out of control. It was a wonderful (Gorbachev) moment in my life where I tried to bring peace and order.

Michael Flemming: Yes, so the question is whether there are other models ultimately that could perform the same function since we've seen again, like I said there has been four years since we've been delegating TLDs - at least three and a half or over three years since we started delegating TLDs.

There has not been one incidence of using in the (everall) yet there's now hundreds of COIs out there that are doing nothing. So to the extent that we have some operation under our belt, is there some other model we could use in order to fund the potential of having any (everall) that has to come up and

protect against registry failure. That's my question that I throw out there - I don't have an answer for that.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, Jeff. I also have Jon Nevett. Hope I said that correctly.

Jon Nevett: Jon Nevett, I think you got it right here - we are being very inefficient as a community in the COI funding. Right, the (everall) function makes sense.

You know, you have a failsafe in case there is a problem with the registry. There's someone that can come in and take over. That - I think that makes good sense. I think we should continue that.

But the funding of the COI has just been absolutely ridiculous in its inefficiency in that every single registry - all 1900 applicants had to put in or commit to a COI of the full value of what happens if they go down.

And if you just think of that in pure numbers how much money is just sitting there being wasted because of the potential with our years of service already understood is very, very low. There's going to be some issue.

So to, you know, whether Paul wants to avoid the insurance model or not, there's actuarial understanding that not everyone is going to go down at the same time. In fact, very few will go down, if ever.

So how do we fund that level of service for an (everall) and what model, I think, is the question and quite simply if you just take some money - a pool of funds and put it away for an (everall) fund, for a rainy day, we can get away with just doing away with this COI.

We don't need it - we just need that (overall) funding set up. Where are we going to get. Let's figure out what the budget would be to do that. Maybe it's three - five million dollars, I don't know.

Maybe that's something that we can refer to the auction proceeds committee for example. You know for consumer protection we put $5 million of that $250 million into a fund for the (overall) and that to defend and protect consumers going forward that will be fully funded. We don't need to worry about that.

Maybe it's excess application fees. From this round probably little less applicable, but auction proceeds might be a good place to do that. Either way, we just need a fund to fund the (overall) and not deal with all the complexities that both ICANN had to go through and we all had to go through as applicants dealing with COIs. Thank you.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, Jon. Simon, please go ahead.

Simon McCalla: I'm Simon McCalla. We are one of the (overall) fathers, so we speak with a bit of experience and I was reflecting on Jeff's comments about four years with no live (overall) fail over which is a great success for the detailed E program.

What I would say is that we would welcome a debate and discussion about all sort of methods in funding it absolutely.

Certainly we need a technical function underneath there underpinning it in the same way having an ambulance - a marathon race is important just because it gives the competitors confidence and we say the same within the (guiness).

We see fluctuations and we see challenges. Could potentially one may result in a real (overall) event. So I think it's important to have that reassurance of having a backup. It's only in terms of the money that comes through (overall) provided it barely it washes its face if you are a provider.

Jeff will know this - he was part of some of the discussions. So we don't make any money off being E-bay providers.

I think we all do it because we think it's the right thing to do for the broader community. So we still firmly believe it's an important function. Thanks.

Michael Flemming: Thank you Simon. I also put myself in the que but I suppose I can go last. I'm just going to close the que as it is within the need of time. Paul, please go ahead first.

Paul McGrady: Paul McGrady, so just to be clear this (overall) discussion and the risks and the funding of it remaining with ICANN is because it remains with ICANN. Right, right now if your back-end registry fails, you get to be assigned an (overall) provider by ICANN.

You don't have any control really over who that provider might be. So we have this risk thing that appears to be a collective risk. It's not at all clear to me why a registry operator can't make their own (overall) provider and settle up the risk between that private provider and the registry operator and make it the (overall) provider's problem about the risk instead of centralizing all the risk with ICANN.

So as we go down this path, I think we should take a look at the model to see if the model needs to be fixed so that we're not pooling risk all with ICANN rather than we're may or perhaps where it should go if we take a different model.

I'm not advocating for it but I'm just saying it, we don't need to treat the (everall) as, you know, some sort of holy doctrine that we can't look at.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, Paul. And lastly I just wanted to comment on my personal capacity - Michael Flemming from a GML (Reiss) Consulting. Even with my own Brand - even with my own clients, the LLC itself has been a painful and very - I wouldn't say torture, but you can think of it that way.

For a lot of our clients, you know, ICANN has introduced new advising banks for example and having to change the LLC for - in order to allow for that language to be input into the LLC has actually created cost for our clients as well.

The model I think needs to change because it's putting cost on our clients that aren't even in the registry agreement itself. But that's just my two cents. I just wanted to thank everyone for their feedback and unfortunately we are out of time, so we're going to remove reserve names for another day.

Jeff Neuman: Hi, this is Jeff Neuman. I think what we'll do is we'll go to Work Track 3 and then 4 and if we don't have any issues for the parking lot, we might come back to reserve names. So we're Track 3 - hi Robin - how are you.

Those of you that aren't aware, we initially had two co-chairs for Work Track 3. One is (Karen Day) who is just not with us today - wasn't able to make the trip. And then we had another co-chair who unfortunately had to drop, but Robin has graciously taken over that role as co-chair of Work Track 3.

So I'm going to turn it over to Robin.

Robin Gross: Okay thanks Jeff. Okay so a couple of the questions that we're going to be working on in WorkTrack 3, we've already gone over them in a little bit of detail earlier, but the first one has to do with - do we want something like rounds, or batches or first-come-first serve process, if we're going to do new GTLDs again.

So a couple of proposals have come forward along these lines. One would be starting with one or two rounds to handle pent up demand and then moving to a first-come first-serve process to handle subsequent applications.

Another possibility that's been discussed is more of a hybrid approach whereby there's a predictable schedule of rounds per year and public comments and objections procedures would be held on those.

So those are two of the possible scenarios that have been discussed and what we need to think about and talk about will be what is the impact on strength contention processes and objections with these different sorts of scenarios.

So we just want to really open it up here for comment and question and feedback, particularly getting people's experiences. In your view what are some of the foreseeable impacts to strengthen contention and object processes with either one of these choices.

And how should these factors be weighed. Should the community decide first what application acceptance methodology will be used in subsequent procedures and then deal with the downstream issues.

Or should the effects and resolution of these issues such as strength contention be fully dealt with in order to drive the application methodology.

So we just want open this up here and really get some feedback from people about what you guys think might be a way to proceed among these different options and what some of the different factors would be for choosing among them.

So if we could get a que and get some people interested and giving us some feedback about how we should proceed or what some of these impacts - some of these concerns could be - that would be very helpful. Anyone.

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff Neuman. Michael Flemming and Paul, your hands are up but I think it's left over, right. Oh that's okay. I'll put myself in.

Michael Flemming: So this is an interesting discussion, right, because if you think about the notion of communities in general. The only reason communities became a topic in this last round was for priority purposes in case of a contingent.

If we go to a first-come first-serve model where we take out any contention, cause obviously by definition the first one in that qualifies gets the string. Is there even a need to have a community-based TLD? What other purpose to community-based TLDs serve? It's an interesting one to throw out there.

Robin Gross   Anybody want to speak to these issues about how to proceed and what some of the implications could be for strength contention? What would be wrong with the first-come first-serve process?

We do that now with GTLDs. Yes, please go ahead.

(Jose Ganus):   Hello, this is (Jose Ganus) from the GAC. So I'm also a guest here in a way. I think that on this issue of whether we go for first-come-first serve or we go for more regulated approach to certain exempts. We have to bear in mind that we're talking about cross resources.

Every top level domain is unique so probably a first-come-first-serve puts a (lead) at the side of the road too many people who may have a stake, may have an interest in the (string) in question.

Be it the community-based applications and there I would like to make a little bit of a publicity to the consular of Europe study which has been circulated - I think recently to the community and to which give some recommendation for future expansions of the TLD space.

But there are also other interests - be it trademark, be it geographic names, be it other sensitive names where other interest holders may have a stake and where probably you need some kind of process where your allow these people to come forward and to make their interests known and that leads us

to certain exempts, almost inevitably to shrink objections to procedures to resolve that kind of disagreements on who has the best stake for specific strengths. So thank you very much.

Woman: Robin, I just want to let you know that there is four names. I don't know if you're follow - oh, you are following that.

Robin Gross: Okay, thank you. As (Every) pointed out we've got que forming here in the Adobe Connect and I see a line up there as well. So let's go with the four in the Adobe Connect first. We've got Alan Greenburg, (Susan Payne Payne), (Stephanie) and I can't see her last name there, I'm sorry and Michael Flemming and then we can. Okay, Alan.

Woman: Okay, I'm going to sit there until the four people are done.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Alan Greenberg. On community TLDs you're correct that the prime benefit was precedence over non-community. It's not intuitively clear however by the time we finish -- that's the only thing that a community TLD might do.

It might end up with different rules. There may be all sorts of different things. So I don't think we can discard community at this point even if we end up with a first-come first-serve.

I think the largest problem with first-come first serve is it opens up the door to potentially vast amounts of speculation and I find that really troublesome of people applying for TLDs not cause they want them, but hope that they can then through good business or extortion make a lot of money. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Alan, if I could just ask a follow-up question on that. So do you - would you suggest that there - we - in a sense take neither of these approaches or only rounds - no sort of hybrid.

Alan Greenberg: First-come first-serve has a whole bunch of problems in my mind. The process we're going through right now as painful as it is, recognizes that we may not get it perfect next time either.

And rounds have an opportunity to change the rules, whereas on a first-come first-serve basis, we're almost saying, "Hey, we're going to shut the door tomorrow - close down for a year and a half while we rethink it. And that's problematic in its own right.

If we ever get to the point where when we open up a round a few people apply, then maybe it's time to go to work a first-come first serve just as we are with registrar agreements right now.

But I don't think we're anywhere near there and the fact that we are spending so much time with so many issues on our table tells us we think lots of people think we got things wrong the first time. And there's no way we're going to get it perfect the second time.

Robin Gross   Thanks Allan. Okay, next in the que we have Susan Payne Tang.

Susan Payne Xian Tang: Thanks, I'll be really quick to let other people have a chance. In relation to a fully open process, I think we could potentially - we would potentially see or we could see a problem with the objection processes.

And I think this is partly going to what (Jorge) was saying which is - in this round in relation to things like (two-carrots) two names at the second level which is not the same issue.

But we've seen real problems where the GAC has been complaining frequently about the resource levels in following what's happening and then tracking applications for release.

And consequently, as a result of that we've had a lot of conflicts and tension and repetitive GAC advice coming in kind of slowing the process and putting a hold to things.

And I think that would be exacerbated if we had a fully open process where I think many governments would find it extremely difficult to be constantly monitoring what's been applied for and so some kind of window process of some form, whether it be round or whether it's this kind of hybrid gives at least a foot of finite period when government with limited resources could be monitoring.

And I actually think that potentially cause some brand owners could also be useful as well. I mean I think if you're still thinking about whether I've got a legal right subjection issue, but will see many brands and as - do watch services for their trademarks and domain names, they can do it.

But it would - I think - speaking of a former Brand and I think it would be really handy for me if I knew I had only to keep a watch for a one month period, and then I could have a bit of a break and then I can have another look in six months' time. So I think it's something to think about.

Robin Gross   Thank you. Okay next in the que is (Stephanie).

(Stephanie Dishno):   (Stephanie Dishno) at Google. I do think that there are some issues around, pinned up demands given the fact that we've been four years now since the close of the last window and as (Jonathan's) last presentation pointed to earlier, there was a lot of lack of awareness at the start of the program about the application process itself and even the different models that were available to registries for operating a registry.

And the points that Susan Payne raised are interesting as well but I think these are just like pretty minor considerations. I really do not understand the

arguments that have been made here around how transitioning to a first-come first-serve model would bring different sets of applicants to the table.

I still think it's the case that even if something is based upon Windows or Rounds or whatever you want to call it, there still is a first-come first-serve component to it.

You still have to be - still the parties participating in the earlier round have an advantage and you are only aware of the parties at the closure of that round. So more is a speculation - I don't understand the connection between first-come first-serve and speculation.

I don't understand how those two are related and from a Brand perspective, I think rounds are Windows that are closed. I actually encourage the opposite. You're required to apply for something with the big chance that you might want to use it in the next three -five- eight years because you don't know when the next process is going to be open.

That's what encourages you to apply for a TLD and sit on it versus waiting until you have a concrete business plan and you're ready to use it and you're ready to implement it to go ahead and apply. So I think it has the opposite effect in those two areas.

Robin Sutton: Thank you, that's really helpful. Michael Flemming, you're next.

Michael Flemming: I kind of wanted to respond to (Stephanie) a little bit on that last point. Versus having this in rounds, I think, initially it was what further - I can only speak from my only personal background. I'm sorry, Michael Flemming with GMO again.

But from my clients who originally expect that apply in the 2012 round, you know the initial timeline for a lot of TLDs was to start a lot sooner than waiting so many years for to get delegated.

But then so at that time a business plan - a lot of them did have a business plan. Some didn't of course, but a lot of them did and by the time it came around to actually be delegated into maybe start implementing this GLD, that business win was lost.

You know, rebudgeting and everything, so I don't think that just because you have - you apply for it in an application in a certain round, you have to wait several years in order - you have to sit on it for several years.

I think that a lot of people, a lot of Brands might actually have a plan to use it and then there was the first-come first-serve model that would - you would probably have that plan initially maybe or you would develop it as you go.

But still being able to have that and move when you want to, it gives a lot more flexibility. But I wanted to touch on the stream contention for first-come first-serve as well.

In this aspect, it does create the idea of having an opposition period. For example, from a brand standpoint, if one brand applies for a string, for example, like give a legal rights objection for another brand to object to that.

It's very difficult because first of all, there is an awareness issue with this, how many brands are actually watching this and then the second issue would be cost issue.

For a lot of brands for example, that are more minor companies and if you look at these, the actual brands that have applied in the first round. They're humongous - they're global, but for a lot of - they're a lot of brands that are, you know, perhaps restricted to just a few countries that would probably oppose a larger brand, perhaps taking over such a TLD.

But then the cost issue with running with the TLD, it makes it difficult to actually even try to oppose that. So that's just my own - that's my take on it.

Robin Gross: Thank you. Now we have two people at the microphone that we should go to and then we could come back to the Adobe Connect.

Kathy Kleiman: Great, thanks Robin. Kathy Kleiman and as many of you know I work with non-commercial registrants, applicants, communities and so I think the implication of going first-come first-serve for communities, the global South Africa is enormous.

While rounds don't stop the problem completely, the access they provide an opportunity for publicity for us to let - for ICANN to let people know that a round is opening and that they're encouraged to apply.

We're also talking about support if you are applying. With first-come first-serve you can envision a situation where someone is applying five seconds after communities are applying five seconds after someone else has applied to the same string, it could be a real problem.

So creating that opportunity a round and just solve some of the issues that have been created about expectation or pinned up demand. Create two or three rounds, let people know when they're going to be opening.

Maybe that could be a job for you is to create two or three rounds and so that there is some predictably. If you don't go into round two, you know when round 3 will be opening because we don't know that now.

So a real unfair advantage to incumbent by setting up the speed lane for those who are already involved with the first-come first-serve. And I wanted to ask a question to Robin or anyone who wants to answer. What the last question means on the slide because I really don't understand it. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Okay, well this question really has to do with - should we decide these issues first and foremost - the rounds or the first-come first-serve before we even go into the methodology for these other issues.

So it's sort of is it a gating issue before we even talk about anything else or maybe we can work on them in parallel. I don't know if that's helpful. Okay. Please.

Manal Ismail: Hi, this is (Manal) and I'm the former president of the (Manal Ismail) (unintelligible) of India. I am also an ICANN (fellow) and now come to review (unintelligible).

So I personally believe that, you know, first-come first-serve would actually solve the purpose because if someone has come up with an idea for the GTLD strength, would not actually want to set up to three years or maybe five years for the next round to open up work.

Four to five hundred TLDs might actually be, you know, watered and delegated which would eventually get the internet crowded and I would not help serve the purpose of bringing the actual (of earnest) and the use of the strength.

Other than the fact that if we were to compare with general domain names, how the (unintelligible) work as a first-come first-serve. So if you were to compare both of them, there is all speculation there as well.

But the domain names are actually worth the person who comes up with the idea of registering a domain name and then eventually if someone is not opening up the main name, they could actually go ahead and sell it to someone else.

It's a simple comparison that, you know, if you opened up the main names registration to first-come first-serve, I believe there are applications for first-

come first-serve TLDs should be the actual solution and rather than waiting for four or five years for the GTLD round 2 (went up) and then getting the internet crowded. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Okay, so next in our que is Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl: Thank you Robin. To further our cause, I would like to point out that having windows or Rounds and doing first-come first-serve are not mutually exclusive. You can't have a Window and Rounds, but still use first-come first-serve as a decision (parchiser).

First-come first-serve is exclusively contention set. So if you go to first-come first-serve, there are no contentions cited. These are the written mutual disclosure.

We can - you could have five year rounds, but like five years to have objections or something and still go first-come first-serve, so that's the question to ask.

What do we want contentions set, what do we want first-come first-serve but doing Window, Rounds, functional processes is not mutually exclusive with first-come first-serve.

And on once the network mention that word community objections, according to your own the same day, outcome of prevailing in the community objection, as removing that applicant from the potential set from the process but we can probably look at community objections prevailing, making mandatory public interest committees and that's hazardous to operate there.

So that would probably be more fine tuning to what a continuous process that if a community doesn't like what (hedges) to this policies, they could ask for things to change those policies, but not change - put the (hedges) operator

with them that has the (unintelligible) would say, oh I like this - I can't live with that, or I can't live with that and drop me off the process.

So we might be using this round commercial objection system. It would take a decision on what do we do Rounds or not. But we might change that community objection process so we might try to look at an alternative and interaction between both.

Robin Gross: Thank you. Yes, I think it is worth pointing out that these were two possible solutions that had been discussed and they're certainly not the only ones and if there are other suggestions, we'd really love to hear that.

Okay next in the que we've got Martin Sutton and then Alan and then - it's the microphone here. Okay, Martin Sutton.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Martin Sutton. So just taking up with a couple of points like (Stephanie) mentioned, the fact, the last and next approach perhaps for Brand is to have a defined purpose to apply and activate a TLD. Kathy also mentioned that the idea for the small (unintelligible) grounds that could be..

Man: Sorry, Martin Sutton can you just come closer to the Mike, thanks.

Martin Sutton: Sorry - Kathy mentioned also the smaller application Windows that could be put into play before it ever moved onto, say first-come first-serve continuum. So what I was wondering if it's consideration towards distinct models that could be identified at a lower risk so that those perhaps potentially could be put into play far earlier while. I really encourage feedback. This is important.

A lot of the other issues are trying to be resolved so areas where there's less risk of any consumer issues, less impact on RPM, contention sets and any failure risks - anything that fits into that kind of model then could be considered to go early and test out any of the new procedures potentially that

are coming into play but in smaller (unintelligible) grounds and then leading up to, you know, the continuum first come, first served.

Obviously I put brands in there because I have to say that but it may not be just relevant to something like a (unintelligible) brand model where there is an identification of a registry model that ticks all of these types of boxes where there's minimal risk to ICANN, the end consumers.

Perhaps those could be put through into play, the advantage also being there that does actually keep some momentum going whilst all the other policy issues, processes are implemented.

Woman: Thank you Martin Sutton. Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Just one quick question and one thought. It's not clear to me that if you have first come, first serve, what do you do for someone else who wants to apply for the same name? It's quite possible that someone applies and it gets rejected or they withdraw or something like that so you almost may want to allow perhaps waiving the fee until it kicks in someone else to go in the queue with the same name. So you end up with all sorts of interesting complexities if you go that way.

The other thing that dawns on me is once - if we accept the fact that there are categories we may have different rules for different categories. GOTOD's by definition have to get the approval of everyone with that name and therefore there's no reason not to simply accept them as they come along. Dot brands might be in the same category although there may be some more contention. Other generic ones may be a completely different game and we want to do it in rounds to make sure we have concepts to string contention and various other things that we need for it. So it's not necessarily a one size fits all there either.

Woman: Thanks Alan Greenberg. Okay, we had one other question or comment at the microphone here - two - okay and then we're going to move onto the next question. Okay, go ahead. Can we get the microphone to work?

Man: It works, yes. It's okay. Now it's working. This is (unintelligible). We are an IDN registry operator. So I think this issue is very interesting but it's related to the work team tracker four. I just want to use an example of IDN registration to reverse my port.

                For example I use template (unintelligible) Chinese. Sometimes in Taiwan or Hong Kong they use a traditional Chinese (unintelligible) and in Japan and Korea they use some Chinese variant as their Chinese variant. So if we adopted a first come first serve principle, my question is if I register purely simply five Chinese strings, will it block all the other variants coming on or some guy in Japan or in North Korea or South Korea - he just apply a combination of variant but it will block me from registering purely simplified Chinese.

                So that's kind of a question very complex so I think current practices for the POD application is that if you choose one primary language or script string - for example just purely simplified Chinese or purely traditional Chinese - all the variants will be blocked but I don't know whether in the new (unintelligible) whether this principle will consider this complex issue. Yes, that's my answer.

Woman: Thank you. That's a really interesting important point. Thank you. Please.

Gabe Fried: Hi. Gabe Fried with (unintelligible) Stream Bank. I run asset sales for a living and one of the practices that we've established is - which I think might fit nicely in the context of some of the non - the more traditional gTLD cases that Alan Greenberg mentioned, not the exceptions like brands or geos is a first come, first serve basis where the first application in starts a clock ticking.

That clock allows - and it's published so there's an application for a dot whatever and now there's a period of time - three months, four months, five months - for anybody else who wants to apply for dot whatever to come in as long as - and then it's just a rolling set of windows as long as there's an incentive to go first and not just sit and wait and see what other people do. So just a thought.

Woman: Thank you. Okay so I think we need to move onto the second question that work team three is dealing with today and that has to do with the role of the independent objector.

Okay so in order to determine what the role of an independent objector will be if any in subsequent application procedures, it is necessary to both review what happened during the 2012 round and what has happened in both the community and world at large since the 2012 round.

For example with the community's impression of the role of the independent objector played in the 2012 round - what was the community's impression and did it live up to expectations? Did the independent objector act in the community's best interest. Has the level of awareness within the community and consumers risen to the level that an independent objector is no longer necessary?

Would an ongoing application process necessitate that an independent objector be in place to ease the burden of constant vigilance on the part of the community and consumers. So those are sort of the broad questions here on the independent objector. Anybody want to get in the queue on this? I know there have got to be folks who have had experience with the independent objector process and that's really the kind of feedback that we're looking for here today. I see Kristina is first. Please, go ahead.

Kristina Rosette: Those of you who know me, this is a subject that is not necessarily near and dear to my heart but, you know, okay and for background for those of you

who don't know - when I was in private practice during the application round I represented that Patagonia which had the independent objector file the community objection against the application and the Patagonia ultimately decided to withdraw its application.

But that gets me to the point of, you know, I think we need to be really - we need to take a really hard look at the numbers here. The independent objector filed 19 objections that went to decision. He won two of them. If you take into account the dot charity decision which was basically just reversed through an IRP and I want to say it was dot medical which was reversed - hospital reversed through and request for reconsideration.

I haven't been able to pinpoint exactly how much the contract is but the published amount - the published reports were in excess of $20 million. That's a million dollars per objection for a success rate of less than 12%. So I would suggest that we take a really hard look at what the objective was and I would note that this was an implementation.

The independent objector role was introduced through implementation. It was not part of the policy and I think we should really take a very close look at what was this role intended to do. Was it successful? Is it possible that the role itself is important and it was just that ICANN picked the wrong candidate which brings me to another point that I feel pretty strongly about and that is that both Patagonia and Amazon asserted that the independent objector had a conflict of interest that would have disqualified him under the relevant rules of arbitration?

ICANN's position was we can't deal with this because he's an independent objector. The ICC which was the dispute resolution provider for these objections took the position of we're not required to address conflicts of interest. We're going to leave it up to the panel to decide.

So if you are an applicant and you are in the position of having the independent objector file an objection against you that you believe frankly was barred on the grounds that it was a conflict of interest, you had to go all the way through the process of actually filing your response, paying the very high community objection fees and then just holding your breath and keeping your fingers crossed that the panel was going to take up the conflict of interest issue.

So I think if the decision is ultimately made to keep the independent objector and I'm not necessarily saying that it should automatically be eliminated but I do think it needs very close scrutiny, there has to be a mechanism very early on in the process for addressing allegations of conflicts of interest and applicants should not have to pay tens of thousands of dollars if not hundreds of thousands to get to the point - you're right. There was a conflict of interest here. This objection never should have been brought.

Woman: Thanks very much Kristina. Next in the queue is Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl: Although people usually criticize (unintelligible) I'd just like to remind that the independent objective was also limited to (unintelligible) objections and community objections and we should possibly look at whether independent (unintelligible) objections because in 2005 around only (unintelligible) could file for a single objection. So there are possibly some registrants that would like to have some applications reviewed (unintelligible) but there was none that could apply to that.

So we could look into expanding the role. Of course it needs possibly a better implementation. I think there are many issues that have been raised that point to improving the process but that's not news regarding ICANN contractors. There were a lot of those that people seemed to have failed so it's just one more of those. Thank you.

Woman: Thank you Rubens. Kathy you're next. Can we get some - her mike to work please?

Kathy Kleiman: Is that controlled from here or from there? It's working? Oh, now it's working. Good. Okay Kathy Kleiman and I agree with (Christine) that the independent objector needs a closer look. Of course conflicts of interest have to be high - have to be handled up front. That didn't make sense.

                   We've learned a lot in the first round including maybe how well we choose an independent objector and a backup independent objector perhaps in cases where there are conflicts but if anything, I think we'll need the independent objector more, not less. If we're talking about going into frequent rounds or - and you know I already object to this - first come first serve, somebody's going to have to keep their eyes open and having someone on duty doing that would be very important.

                   I'm not sure we've - I haven't heard anything here that says the underlying reasons for the independent objector don't still exist. Thank you.

Woman: Thank you Kathy. I don't see anyone else in the queue but I'm pretty sure other people have had experiences with the independent objector process so anybody care to get in the queue? It's all settled then?

Man: Yes, thanks. Well I mean I was just going to go on and close on that subject if no one else had any questions or comments. Yes, I don't see any hands in Adobe. Alright so then work track four.

                   So we have both (Cheryl) and Rubens here. Work track four is the technical operations and there's a set of questions we went over before if we can just get them up on the screen. There we go and I will - who's got it - Rubens or (Cheryl)? Who wants the first crack at it?

Rubens Kuhl: That's me then. Rubens (unintelligible) for the record. First question we have on the screen - first group of questions (unintelligible) shown during application process are only prior to be shown prior to signing a detailed agreement. This is basically the question that my (unintelligible) ask before. Should we just pick up all and say I commit to sign up with a proved provider or someone that can mess with (unintelligible) evaluation or do I need to sign first.

Then you should - regarding financial capabilities. So through the financial (unintelligible) during the application process (unintelligible) 2012 round or only required by the signing. Just wanted a bit around this one.

The only applicants that seem to have failed initial evaluation on this were the applicants that refused to provide financial statements so basically financial evaluation that previous round out. Are you willing to provide financial statement or are you unwilling to provide financial statement? That's basically what came through.

And but if one or both of these capabilities are not met, what do we do? Is there a contention set that we go to? Another contention set member we set for the new procedure and so forth. So any thoughts on that?

Man: Thank you. I want to make sure I understand the question at the end. It says if they fail one of those things and there's a contention set, should it be offered to the other people in the contention set or wait until the next round. That would imply that I could kill other peoples' application by submitting something that fails the criteria. That doesn't sound right.

Rubens Kuhl: Fail the criteria and then you prevail on the contention set by using some of the contention set criteria like winning an auction. So win an auction for a contention set and then you have committed to find a proved provider and then you fail to do so and fails to sign agreement. It shouldn't go to other member?

Man: Yes, I think what he's saying so let's say if you don't - if you just have to say I commit to doing this in the future and that's okay for the application process then what if you go through contention, you win at an auction and then you don't end up ever finding anyone that can meet the technical criteria. Do you just then go to who - a second in the auction - or do you say whoa, that string's not allowed and we'll just wait until the next round.

Man: It's clear but now I need to think about it. Thank you.

Rubens Kuhl: But coming back to the first question - technical competence. It seems that people are taking for granted if there are - if there is an accreditation program, it could allow them to show technical competence afterwards but we actually need to change policy to do that. I think (unintelligible) policy would still require technical competence to be shown beforehand. So even if we have an accreditation program, that is still - all of it needs to be either captured or changed by what your group or groups decide. It's not automatically tied to having or not an accreditation program and this could happen even without an accreditation program.

                So we could have an application process that wouldn't require it to be shown beforehand and then up until we still need to go over evaluation and repeating evaluation and all the things we have mentioned in work track one but although this seems to have a connection, they're not exactly tied to one another.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. Avri Doria and I were just talking. If you had - if you were able to select a certified provider, wouldn't you then already be meeting the policy of passing the technical evaluation or are you saying I wouldn't?

Rubens Kuhl: Considering what is (unintelligible) you probably are not fulfilling the current policy.

Woman: Next in the queue is Michael Flemming.

Man: Alan Greenberg is that an old hand? Oh.

(Michael Fomingino): Thank you. (Michael Fomingino) for the record. I guess I'd kind of like to ask for clarification whether or not I'm understanding completely the question. Should financial capability be shown during the application process or only required prior to signing a gTLD agreement? That's assuming that if the application was approved without showing financial capability as well as if there are other multiple contenders.

If for example ICANN approves the TLD if however when it comes time for financial capability if that applicant doesn't actually or I suppose that - yes at that stage they're still an applicant but at that stage the applicant actually doesn't have financial capability. They would pass that onto the next contention set number that prevailed? Am I assuming…

Rubens Kuhl: That's a question but not the only question if you're in a contention set of only one member so (unintelligible) application. You still could have an applicant that filled out an application, committed to have some kind of financial capability but when agreement signing time comes up, ICANN (unintelligible) noticed hey, that's not true. That could still happen in both cases.

(Michael Fomingino): So in my understanding of that I just don't see what the difference would be in - maybe could I ask for another clarifying question? What would be the advantage of showing that after the application process versus showing before the application process - the financial capability?

Rubens Kuhl: Simplifying the application process, making it cost less.

(Michael Fomingino): I can take that but I still think that you might actually waste cost in the end if you actually don't have the financial capability that ICANN's seeking.

Rubens Kuhl: That was a possibility but the experience form the first - not first round but the 2012 round - nobody that really wanted a 15 failed. It's obvious we - there are some controls that are there to not fail so people that wouldn't have failed simply don't apply to that so that needs to be done but it probably could be in another position of the workflow that cloud ease up the process.

Woman: We've got Martin Sutton and then Christa in the queue.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. Martin Sutton. I'm just trying to think of how the process would work here because I kind of like the idea that it would be later down the line after an application has been approved that you then acquire all of the relevant confirmations of technical and financial requirements but up front there's still a commitment given that you will supply those. There's an application fee which will still probably be quite excessive to cover the needs and indeed probably the operation of my registry for the first year I should imagine could be included within the application fee but also perhaps things like a time limit to actually produce the financial technical requirements as well.

                   But I suppose there's lots of things that could be done in terms of a process to help that go through and as you say, the evidence of 2012 round is that there's not many that have gone in there with the intention not to proceed. I'm not quite sure yet. I'm still trying to work out what to do with that odd scenario where it may need to go back into the environment to be reapplied for.

Rubens Kuhl: There were some other possibilities that could prevent (unintelligible) from complying with the (unintelligible). One of them was (unintelligible) delegation tasks. So ICANN already established one year limited to that so it would probably have a similar time limit in order to address (unintelligible) just like to see on the name and perhaps gain the system and sell it afterwards. So it would probably have a similar cost range although they are implementation

details, not the ones that we are looking at right now. It would probably make sense.

Man: Next we have Christa.

Christa Taylor: Christa Taylor for the record. I think one of the bigger components is the financial review and I don't think it would be something that we would want to delay until afterwards.

Secondly I also think that we need to maybe perhaps look at the different companies whether it's a - we had some issues on the first round. If it was a big, big company and they didn't provide - they couldn't provide the financials for one subsidiary, the company still had a gazillion dollars in their bank account over all but we had to change their applications in order for it to be through a subsidiary that was significantly less.

So I think hopefully in the next round we'll actually consider that rather than just having - setting up a new little off the shelf company and seem to think that that was a good enough kick box when we had a million dollar company on the other side.

And then finally I think we should also - and I don't want to go too far out - but we never really reviewed the business plans. We all sat here and we made all of these great financial models but and we just kind of ticked them off. We never said were they - did they make sense? Were they legitimate and would those business plans actually make sense and, you know, why are we doing these financial projections if we don't actually give an opinion on whether or not they make sense.

So I think we could go a lot further into it without going too far but making sure that the ones who do put in an application are going to be there to succeed and they have the necessary financial resources in place. Thank you.

Rubens Kuhl: Thank you Christa. You just had a great point. Business clients were ready and validated by ICANN and ICANN changed the conditions like requiring us to have 2013 certification. So ICANN was the one that first invalidated everyone's business plans.

So we should - if you are looking to the (unintelligible) business plans, we also need to look at the predictability and stability of the process because they also affect the business plan. Next in line is Michael Flemming. Go ahead.

Michael Flemming: Thank you. I would have to say that I oppose moving the financial capability until after the application process. My reason for this being is that I see gaming of the application process in the future. I know that it's foreseeable that application costs will go down in the future and I see gaming the way I see the gaming of a lot of trademark applications for a lot of - well for a lot of trademarks that have yet to be filed for example.

I see - I think that's one thing that we need to have a very strong check on and we need to have a very strong - well I'm sorry - check is the right word. Just to prevent one applicant for example from preventing - one applicant can apply for maybe - I don't know - 100 TLD's if the application costs just go that far down and then - I know that's kind of obviously exacerbating the issue but it's definitely foreseeable to see gaming and I think having financial capability is a very important check during the application process myself.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks Michael Flemming. We are now moving onto the next question which is on IDL's is whether should single charter IDL's be allowed in language where a single charter should denote a word or phrase (unintelligible) around that was not allowed but there was that we're allowed - we're given priority to do the application. Do we still need that priority? Does that priority still make sense and how should we treat an IDN variant.

Just an example in the 2000 go round (unintelligible) applied for a GOTOD but they couldn't apply to (unintelligible) with an accent like Britain French and they still couldn't today. So how do we handle that? By allowing that or simply allowing that to allowing that to (unintelligible) policy. So many questions regarding IDN's. Any thoughts? Christa please?

Christa Taylor: It might be an old hand.

Rubens Kuhl: Old hand? Let's go to Michael Flemming.

Michael Flemming: Michael Flemming for the record. How should IDN's be treated? I'm sorry. How should IDN variants be treated? This is a very fund topic for us in the - especially in the APAC region. I could go into history but I'm sure a lot of people are familiar that, you know, Japan and China share a lot of variants on the top on the level and I know that recently I believe the top level - the variant rules for the top level were also decided.

But anyways my statement here on this is that just - and a label that would be considered usable for example in China would not be the same in Japan. Just imagine the scenario that you have one applicant - you have one TLD that's applied for in maybe say Japan and later on the other registry operator stops and no longer wants to run the TLD and ICANN would perhaps change or perhaps seek to have a new registry operator for that.

If you have a registry operator in China, they might want to use a different variant at that point and you can't always change them even on the current second level rules for a top level domain and I'm not sure what the variant rules for a TLD are but you can't change the variant without deleting the second level domain at the current time. So that creates a lot of issues for obviously the target audience and who wants to use the variant but thank you.

Man: Thanks Michael Flemming. Chuck please.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Chuck Gomes speaking in my personal capacity and I want to talk about IDN variants and how they should be treated and possibly what I'm going to say would apply to the other questions on IDN's as well and my general statement is that IDN variants for gTLDs should be treated the same way as IDN variants for ccTLDs. That did not happen.

ccTLDs were allowed to have exceptions with regard to variants but gTLDs were not and the GNSO's should demand in my opinion that they be treated the same and that is even more important when you consider if you look at ICANN's latest audited financial statements, the fees from gTLDs cover more than 97% of ICANN's budget which means we as gTLD registrants and registrars and registries and participants in the GNSO process subsidize the ccTLD participation in ICANN by a large amount and certainly the ID in fast track for ccTLDs did not fund itself. We funded it for them and yet we're put as gTLDs at a disadvantage that they did not experience.

So what I'm saying again and I'll repeat it one more time is they should be treated the same whether it be a ccTLD or a gTLD and we in the GNSO should demand that.

Man: Thank you Chuck. Next we have (Ollie).

(Ollie):   Thank you very much. I'm a bit of a disadvantage because I don't quite know how they were treated in ccTLDs but I'll talk anyway. We don't need to let facts get in the way here.

I think variants - variants cause all sorts of problems. They cause problems. They caused problems in the program and when they weren't causing problems, the part where they caused problems is the Trademark Clearinghouse and I like the analogy that we in the Latin character set we have variants. They're called upper and lower case and we treat them the same. Now that's historic for many reasons.

If we don't allow variants and with certain conditions and there have to be conditions then essentially we're causing significant problems especially when you find trademark offices in areas with variants will very often imply that if you trademark one, the other is trademarked. It doesn't leave it open because they are equivalent to - well not quite upper and lower case but they have the same meaning.

Now clearly you have to end up saying if Quebec and Quebec with an accent are both allowed and right now they're confusingly similar so they're not allowed, they would have to be kept in sync and treated as a single domain but it would be ridiculous. I think it's ridiculous to not allow them to do that. So I think we need to allow variants and I think we need a set of rules that go along with it to make sure it doesn't cause problems for the end user because if it but I don't think we can pretend they don't exist and aren't used interchangeably in those cultures. Thank you.

Rubens Kuhl: Thank you (Ollie). Can I make a follow-up question on what you're thinking? There's at least one (unintelligible) separator that is now doing bundling. If you write your domain on one TLD, only that (unintelligible) the other TLD. They are not ID environments but they hazardously decided to do it that way. Do you see that as a requirement for ID environment TLD's or not?

(Ollie):   Pretty much I think so because if they're going to be confusingly similar, there has to be another mechanism to avoid the confusion and that says they're treated the same so you can pick one or the other.

                 If we allow strings that are clearly confusing and the registry operating both of them can have different second level domains, now that violates all of our rules for predictability of how the DNS operates. So yes, I think there are some mandatory rules that would have to go along with it.

Rubens Kuhl: Thank you (Ollie). Next we have (Joe).

(Joe Walden):   Thanks. Hello. Alright, it's on now? (Joe Walden) from VeriSign. So I also wanted to address the single character question and I guess I'm really asking a question. As I recall during the development of the application guidebook the FSAC and the GNSO both had reached a decision that there was no issue with IDN's that were represented by a single character and for some reason in the application guidebook that guidance was reduced from single characters to limited to two.

So I'm not sure what the background or the history was at that time but I think it is still an open issue. Thank you.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks (Joe). Just my personal views on that - I think we should probably look at it in latching alphabet and other sets are still an issue so like Cyrillic and (unintelligible) and so far and so the language that is being used actually makes a big difference in this case. So we might want to look into that and that's probably why it wasn't looked but just a wild guess. Next we have Michael Flemming.

Michael Flemming: Sorry, I just wanted to have a follow-up question. So I think first of all my question to the working group is how does the working group address the ID variance versus - I mean while also looking at how each language - each - sorry - each language - what's the word - each TLD language - there's a word for it. It's not script.

No, I believe that there's already rules applied for each IDN language for example. I know that the Japanese - there's a label generation - that's the word. Thank you. While also looking at the label generation rules that have been set for each language. I think that you could look at that for example for some - for example that we may leave that up to the language generation panel but then I also don't know what the language generation - what rules the language generation panel has come up for the variance in those different

languages of course so I think that's a very important issue to look at while addressing this issue.

Rubens Kuhl: Next we have (Ollie) again.

(Ollie):   Yes, just on the single character, by recollection is the allowing a single character was only in those scripts where it represents a full word so it's not - Cyrillic is not applicable there. It wasn't all IDN's.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks (Ollie). Next we have Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: I'm just following up on (Ellen)'s point. My recollection is that (Edmond Chung) was one of the folks on the GNSO council who is most vocally in support of the single character ID and so he would probably be a good person to touch base with.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks Kristina. (Unintelligible) clear and we need to move on because yes, this line to go for the - the line to be changed to the next set of questions (unintelligible) next. Who's controlling the slides? Thank you.

                  So I always keep the more general open-ended questions that we have here. I think we have more time to discuss that on the main list and go for the final issues we had here with the main collisions. During the 2012 it was eventually determined that some certain strings be prevented from moving forward. Split it (unintelligible) although they are still considered to be in an application.

                  Other any additional high risk strings that can be identified prior to the launch of subsequent procedures? What would be the methodology that we could use in determining such high risk strings? Any takers?

                  (Unintelligible) people think how they'd like to point out a distinction that already made (unintelligible) mainly not in the forward (unintelligible) list.

Those three strings actually have - belong to two different categories. One is dot home and dot car which are more (unintelligible) collisions. People use that in their companies as internal domains. Some routers use that as identifiers for their routers - mostly dot home - and these are the categories to most likely linked to specific manufacturers - device manufacturers - and some specific guidance from software makers that say oh, use that car that was such (unintelligible) suggestion from one company.

This is one type of issue and the other type of issues is like dot mayo when most of the collisions even if not all collisions but a good part of the collisions happen in a dot-less query. So most of the question dot mayo was actually only mayo, not something dot mayo. And there are some who believe this could be treated differently. Whether or not this would be done for this round is not up for this workgroup to decide. This is still an ongoing process. The two should try not to interfere but we might see again these both types of collisions happening in other risk strings. Now we got to Avri Doria please.

Avri Doria: Thanks. I wanted to bring up a slight variation on this topic because it's a continuing issue I think we're going to have to look at. Looking at the three themselves - they were part of a previous round and there's still an issue that needs to be dealt with but between the ITF's ability to assign names, the ability of anyone to basically grab a name and use it and setup some kind of precedent and ICANN's assignment of names.

We have a continuing possible issue here where we have no control between an ITF deciding to assign a name and us assigning it. We could be having a round at the same time and they could decide. Now it may or may not happen because there's enough people going back and forth but there's absolutely nothing that stops both the ITF and ICANN assigning a name at the same time.

Additionally we have absolutely no incentive at the moment to stop anyone from squatting on a name whether it's done through an innocent corporate

type of procedure, oh yes we're just giving an example or whether somebody actually just wanted to squat a name. There's no incentive. In fact the incentive that we built in the past may actually inspire people to squat on a name because if you do it and you do it successfully, well then it's hard to take it away from you.

So I guess I'd like to sort of add that kind of content to this question and sort of in terms of ICANN doing its job with, you know, names how do we deal with the issue of simultaneous assignment by an ITF 67 6671 process that basically they decide to assign a protocol to it or somebody just basically squatting a name.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks Avri Doria. Next we have Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. My recollection may be wrong is - there's an FSAC report about it somewhere - is that the names that we ended up discovering partway through the process there was a collision - we had collisions on - we were in fact warned about, about two years earlier. I'm pretty sure there was a report earlier that had not been...

Man: No.

Alan Greenberg: There's something like that in the past so the research may well have already been done and we just have to dig it out. Certainly FSAC is the place I would ask that question first.

Avri Doria: But there's nothing to stop it from - I'm not really talking about those three.

Alan Greenberg: No.

Avri Doria: But there's basically nothing to stop someone from today deciding I want to squat a particular name and do it.

Alan Greenberg: No, I was answering the original question, not referring to yours.

Rubens Kuhl: Just to Avri Doria's point, I think monitoring the ITF DNS opt group and they seem to have - they are concerned about the - let's say the high star collision risk. Let's say ICANN tells people to do something. ITF tells people to do something else and I think they will stop at least control much more what's being added to the ITF round release. So that's possibly something we could try to reach out for the ITF area leaders and see if you can come to some sort of consensus.

But they seem to be concerned as well with the risk so if we are more concerned, they were not, that wouldn't be a problem but all organizations seem to be concerned. Any other takers or I think we could end up on track four.

Avri Doria: I put my hand up again because I wanted to respond to that if I could. I think you're probably right. The ITF does care and I participate there also but we need - the other half of that is basically we would need some way to also deal with that and monitor it and any subsequent procedures because it would be an ongoing issue so we can't just count on the ITF fixing its processes.

We would also need to have some way of monitoring it and dealing with the issue. So that's the only reason I'm bringing it up in that way is that it seems to be something that we need to figure out how to track.

Rubens Kuhl: Michael Flemming.

Michael Flemming: I'm sorry. I just wanted to ask. Does this working track also address the ongoing measures for name collision as well or the - I can't think of words today that I want to think of.

Man: Controlled interruption?

Michael Flemming: Yes, exactly. Not a controlled interruption - is a controlled interruption - yes that and also the post - the emergency contact you just setup in order to…

Man: Post two years of delegation while you go onto the next. Yes, it's also (unintelligible) these things also in our chapter.

Man: Okay, thanks. So we've now gone through the work tracks. There were a couple of issues that were put into the parking lot on Adobe Connect so for those of you that were following that. The first issue is there were a few people that wanted to have some additional discussion on the RSP - the Registers Provider Accreditation. I'm not sure if any of them are still in the room here.

Man: I wanted (unintelligible) either.

Man: Then the second one was also - what's that? Yes, the second one was going back to the reserve names. So with that we can go back and talk about a couple of the reserve names issues that we skipped from work track two if you want to go to those Michael Flemming or if you want to post those up on the…

Michael Flemming: So Michael Flemming again for the record. So for reserved names we had one session - one meeting that really got into the nitty gritty for this. Basically we looked at what the current GNSO policy on new gTLDs looks at for the reserve names and we found that aside from technical - no I'm sorry. There were 30 reserves - I need to go back to my (unintelligible).

Man: So on this topic it's, you know, we had broken down a couple of questions. The first ones were there were a few sets of names - of reserve names that were reserved at the top level and they were certain categories of names that were reserved at the top level including so-called ICANN IANA names. That is the category that the 2007 or 8 reserve names working group had given.

That is the policy right now is still to protect those names at the top level and so the question is whether we should keep those names or whether are there any changes to that policy. Is there any reason that that policy should change? For example should we add additional names, take away names? That's one of the categories. Another category that was mentioned in my reserved names working group were - there were some other categories that were mentioned in there.

We don't need to go through all of them but in the interim time since then the ICANN board (unintelligible) program committee added several other sets of reserve names including the IOC and the Red Cross and then a third way of adding names to this reserve were names added because of name collision. So it's just a general question of is there any reason to have to revisit these policies. Can anyone think of any circumstances that have changed or any reasons why we would need to revisit that policy? Okay Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette. I'm going to make a request that's probably not going to be very popular and I would just - I found our last discussion on this topic to be painful. So I would just ask that if we are going - if there are folks who feel that we need to revisit this policy, I think we all need to go back and look at the reserve name working group report and make sure that we're all familiar with it and that, you know, we're all operating from the same base level of information because otherwise I just think it's going to be an extremely unproductive use of everyone's time.

Man: Thanks Kristina. Avri Doria go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, I very much agree with Kristina about going back to that report on this issue and various other ones but I also want to point out that there was a whole lot of recommendations that were made at that point that have been deviated from to a very large extent. So I actually think that it is a good idea for us to go back to the old policy and see where we have - where we've got

a policy that we haven't deviated from and there's no reason, where we have a policy fed through board initiated activities. We have deviated from what were the recommendations there and we'll certainly find stuff I believe in the geographic names in that context which we know we're going to have to deal with to a certain extent in this one.

So I think it's a good background. I think it is actually should be fit into our work item and then we have to deal with both what has already been deviated from and what we have to review and what things we haven't deviated from and yes I remember the - I remember the conversation as funny though not as painful. I don't know why I remember it differently than you do but I do.

Man: Thank you Avri Doria. I have Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl: Thank you. Rubens speaking for the record. I would like to point out I haven't read the original point Kristina mentioned. I should probably read it but in this light we are actually mixing up some types of strengths. One of them is like an example TLD. Well there is an actual collision risk because people will use that as examples or sample codes and so far these are more like name collisions risk than the others.

Sorry for (unintelligible) but I don't think anybody would take FX over the specific advisory meeting in ICANN so these are actually ICANN (unintelligible) FX, GNSO, etcetera but example in TLD. Here's one that we should probably keep refraining from delegating but from different issues. So we probably need to look at taxonomy and knowledge and close the details starting by reading the report. Thank you.

Man: Thank you. Francisco.

Francisco Arias: Yes. So to that point and what Avri Doria said before, there is thing in there you have called the special use names for your (unintelligible) and in the

current applicant guidebook I think it includes all the names of where I end up at least at the time but it's not a reference to the special use names for (unintelligible) and as of now at least has at least one more name there (unintelligible) and so there is something that you may want to consider the special use names (unintelligible) for reservations at the top level.

Man: Avri Doria you're in the queue again.

Avri Doria: Yes, sorry. Yes, the whole - I believe I'm getting the number right - 6761. I think that came out, you know. I mean they had a reserve list and that whole special use of something. That is what is being reviewed in (unintelligible) now because they found that it was a problematic process that they weren't actually following.

                So it's something for us to watch over the course of the year as that gets and in fact we probably won't be talking about it next week at ITF because they said specifically that they weren't going to put it on the agenda this time because they got sort of sick of talking about it but it is something that the ITF is going to have to deal with in the next year.

Man: Yes so some of those were on the special use registry but then they were other ones that for whatever reason - and it's not well documented in the reserve names working group why we reserve certain things like - well ICANN itself but ASO, GNSO, ICANN, Interlink, CCNSO, AFNIC and some other ones that are just on there.

                So again I think part of the reason of going through the list is one, to see what we actually implemented in the guidebook, two is whether those are still needed or not or three, are there any additional ones that we need to add to their? So those are the topics. It doesn't sound like at this point anyone recommends any changes so we'll just go onto the next.

Man: The second level I believe. Yes, so the take on the top level is that we need more information before we move on or before we have more discussion I think is a good way to summarize it. But for the second level so this one is basically looking at what is currently reserved from the second level. We're going back and forth between pages. I think it's on the bottom - one down. One more down. Stop. Thank you.

So looking - we've had a lot of - since we've initially actually launched there we had a lot of registry agreements signed on. We've also had a lot of releases for second level reserve names and so basically we're looking at if we need to have any changes made to the reserve names policy and for example perhaps for the process for the release of those reserve names. Any takes? Avri Doria is that a new hand or an old hand?

Avri Doria: Old.

Man: Old? Okay, Jeff you've got a new hand.

Jeff Neuman: So I'll point first to two characters. There's been a lot of work done on two characters and still not complete with between the time that the guidebook was written, the contract came out and then afterwards. So I think what we at least need to do is to document what's been done to date with the two characters and then decide whether that is something we should codify into our policy.

My gut is yes because that's what everyone in the community has been working on for years now. so we should at least at the very minimum collect everything that's been done with two characters, document that cohesively and then also I know the issue is not final at this point is something that hopefully ICANN's getting towards a final proposal and consultation on some of the two character strings that have been objected to by governments. So we should at a very minimum document that and recognize that not

everything has been carried out the way the initial two character reservation was written into the guidebook and ultimately the contract.

Man: Thank you. There is a new hand in the queue. It's mine by the way and I know everyone's sick and tired of hearing me play the brand card but I just - I think this will also kind of go hand in hand with similarly with the single - sorry - the category based agreement discussion. Some may say that we'll probably have similar reservations for each - for all categories even if they are different agreements but I can say perhaps differently I know that the initial reaction for a lot of second level - sorry - a lot of two lettered characters was - the atmosphere was different versus an open generic TLD and a closed brand specific TLD.

But although nothing has been completely 100% decided on the whole for all of that. As Jeff notes, we need to take note of what has happened to date and what I feel will probably conclude in the - well maybe hope to conclude in the near future.

Any other hands? It's an open - it's open mike so anyone can jump on and maybe sing their favorite karaoke song or - nobody's laughing. I'm sorry. I guess we'll close the discussion on reserve names and move to open mike Jeff or…

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I think we can go to any other business. Obviously when you say close the discussion, you're just closing it for today. This is going to be a lengthy process talking about reserve names and I think one of the things coming out of it is that we need to clearly document what has happened since the original policy in 2007/2008 - the reserve names working group. We need to document the differential and then figure out whether we want the differential to be documented in official consensus policy or whether there's some deviation that's needed.

So for any other business, Avri Doria did anything come up since…

Avri Doria: I didn't hear anything but if anybody has like the brilliant proposal that solves all the problems that we need to solve for, you know, subsequent procedures, this would be a great time to stand up with it but I haven't gotten any. Does anybody have any other business at this point that they think we should talk about or and I thank those of you that are the hardcore who have stayed to the end on this session but does anybody have anything that they think we should discuss while we're here together in the room that we haven't touched on because there's obviously many other subjects?

You know, we said we had - what - 38 topics to cover as part of this PDP GTL - I mean this PDP working group process. So if anybody else has any of those that they think we should spend some of our last minutes or we can just sort of say that four hours was enough or four hours and ten minutes was enough and we didn't need 4 1/2 hours.

But so I don't see anybody rising up to the offer so what I would like to do then is basically thank you all for contributing and anybody that's not in any of the subgroups - anyone that's - there's a whole lot more talking to be done and a whole lot more problem solving to be done and so I want to make sure that you hear the offer that, you know, you come and join in the groups and I want to thank the leads of the sub teams for having prepared the questions and having worked us through them. So Jeff I don't know if you've got anything else to say.

Jeff Neuman: This has been exhausting.

Avri Doria: Exhilarating.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, exciting as Michael Flemming would say. No, nothing else for me.

Avri Doria: So thank you very much. It's over for now.

END