
HYDERABAD – At-Large Leadership Working Session Part 7

Friday, November 04, 2016 – 13:45 to 15:00 IST

ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

ALAN GREENBERG: Ladies and gentlemen, we're unfortunately 15 minutes late. May I call the group to order? I see we have Kaili. Do we have Carlton?

CARLTON SAMUELS: We have Carlton.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm flanked on either side.

Which of you is going to take the lead in this, Carlton or Kaili?
Kaili says Carlton's taking the lead.

Okay, we have a 45-minute session of which we have 30 minutes left, unfortunately, at this point, and we have a hard stop at the end. We need to get the attention of our speaker.

All right, thank you. I'd like to turn the floor over to Carlton. Carlton, if you could give... There's a fair number of new people in the room. if you can give a very brief synopsis of why the CCT Review Team exists, perhaps a little of the history of ALAC and the issues associated with it and then a summary of where you

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

are and where we are so we can have a bit of discussion. It's a big challenge for 30 minutes, I'm afraid, but it's yours.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Afternoon, everybody. Good to see all of you. As Alan has asked me to give you a little background in where we are, these reviews, this is about the Competition, Consumer Trust, Consumer Choice Review is one of the AoC (Affirmation of Commitment) Recommendations. It came out of the Affirmation of Commitments by ICANN to the United States Government and it's essentially committed ICANN to do a review of competition and consumer trust and choice in the domain name system.

This is the review that had a bit of a rocky start with. Of course, in these reviews you have a working group that lays out the terms of reference for the review and that was established with community input of course.

The ALAC and At-Large were very much a part of this. Some of the controversies that came out of the review were some insistence from the ALAC and the At-Large about metrics. There was a long discussion and a big to and fro about what metrics would be used for setting a baseline for competition and trust and choice.

You might know that the ALAC position was stonewalled for a little bit and then there were some active measures taken to get an embrace of the metrics that were being proposed by the ALAC.

Eventually they reported a set of metrics that would be used as indicators for competition and choice and trust and the terms of reference for the Review Team were finally agreed upon and we started about — it's only a year ago with the review.

I am one of the members of the Review Team endorsed by the At-Large and there are others from other constituencies – the Registry Constituency, Intellectual Property, the GAC is represented, and so on.

We have a Review Team and we have a charter that we were looking at. I don't know if it's the same as the... Haven't seen it yet? Let me look and see what has happened with this. In any event, we had a Review Team which started the work and in the end we decided on a set of metrics.

When we started, there were—and this is where I'm trying to find these things to send to you. It's easier to look at it from the... Let's continue. The team had three major charges. We were going to look at competition in the DNS space. We were look at what is brought on by the new round, the new round of gTLDs. We were going to look at the application of the processes to see

if they were fit for purpose, and we were going to look at how well the safeguards worked to protect the domain name space. Those were the three main sections.

The team was divided into subteams, Competition Subteam and the Safeguard Subteam. I was on the Safeguard Subteam and I moved between the safeguard and the application processes and Kaili was on the Competition Subteam.

So to begin with, because there was no baseline data, there had to be some studies, some surveys that were done to provide the data that we were going to look at to see the indicators of competition and safeguards and so on.

You may be familiar with them, the global registrant and the global consumer surveys. They were done in two waves. The first wave was done in 2015 and then the second wave was done this year and the last report was received in September of this year.

They are complementary studies by Nielsen and there was an attempt to get some depth into understanding the phenomenon that we saw of interactions or inputs or involvements from the Global South in the latest round of new gTLDs.

In global, I was contracted to do this work and they chose to look at the people who had not actually applied for a string but

were contemplating applying and tried to find out what was going on with them.

And then there was an economic study that was done by the Analysis Group to look at the economic variables to see whether or not the original ideas beyond economy in the DNS space, if they still existed and supported the new gTLDs. So we had these four major studies that were done to provide the baseline data.

The team did a lot of work. I think we have now been to 24th meeting and there were subgroup meetings every week for the last probably 15 months, and essentially we went through all of the issues that were on the table.

The original framework for the work groups was that we would only make assertions that were evidence-based. So unless there was evidence for an assertion, it would not be accepted by the team.

So in respect of competition, whether there was competition in the space, there had to be evidence, and most of that evidence came from these surveys, these studies that were actually submitted by ICANN and paid for by ICANN.

First of all, we're at the stage now where we're putting together an interim report and this interim report will be available in

December. This meeting was an opportunity to share the results that we see from the evidence in the interim report.

So this basic outline of what we've seen so far, yes, competition is very difficult to define in this context because there were so many layers to competition. So the decision was that we would spend time looking at some of these competition layers and not just have a one-size-fits-all definition for competition.

We found that in some areas we could not definitively say there was competition, and I'll let probably Kaili come in here and give you some background as to what we found in the competition space. Kaili?

KAILI KAN:

Thanks, Carlton. For the Competition and Consumer Choice Subteam, there have also been very, you can say, heated debates and arguments.

It is not unexpected because our members came from different constituencies, from different ACs and SOs and have different interests and so forth.

For example, for people from the registry-registrars side, they obviously would like to have the next round of new gTLDs as soon as possible and as open as possible while on ALAC side, for example, we would like to look more at the end-users and

consumers interests, which often conflict with other groups' interests and so forth.

But anyway, because of the team's composition is a balance from all the different SOs and ACs, for the topic issues that we at ALAC are more concerned about is after quite some discussions, arguments, debates, what was included in the preliminary findings.

Primarily there are two points. One is that the large scale parked a number of registrations. As a matter of fact, for a total of the new registrations over the last two three years in new gTLDs, it is found that it has 65% of the registration domain names being parked that are not even being resolved.

That could imply large scale speculation. First, that creates artificial scarcity, makes the price higher for real end-users, and also will harm the long-term stability of the DNS system.

So then also for the consumer trust issue, many of the parked domain names are being monetized for various kinds of DNS abuses. This large scale parking as well as likely to be large scale speculation that was included in the preliminary findings this time.

Another issue is the brand name issue because a lot of brand owners believe that they are being forced to defensively register

their brand names in hundreds and hundreds of new gTLDs. First it's unfair and wasteful and it's no good.

Of course there is only one reason for defensive registration but this has also been called to attention and included in this time's preliminary reports.

So from our side, ALAC, what we are concerned about is primarily from the end-user and the consumer's point of view. These two otherwise would not be included in the findings but now it has been included in the findings.

So this is what has been done on our side. Anything else or maybe questions?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Kaili. I'll open the floor. I already have my hand up. Leon, could I ask you to watch the queue? And I see we already have Holly Raiche.

I have two questions. You've identified the several kinds of things which you have been pushing for. At this point in time, do you believe those will be included in the draft report?

KAILI KAN:

Yes, primarily two issues. One is the large scale parking, the other is the brand name issue, and both of these are included in

this time's preliminary findings so naturally it would be included in reports.

ALAN GREENBERG:

The second question which is related to the brand name one, I understand the number 65% are essentially either monetized, parked, or something. By the way, just to be clear, carefully using the term monetize for malicious purposes. Monetized is monetized. Malicious purpose is a separate thing.

The question is has anyone done—I know the question because I asked the question to Jonathan yesterday in a GNSO session—but the question is has there been any interest in taking the domains that are not parked but are redirected and doing a sampling of those to see how many are simply redirected at their .com site or something like that, which essentially may be a measure of how many people have to have registered these domains and are not using them but are simply using it as a redirect to protect their brand.

Jonathan's answer yesterday was no, they hadn't thought of doing that, but I'm curious as to whether it has been brought up or is there any reason not to. Clearly it's just a sampling but—

KAILI KAN: To my knowledge I think there was some data. Maybe not that complete but there was some data that first of all, the redirection of sites to the .com site is not counted as parking.

There is defensive registration but also some brand name owners feel that they want to increase their exposure to the public, whatever. But I believe I saw some data although not incomplete. I'll take you through—

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Certainly you can't tell the motivation of why it's redirected but if many of the users on the things are not going to unique sites, then you haven't introduced competition. Whether they are registered to increase their exposure or because they've been forced into it, you can't tell.

We have Holly next and we have the SSAC—I don't know if we have anyone else. We have the SSAC coming in in about six minutes. Oh, they're here. We are meeting again with Kaili and Carlton and Jonathan later on today.

Let's let Holly speak, if we could.

HOLLY RAICHE: First, I would say that the slides that were presented today have a really good summary of all of the statistics, some of which are

really both interesting and questioning. What do you mean by the market if you are talking about competition? What do you mean by parked if you are talking about competition? And a whole lot of issues are actually raised by those slides. I would actually like to see those slides being discussed.

My actual question is the timeframe, the final that the report's going to be issued for comment and it's going to be over the Christmas break. I trust we're going to do something in that time and reply. Thank you.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Yes, Holly. There are a couple of issues. There's still some data that's required for us to have a full definition of what we mean by markets and how the competition landscape looks. There's data, a lot of that.

There's also data that's missing to help us determine how DNS abuse of the safeguards of work in comparison to DNS abuse, and we won't get that data until probably end of April, May next year.

So the preliminary report is going to be indicative of what we're seeing now but some of the data that we hope to underline and underscore what we're looking at will not be available for that.

So to your question on whether or not the comment period is sufficient, it's going to be an issue definitely.

And maybe if you could go to the last page where they gave a timeline, go further down, yes. If you start from the end then work your way back, we will see it. Not that one. Yes, that one—that's the work plan.

If you notice, we're here November 2016 and the draft report for public comment is due at the end of December, and then we have the DNS Abuse study at the inter-survey. The inter-survey is supposed to provide information about what's happening in the IP area and to do with Rights Protection Mechanisms, some of the safeguards, important safeguards. We won't have that data until, as you see there, at the end of March. So by the time we get all of that data in and work it into the final report, which is expected in July 2017, we're going to have... I think we're running it very close and we might not make it.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I'm going to intervene here just quickly to say it's going to be pretty hard to comment on a report when in fact some of the important data isn't there.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Absolutely, and I think that is a concern and you should raise it that if you don't see the full report, then your comments might be caught in midair somewhere.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. If I can summarize the beginning of what you said, it sounds like you've had a hard time convincing the rest of the group to include some of the things that most concern you, but at this point they are in the draft report.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's number one, okay. Number two, are there any studies or other data gathering efforts that you believe should be done but which at this point are not on the plan?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Still looking at the draft for the Domain Abuse report, a lot of the indicators that we would be willing to look at that were of our interest for safeguards would be outlined in that report. And the draft, we still have not seen the initial draft yet so we have to look and see whether or not that frame—if that is framed

correctly to take care of our issues in that one. But we have a commitment from the Chair that they will look at it fully.

It comes up in a couple of ways. If you look at the safeguards and you look at how the safeguards have been put into the—covenanted now in the Registry Agreement and the Registrar Accreditation Agreements, there's a whole set of domain abuse activities that are now under the purview of ICANN Compliance and they are contained in what is called Specification 11 of the Registry Agreement.

Most of the indicators that we were concerned about would help us to understand better what is happening there, and what we have to make sure now is that the data points that would allow us to ensure that we have the right indicators are included in the Abuse report. I can tell you we're watching that closely to make sure that is in there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, to summarize, you've had a hard time but at this point there's no reason to call foul but we have to really maintain a watch.

CARLTON SAMUELS: That's correct. Be vigilant.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, last question is in response to ALAC and GAC advice to the Board, the Board asked both the GNSO PDP and the CCT Review Team to look at the TLDs that the GAC identified as sensitive regulated ones. Is that in your work plan or has that been done?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes. They are in the work plan. As a matter of fact, one of the issues we had here is because there was a disconnect between what we're seeing from ICANN Compliance in terms of data points to ensure that the very restrictive ones that were copied whether not all those public interest commitments were observed in spirit and letter. At this point we can say that they're all included for further work, but, again, the details are still to be examined.

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess I'd like to speak to the two of you for two minutes after this. I'm going to turn the session over to Julie Hammer right now who I think is chairing. I'm going to move away from the middle of the table and I will be back in less than a few minutes to listen and participate to the SSAC session. Julie, I'll turn over to you.

JULIE HAMMER: Good afternoon, everyone. Julie Hammer speaking, SSAC liaison. You all know Patrik Fältström and Jim Galvin requires no introduction to you. They've come along to give us an update on what SSAC has been doing since the last Stockholm meeting. But there are also a number of SSAC people in the room. I can see Jaap, and I know Robert Guerra is behind me, and there's also Jeff Bedser, Julie Hedlund and Kathy Schnitt and Andrew.

I wonder if all the SSAC people would mind standing up, please, just so that everyone gets to know your faces, please. And Jacques Latour who is a new SSAC member.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Let me just interrupt. This is important for us because this is the first SSAC meeting that Jacques is part of as a member so welcome, Jacques.

JULIE HAMMER: And with that I'll hand over to Patrik.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Thank you very much. As we do this, normally I would like to have our slides, please.

Let me explain in the meantime a little bit what SSAC is doing. SSAC is the Security and Stability Advisory Committee of ICANN.

We're an advisory committee just like ALAC. The important thing that we see with that is that we are trying really, really hard to not have any formal participation in any of the PDPs. We are trying very hard to write very clear and direct recommendations which are standing on their own grounds, so good recommendations people listen to. Recommendations that are unclear or doesn't make any sense, people can ignore. And by evaluating our own recommendations during the years and trying to create better and better recommendations, we have succeeded to actually be listened to, which we like.

We are at the moment just about 30 members. You become a member by applying to us in SSAC. We have a Membership Committee that evaluates the applications.

The path for our advice is really simple. We either get a question from someone or we identify some kind of issue ourselves and based on that we think that, "Well, there might be something to say here." What we are then doing is to start a work party that is investigating the issue and making the decision whether there is actually something to say, and if there is something to say then we are releasing our recommendations.

The recommendations from an Advisory Committee must be taken into consideration by the ICANN Board if the

recommendations are targeting the Board. Otherwise, it's up to the receiving organization to do whatever they want with them.

“ICANN Board can take into consideration” might mean we have listened to you but we are drawing a different conclusion and we move on, but sometimes the Board—and quite often, actually, lately, which is really good, the ICANN Board is implementing our recommendations.

We have produced a little bit more than 80 advices and there are specifically about 2 of them that we were thinking of explaining to you today. The first one is SAC084 which is Comments on Guidelines for what is called the Extended Process Similarity Review Panel for IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process. So we're saying to ICANN community that we have too many acronyms but sometimes reading out the acronyms doesn't really help. It's still very complicated.

In this recommendation, the recommendation itself tells ICANN Board that the EPSRP process as proposed is not to be adopted. The reason for that is that from an SSAC perspective, there are three very important security and stability related principles which are missing in that process.

The three of them are conservatism, which means that whenever you going to add something or make some changes, specifically if we now talk about the root zone, you have to be

conservative. Don't add something unless it's really needed because if you added something, as I will come into a little bit later, you cannot remove it. So you have to find arguments why you're adding it not find arguments why you're not adding it.

The second principle is actually an addition to what I just said that by default—and if we take once again the top-level domain as an example—the default should be to not add anything. So the argument should be made why things should be added and that is what we call the inclusion principle. Of course it's kind of weird that the inclusion principle implies that some things should not be included but anyways that's how it is.

The third principle is the stability principle—and that is also what I mentioned that is also related to the other two—which talks about the fact that if you're adding something, adding a new protocol, deploying something on the Internet, it will forever be deployed. There is nothing that is a temporary test deployment. We are still using, there are still people using Windows XP and whatever, MacOS 9 and whatnot so we just have to be careful of what we're adding.

We cannot, for example, add code points from Unicode and then later say, “No, that code point was dangerous,” because as soon as we allow a code point, that code point will be used by

someone so we need to be very careful with it. That is also part of this principle.

The last thing that is important is that those of you who have followed, for example, the whole discussion of whether TLD should be added in the first place, there is no right answer on how many TLDs can be added. The correct answer is that the risk is in how fast they're added and there are written a couple of reports there. So change rate is sometimes much, more important to evaluate than what the changes are, which means what the actual end game is.

And these three principles, to summarize, conservatism, inclusion, and stability, they are very common. They are used by anyone that evaluates things from an SSR perspective and we have not invented these words in SSAC. It's actually ITF that wrote about this the first time so we're building upon work done by the ITF. Are there any questions?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes. How you're actually coming to the new gTLD process seems to be—inexorable is probably an unkind word. There is momentum. To what extent will what you're saying about the right at which new gTLDs are added—to put it, I suppose, a little gently, are you being listened to and have you had input into that process?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

The first question whether we have been listened to, yes, we are listened to. On the other hand, I also feel confident that people are listening to us just because people sometimes ignore us, because that means that they're evaluating what we're saying. And if they're evaluating us and not just rubber stamping and they demonstrate that by sometimes doing something slightly different, solving the same, addressing the same risk in a different way, a reason for that is that they evaluate also the ones where they agree with us. So, yes, they listen to us.

Secondly, do they specifically listen to us in this case? We actually released three reports just the last three weeks which actually are input to the gTLD process.

To some people that follow the process, they are pretty boring because what we're doing is that we have gone through all our previous advice and pointed out which one of them we think people should reread. We find some of our historical advice be more important than others because we just like others, we also learn during this trip.

So we just issued three new advises but, as I said, it's just reprint of old things. But yes we are following the process and we will probably speak up if we feel we have to just like I always said.

JOHN LAPRISE:

Thank you very much for coming and speaking with us today. Patrik, we had an e-mail conversation at some point in the past about the potential problem of what would happen if a gTLD operator in this era of new gTLDs failed and picking up the pieces after the fact. And if we have a long tale of gTLDs and you have a number of failures at the same time, can we pick up the pieces from that particular problem? Are we prepared? I'm just wondering if you'd done any further thought on that. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

Yes, both as individuals and also SSAC have been looking at the fallback mechanism. Jim is actually the one that we're working most with so I'll let Jim respond.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you. We haven't said anything new recently. Back being before the New gTLD Program, which has finished or now is in its delegation phase, we had made a comment about the operation of the BERO process but we haven't added anything new to that

process since then and at this time I'm not aware of any issue that requires our attention.

But as always, we're certainly always interested in comments and questions from the community. If you think there is something that we have missed and would need attention, we would love to hear that and get that advice too.

JOHN LAPRISE:

Well, I guess to reiterate what I'd spoken with Patrik before, depending on the economic success of gTLD holders, if you have a holder who goes under, are we prepared to pick up all the pieces after the fact and instead of just on a small scale but potentially on a larger scale? I guess that's my question.

JIM GALVIN:

Certainly the process does support the movement of DNS services to ensure that existing registrations can continue. Frankly, the rest is more of a business process kind of decision and I'm not aware that we've actually experienced that yet so it'll be interesting to see when that happens the first time, to see how the ICANN processes works.

They did just do an experiment of the BERO processes. They had a TLD that had withdrawn and had a done a minimum deployment and so they used it as part of the withdrawal

process to exercise some of the BERO processes, the DNS transition and stuff to make sure that all of that worked to the emergency operators that they have. But there's been no exercise on the business side yet so you're right, the time will come and then we'll see where we are.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. On the topic of the EPSRP – and I'm never quite sure how to pronounce it or say it – we issued a statement prior to your issuing yours, which was pretty positive for it, and we're also meeting with the ccNSO where it's conceivable that topic will come up. It's been on and off the agenda but I'm not quite sure if it's on or off.

So I'm interested in number one, have you talked to the ccNSO about it and I'm interested in comments from the people in this room who helped draft our statement of do we need to rethink our statement in light of what the SSAC is saying or do we say, "No, you're wrong."

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

Let me try to help you a little bit there and maybe you can also help us. No, we have not talked to ccNSO. We are trying to arrange a meeting with ccNSO and those of you who have

followed the discussion understand how important it is that we actually talk to each other.

From my perspective, there is an enormous amount of misunderstanding between the two groups and there are two things that I would like to emphasize because the document that we wrote includes lots of background information that people misunderstand a little bit, where they read the letters a little bit too bold type phase than the recommendation itself.

The first one is that we're an Advisory Committee and our advice can always be ignored. So the first one is if people don't agree with us on our conclusion, move on, okay?

We are not part of the PDP. We don't have to reach consensus with other groups. That's the first thing which means that you and ALAC or ccNSO should not be afraid of not agreeing with us. We should listen to each other, we should draw our own conclusions, and make statements based on our own conclusions, specifically as Advisory Committees, and that's also my recommendation to you. ccNSO [inaudible] PDP, that's different.

The second thing, which I think is important regarding these things, is that these three principles are so important to us that we really want to see them. We haven't really spoken out loud earlier in the life of SSAC to have actually written down that

these three words, but this is what [lack] for us is motherhood and apple pie. These are principles you always use.

What is important to remember here is that we want those words to be as part of the evaluation but we are not the ones that do the evaluation itself. Other people have to do the risk calculation and decide whether something should be approved or not.

SSAC does not—and let me repeat that—does not intervene on our results in any kind of PDP that do the risk calculation for any specific TLD. The misunderstanding here is that in the report, we are pointing to, among other things, the ccNSO, the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process. Where these principles were spelled out, we point out that an evaluation was made and two specific domain names did not pass the evaluation. The misunderstanding here is that people think that because of that we want that, we want this criteria included so that these ccTLD IDN versions should not pass. That is not what we're saying.

We don't mind having more evaluations or whatever is needed but we cannot have a process in ICANN move forward without these SSR requirements and evaluations as part of the evaluation process.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just to be clear, when I mentioned our statement, I wasn't saying we should adjust it because you have given us the fount of all wisdom, but I'm just wondering is there anything in your report which we didn't consider and therefore maybe want to revise the statement?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Basically, once again our report boils down to we really would like to see these three words so some SSR related portions as part of the evaluation. That's all. That's everything we've said. The rest is background information.

[SEUN OJEDEJI]: Thank you madam Chair. I just want to note that yes, even though SSAC is advisory, I think that they play a very critical role and whatever they say goes beyond advisory, the way I take it, especially as it has to do with the security and stability of the DNS. And so if they're indeed against this particular issue, I think we may need to also perhaps, maybe when they leave, think about what we've said previously.

Just a separate question to you, which is not related to this particular point, I checked your website and I noticed that some of the statements have full translation whereas some are just in

English. What determines which one is fully translated and which one is not?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

The simple answer is that we don't budget have budget and resources to translate every document. We have tried different methods. The way we select documents depends on what interest the document has. So for example, input from ALAC has helped us a lot to know which documents we should translate.

To some degree it also has to do with the length of the document and how we import and we think at least certain portions of the document is. In this case, the SAC084, we choose to translate it just because we think these three principles are so important so we want everyone to be able to reference at least that part of the document. Even though they don't agree with the conclusion of the recommendation, it's important that those principles are translated into many languages.

We did try or we did talk about translating the executive summary of every document but after talking to people in the community, we found that that did not really make any sense. So instead we are trying to translate as many documents as we can into all the languages.

Is there another slide?

JIM GALVIN:

This is just about clarity. SAC083 was a response by SSAC to a proposed amendment to the gTLD Registry Agreement. There's no substantive explanation that's here. We were looking for clarity in what appears in the text. The interesting thing is SSAC has very clearly stated in the past that there should not be what are called dotless domains. So there should be no services and no extra records in a root zone except explicitly records to support the TLD itself, so the signatory records, the key records, and of course the second level domains themselves.

There was some ambiguity that appeared in the gTLD Agreement. It was an accident more than anything. It certainly was not intended to be a substantive change in any way, but it was possible for the movement of text around in the gTLD agreement to suggest that you could somehow apply for and get the ability to put other records into the TLD root zone, other than things explicitly to support the TLD, not for any other services. And all SAC083 did was to ask for some clarity and we made a couple of specific editorial suggestions about cleaning up the text to clarify that issue in the community.

As far as I know, there has not been any reaction from the community about this and the advice was taken on board and is going to happen just the way that we asked for it.

Any questions or comments about that? Sheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Just on SAC083, the one that you were just referring to in case I've had a mental blank on the last number, we are currently in the Subsequent Procedures for New gTLDs Working Group in our Work Track 4 specifically looking at dotless domains and I would be very keen to suggest, as one of the rapporteurs on that, we should liaise with you in a fairly formal sense rather than just expect us saying, "Here's the link. Here's the reference."

It might be a good idea to perhaps get a briefing at one of our Work Team meetings or a piece of specific advice in response to perhaps what was being discussed in the GNSO Subsequent Procedures face-to-face meeting yesterday. Because I think there's an opportunity for not quite getting things in mesh otherwise. So if I can have the right name to liaise with, I'll talk to [Rueben] and we'll see if we make sure we close it.

We're doing the same on Universal Acceptance and on other things perhaps sending specific questions, for example, to the JIS advisors to find out their opinions on some of the new gTLD processes. So if you can let me know, not necessarily now, would you like some formal questions, would you like to be

copied on those questions? Would you like us to invite you? I just think we need to make sure we mesh properly.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

There are two ways we can do this or there are several things that can be done. First of all, we can help you to find the relevant SSAC documents that we have published earlier that are relevant to your work. That's one thing that we can help you with.

Second thing, which I think we should not forget, is that we can have SSAC members participate and help you in the work that you're doing, the ones that are interested in helping. Note that I said that SSAC members are doing that.

The last thing that can be done as well is that SSAC can evaluate something but for SSAC to evaluate something, we need either some text from you or a question from you that we are responding to or we are responding, just like anyone can respond an open comment period. Because when SSAC reaches a conclusion, we have an internal process just like you have an ALAC before we actually reach a conclusion. So because of that, as SSAC we cannot really participate in other groups' work, if you understand what I mean, because we must reserve the ability of SSAC to evaluate any specific sort of snapshot or final work product.

On the other hand, we can help you as individuals along the way, both in the form of SSAC staff and also SSAC members can help you. So as long as we keep that distinction apart, we're fine and we're happy to help as much as we can.

JULIE HAMMER: I can't see any more questions so, Patrik, is there anything further you'd like to add? Oh, Olivier, sorry.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. This was released in July 2016. Was this advice followed? In general is SSAC advice followed? Do you keep track? Do you have any way for us to know whether SSAC advice is followed? Because one of the concerns that we've had in the past is then in some cases SSAC advice was not followed but there was no way for the ALAC to know about it, and we would love to be able to make sure that if we agree with the SSAC advice, we could remind whoever we need to remind about the SSAC advice that was not followed. I hope you've followed that.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Oliver. Let me give a two-part answer. The first part is as far as we know, this advice was accepted and will be followed and the communities that are dealing with this are

going to do that. It's really just a reiteration of a standing position from Board and a resolution and it's just an editorial effect to make sure there's no ambiguity.

To the larger question of SSAC advice being accepted and acknowledged, if you will, because again as Patrik has said before, we offer advice, certainly no one is obligated to follow it, we just offer an opinion in due consideration.

You're probably familiar with the Board Advice Tracker Project. It's an active project and ongoing and we've been very engaged in it and we're pleased to be the beta team, if you will, in going to details and working out the process with the Board.

They have a well-defined set of people. They now have staff, they have resources, this is a real project. People assigned to do this, whenever they get any advice in our document, they take out all the recommendations and create a list and they get it entered into the tracker. So we're tracking it very carefully ourselves too.

We have an ongoing process that we're building internally. The Board is doing this and their intent is to add other groups. All of the advice that comes to the Board will go through this tracker so all of this will be much more visible to the community.

They ultimately are going to have a publicly visible opportunity for everyone to see the advice that they've gotten and its status as it goes through the various steps and eventually gets closed when it's been addressed, and all this will be documented and available to the community so it's an ongoing thing.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

So if you look at All Board Advice Tracker, which ALAC was also part of, that was a graphical user interface which people could see but there were no processes behind it which led to no one really updating it so the data became obsolete after like the first second it was entered.

What they have done now is the other way round. They have processes for keeping track of the advice and the whole nine yards but they don't have the visibility because it's implemented in a tool that licensing and access rights and the whole nine yards.

But it is possible for people now to ask for a report from this tool because the machinery exists as Jim said, but the interface does not exist yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're actually technically out of time. I've told Julie to go ahead with the next speakers with a one-minute countdown clock for the speakers, please.

JULIE HAMMER: Holly's going to [inaudible] and Sébastien, if you would, ask your question. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It seems that it's easier to put 1,000 new gTLDs in the root that we have a tracking system for the Board. It's something we were talking about seven years ago, but never mind.

My question, and maybe I am a little bit slow, I understand that you were discussing about gTLD, who will need to go outside of the root. Of course the one who got outside was without any domain names and it was quite easy.

The question will be when it will happen with something— when gTLD with domain names, technically what we will do but also for end-user, how we will treat them. And it's something we never discussed either in the gTLD program or after. It seems like we want to put but we don't know when something died what we will do, and I was wondering if it's not something we need to take into account both technically and user centering from the user side too. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Sebastian, I think you touched upon at least two different things that SSAC actually is looking at, but I think we should talk offline and we can bring things back into this meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Julie, you can close up.

JULIE HAMMER: On that note, can I thank Patrik and Jim on your behalf, and we look forward to taking up some of these issues outside the meeting. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We're running a little bit late but we'll break for our full 15-minute break to give our interpreters a bit of time off. We'll reconvene 15 minutes from now on time please.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]