

ICANN
Transcription ICANN Johannesburg
GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG
Tuesday, 27 June 2017 at 08:30 SAST

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: Well thank you. Welcome to New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group our face to face session. And today is 27 June 2017. My name is Avri Doria. I'm one of the two co-chairs of this PDP with Jeff Neuman my – the other co-chair.

So if we can go to the next slide okay. So our agenda for the day is we have a welcome which I guess is what we're in the middle of, background of the session overarching issue discussion then the work track discussions. There'll be four of those then a section on next steps and the any other business mandatory ending to the meeting.

Next please. So okay already talked about who the co-chairs were. We have worktrack leads and they'll be leading the sections on the various work tracks. We have Sara Bockey and Christa Taylor on Worktrack 1, Michael Flemming and Phil Buckingham on Worktrack 2, Karen Day and Robin Gross on Worktrack 3. I know Robin is remote and not here. I see that the slides still have that funny bit of cutting out part in the middle. And Worktrack 4 Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Rubens Kuhl. So can we go to the next so the background of the section? The first thing is the current status. And should I proceed with these (unintelligible)?

Woman: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: The current status so overarching issues. We did a community comment one quite a while ago and preliminary consider six overarching subjects was in its charter. And we saw comments from everybody on them. We've just recently completed community Comment 2 which was focused on comments from each of the four worktracks. And we that the comments have been synthesized and collated and we've really just beginning to the - to start going through them. So the established worktracks are considering all the subjects, the remaining subjects, the particular subjects.

And within the worktracks themselves basically have this notion of making three passes essentially through all of them. The first pass has already been done. That's one where we looked at each issue, did a bit of blue sky on the issue, did a bit of pros and cons on any decisions that might have to be made and started getting our way towards what might end up being some sort of consensus. You know, now the second cycle the second pass begins where we take those discussions, the documentation is on the wiki site and start mixing them with the comments we've gotten and so analyzing the issues in the light of the comments we received the questions to the answers.

And then the third pass after we've done that we may reach consensus or a possible consensus on some of the issues in that second pass. The third pass is basically to ask two questions. Do we have consensus to make a change here and if so what is that change? And at that point then basically all the work would go to the full group to try and come up with the group's consensus for our initial recommendations.

Okay I covered all that. Next slide please. The timeline. The timeline is up there. It slips a little but we try not to. The original plan was to publish the initial report for public comment before the end of this year. Now just looking at schedules and everything it seems that January with all the work with the end of the year weeks and such that January is the more likely target for that but still ending, you know, to complete in 2018.

And I guess the what the project is about most of you probably know it's chartered by the GNSO Council to consider experiences from 2012 round of new gTLD programs to determine what additions or modifications are needed for the existing new gTLD policy recommendations and I should say implementation. We basically came into this with the policy of 2007, the application guidebook of 2012 and then all the various addenda and clarifications and what have you to that. Now that's not specifically policy at the moment but it is the base material that this group is working from. And at the end of this group with our recommendations it does become policy if it hasn't been changed.

So the, you know, we sometimes talk about what the existing policy is. The existing policy is 2007 but there's a certain de facto existence of the AGB, its practices and all of the rest of it that is the base material of this group. I'll move on now, overarching issues.

Jeff Neuman: (Unintelligible). Okay. Good morning everyone. I'm Jeff Neuman. For the transcript. Actually before I get started on these overarching issues can I just - everyone's welcome to come up to the table whether you're in the working

group or not and we want to make this very much interactive. So if you have questions at any point please make sure, you know, come on up to a mic. I think I guess there's none in the back right? I don't know why I can't see there. I've got to clean my glasses. But come up to the table then I guess and, you know, make sure that you ask your question.

Can I just see raise of - raise your hands if you are on or participating in the PDP Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group? Okay great so there's a lot of people here that are actually participating and that's great. Thank you for all your work so far and we still have a lot of work to do. But for those of you that are not in the group we always welcome new members so if after this you decide this is something you want to participate in just let - we should introduce the ICANN staff that's working on this as well. So to my right we have Steve Chan. Say hi Steve.

Steve Chan: Hi Steve.

Jeff Neuman: There you go. And we have Emily Barabas.

Emily Barabas: Hello everyone.

Jeff Neuman: And is Julie here today?

Avri Doria: She could not be here.

Jeff Neuman: All right we also have Julie Hedlund that helps us out tremendously as well but she also supports the SSAC in a number of other groups so she might be in one of those sessions. So let one of the ICANN staff members know that you're interested in joining the group. And like I said at any point if you have a question please don't hesitate to ask. One of the things we're trying to get out of this session is some views that we don't get to hear every day and just kind of a more diverse set of not that our group is not diverse but certainly people that we don't get to hear from all the time.

So with that I'll just jump into the overarching issues and we'll spend the next 30, 40 minutes on some of the overarching issues. One of them which will get to is actually is Trang here? So am I...

Avri Doria: No she's...

Jeff Neuman: Trang is with ICANN staff and she's responsible for a lot of the items in the new gTLD implementation and she has been fantastic in participating in this group. But there was a recent email from Trang saying we had asked the question of if there were, you know, the top ten gating items before ICANN staff could really start working on, you know, the next version of let's call it the guidebook or whatever it ends up being called. Trang had responded to the group that one of those issues which we'll address as number three is on that list. And so it's vital that we get moving on that one and so we'll talk about that a little bit later.

So the six overarching issues were separated out initially because they were considered high level or foundational. The first question which was - well one of the six or the first of the six was, you know, whether we should actually have new gTLDs or not. The policy of the GNSO that's in place now today says that there will be subsequent procedures for new gTLDs. And so that is the assumption we have been going under. And so we wanted to make sure there we asked that question of the community. And not surprisingly the community overwhelmingly came back and said that there was no reason to change the existing policy not to have additional new gTLDs. I know that's kind of a double negative but that was kind of the way it was worded.

So the community, you know, did come back with certain things or some members of the community came back with certain things that they want to see happen before a next application window starts. But there - whether it was the GAC or any of the supporting organizations or advisory groups no one came back and said a blanket we should not have additional new gTLDs.

A second question that we asked -- and I'll just skip that second -- well I guess no sorry, second question that we did ask was, you know, if we do have a subsequent application windows or round should they - should applications be limited either by organization or do we just say, you know, the most applications we're going to accept in the next window is 1000? And I'm just throwing that out there.

And we seem to have a consensus of those that responded to CC1 that said no that we don't think that we can have any kind of enforceable limit on the number of applications that are submitted either in total or by organization. And, you know, while there were some reasons pointed out by some of those that made comments as to why in theory we might want to do that I think overwhelmingly the comments pretty much stated that even if we wanted to have some sort of limited there would be no fair protectable mechanism for us to do that in some sort of way that was enforceable. So those are two items that we reached a preliminary conclusion on. And those will be reflected when we do come out with a preliminary report.

So three other issues that we've established drafting teams on for four different topics or sorry, three drafting teams four topics one of them included, you know, should we recognize different TLD types? And when they talk about recognition it could either be during the application phase, it could be during a testing phase. It could be recognizing different TLD types based on a contract, you know, having different contracts for different top-level domain types.

And what we are looking at now is we certainly have some types or different categories of TLDs that were listed in the Applicant Guidebook in 2012. So for example communities are recognized as a type of top-level domain. Geographic top-level domains are recognized as a category for certain areas. Intergovernmental organizations if they are the applicant for TLDs have certain types of provisions in the legal agreement that either don't apply or are a little bit different for them. And in addition after the Applicant Guidebook

came out and, you know, we saw all of the different types of applications we had it took about a year or so but eventually a new category of brand top-level domains was recognized through a Specification 13.

And additional category that was recognized indirectly was something we call closed generics which were those applicants that applied for generic sounding words I'll say and had proposed to make them closed to only their organization. So for example there was an application for .grocery which was eventually withdrawn. But there was an application for .grocery that was from one of the largest grocery store chains in North America. And they had initially applied to have it closed. But after some advice from the GAC and a number of community comments it was determined by the board that for the 2012 round we were not going to allow closed generic top-level domains.

With the caveat that that's not policy, that's not what the GNSO has come out with as a consensus policy and its specific recommendation from the board for the GNSO to consider whether we should allow closed generics going forward. And that topic is being addressed by Worktrack 2 Michael it's yours or through 3? No it's 2, yes sorry, Worktrack 2. So that's in the legal regulatory worktrack.

However there are many other types of things that we need to consider in terms of categories. And it had been suggested even prior to starting the last the 2012 around that we - there was certainly a number of governmental advisory committee members that were advocating that we should recognize different types of categories and maybe even process them in different manners. So one of the overarching issues that we are tackling now is should we keep the categories that were recognized in 2012 and/or should we add additional ones? And if we do either keep those or add additional ones how do we recognize them? How do we treat them differently?

And so that's a topic that has been taking of some of our time. We have a drafting team on it and we are looking at all different types of aspects on that.

The second issue I think it's on the next page there slide -- there we go -- is certainly we heard from pretty much everyone in the community I think I could say that we could from the last round certainly predictability of the process. There were a lot of elements that were introduced either last minute or they came up sort of on an ad hoc basis that affected the predictability of the process that was laid out in the guidebook.

So one of the questions that we are looking at in a drafting team is, you know, how do we establish that framework of predictability but also recognize that there can be things from time to time that would cause us to take a step back and say well wait a minute, you know, we didn't anticipate that this whatever the this is and we really should address that prior to either continuing that application window or continuing the evaluation process or whatever stage that that issue comes up. So one of the things that we are trying to do is to try to establish a framework for how we deal with those types of issues, whether we deal with those types of issues or I guess I would say what is the burden on the type of issue in order to make sure that it rises to a level that we need to address it in the middle of an application window? Or if we end up going first come first serve, you know, how we would address different issues that come up which leads us to the question of, you know, normally when we make changes to policy we do through -- do so through a formal policy development process.

You know, is that the appropriate way for dealing with changes that need to be made when issues come up in the middle of an application window? We do have a process now within the GNSO of an expedited policy development process but is that even something that might be too long to address certain issues that may or may not - well that may come up? And a third is that, you know, we should acknowledge that there are going to be issues that we can't account for that just arise that despite our best planning and even if we took a number of years to try to figure out everything that could possibly come up with we're not going to be able to. So how do we resolve all of these in some sort of predictable manner?

And the last issue which actually I want to - we want to spend the time discussing we thought would be kind of the most interesting and certainly ones that we've gotten a lot of thoughts on is the model on how we assess applications. Do we do it in rounds as has been the historical way of addressing new TLD applications right? We had a round in 2000 yes. It was 2000 sorry and in which seven TLDs were selected. We had another sponsored TL - we had a what's called a sponsored TLD round in 2004, 2005 and then finally we had this round in 2012.

And a round implies that you accept applications, you close an application window, you evaluate the applications, and then you spend some period of time reviewing what happened in that last round. Do we continue on that basis knowing that interestingly enough it took between 2007 - sorry 2005 to 2012 till we got that 2012 round so that was a period of seven years. We're already in 2000 and what year are we in '17?

Avri Doria: Almost there.

Jeff Neuman: That's been five years right? So since the last over five years since the last round. Is this really the type of progression that we want to maintain on a - on an ongoing basis? Most people came back with comments saying no that we really should try to stick to the GNSO policy that said that there should be a predictable mechanism for introducing new gTLDs in a continuous manner. But other than that there's - there hasn't been quite yet agreement on exactly how we do that. There are certainly been proposals for just the first come first serve right?

So we say the application window opens up on January 1 in whatever year and we just take the first application that comes in, evaluate it and, you know, we move on from there. That would of course imply that there would be no contention sets and so that would ease certain burdens for certain things.

However there are a number of problems that have been identified with that pure approach.

Number one is that while we have at least now five years of and by that time more years of pent-up demand? And so do you really want to open up a first come first serve right away and, you know, basically reward those that happen to get the application in first in sort of a digital archery type way or there has also been a recognition I would say for most of the community that even if we end up with a first come first serve approach as the long term aspirational goal that because there's pent-up demand now we would at least have to start with an initial round and then potentially move into a first come first serve model.

Another mechanism that was proposed was a model whereby you have application windows that are predictable but do allow for a closing of the window in order to process different or in order to accomplish a number of tasks in-between the windows and then start that next window on a predictable basis. So for example you could say that one window a year where you start an application window January 1, you accept applications through the end of March. You process those applications and then January 1 of the next year you will start another application window. With that type of a model you would certainly have - it would be predictable. But you would have to deal with all of the contention set issues that we had to deal with in the last round. So you'd have to figure out how resolve contention. You have to figure out whether you're going to do things like auction as a last resort, you know, how you're going to, you know, do all of those. So there are still a number of issues that if we considered that kind of mechanism.

Then there is the, you know, what we call the hybrid model which is that you do either one or a fixed number of rounds or application windows followed by what we would call the steady state which is either of those two models we talked about, the first come first serve or predictable application windows. And when you look at some of the things that we've been considering which

is on the next slide, you know, one of the things, you know, how do we ensure that stakeholders can monitor the program for, you know, things that we know are going to continue in the new gTLD process? Certainly we are going to have some process to file public comments on applications.

We're going to have some mechanism for objections to be filed. How do we not make it so much of a burden on groups that have the right to object to basically be monitoring every single day if we went to a first come first serve model right? Are there ways that, you know, and certainly some GAC members have expressed some concerns and intellectual property, IPC, some members have expressed concerns that having a pure first come first serve model in addition to rewarding those that happen to get the applications in first whether or not they're the -- I'll use it in quotes -- whether or not there the best applications whether we should reward those but also the problem of, you know, if there's only a 30 day window let's say to file public comments or 60 days, you know, we being those that want to file comments we can't monitor every single day and keep track of applications that come in that day. It's just too much of a burden on the rest of the community.

Now one thing that was suggested which I thought was a constructive suggestion was well even if you accept applications on a first come first serve basis you may still opt to only publish those once a quarter or once a month and put those out for public comment at the same time thereby still have in the first come first serve mechanism but having a more predictable method for filing comments or objections. That was something that was thrown out. I'm sorry that was thrown out to the group, not that it was thrown out as an idea. It was a constructive idea.

Another consideration is how do we avoid pent-up demand? So if we do things like application windows and we do for example one a year then you create the problem of or the issue of having any pent-up demand between the time that the last application window closes and the time the next application window opens and thereby creating all these issues that we see

of this issue of pent up demand and what are the impacts of having either a first come, first serve process or an application windows or some other mechanism on other aspects of the gTLD program?

How do we prioritize who gets evaluated first for example? How do we deal with string contention? Do we have a preference for communities or geographic TLDs or any other kind of category? So each mechanism comes with its own consideration. So if you did let's say a first come first serve process you wouldn't have to deal with string contention but on the other hand you also wouldn't have as was in 2012 a advantage for community-based top-level domains which is something in 2012 we wanted to see.

So with all of that kind of introduction I want to just, you know, get thoughts on where you - considering all of those aspects and things perhaps we may not have even mentioned kind of thrown out there as to what you see as the most efficient mechanism going forward and how would you address some of these concerns? And this is a lively subject on our mailing list. There was certainly a lot of thoughts. I'll ask more pointed questions if I have to but I see Jonathan. So Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi Jeff. It's Jonathan Robinson. Just I think probably a quick question and then a suggestion perhaps but I mean on the question side where do we stand on the 1000 TLDs per year limit?

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Jonathan. This is Jeff Neuman. That's a great question and for those of you that have been paying attention to a study that was done I think it's called the CDAR, C-D-A-R study. And I don't know I - blanking on what that stands for. But there was a group that was commissioned probably two years ago it started and came out with an initial report and a final report a few months ago. That report was submitted to the board.

And that report basically said that the, there were no significant impacts or adverse impacts on the root zone from introducing the TLD, the Top Level

Domain so far in the 2012 round. And they found that even with the - it basically implied -- I'm not sure it actually came out and said directly -- but it implied that the community may want to review whether 1000 applications is still the appropriate limit given the findings that there were no significant negative impacts on the routes. And so that report as I said has been delivered to the board.

We have discussed this issue in Worktrack 4. I'm looking for Rubens or Cheryl's here. That issue has been discussed in Worktrack 4. and I will just say because I know that they'll probably address it, it is something that we are planning to send a question to the SSAC because they also came out with a paper way back when that agreed with the or set the 1000 TLD limit. So given this new information from the group that did the CDAR study would they revise their thinking on that paper?

So it is a significant issue especially if what we hear, you know, obviously we don't know how many applications there will be but we've heard everything from, you know, up to 25,000. Don't quote me on that. You know, it's something that has been thrown about but if there's 1000 TLD limit per year you would be forced telling people that apply I'm sorry you're going to have to wait 24 years before we can, you know, even if we evaluate your application, you know, you can't be delegated until 2043.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so Jeff...

Jeff Neuman: I'll let you...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...just a follow-up on that on that then. In a sense the to the extent that that was a technical limit rather than a limit imposed by any other constraints that technical limit remains in place subject to alternative advice being created right? And you - it sounds like your group is going to look for an

alternative position say look is does this still stand? But absent a new position that's the status quo?

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff. Correct that's what stands right now and that's what Cheryl and Rubens with Worktrack 4 are working on.

Jonathan Robinson: And so I guess from well then when evaluating because one of your questions at all about, you know, rates or how - or rounds and I guess in looking at those one must either look at them with that 1000 limit in place and/or be sure to ask the question as to whether that 1000 limit can be modified.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks Jonathan. I'll just say that, you know, from a purely policy perspective in CC1 the question was asked should there be a limit on the number of applications? And the preliminary consensus was that from a purely policy perspective there should not be a limit. So you are absolutely right, it is at this point a technical issue and it is being addressed.

And I think and I'll just say this as an opinion and maybe Avri might differ or others might differ. I think we should proceed to figure out which of the frameworks we think is better from the policy perspective and not necessarily at this point in time worrying about the 1000 TLD limits. Let's come up with what we all as a community think is the best framework. And then once we come up with that framework if there is a limit, a technical limit we can then incorporate that into what we the community feel is the best framework. I know there's others in the queue so...

Avri Doria: Yes and I very much agree. And it may even be an issue where we need further opinion and further analysis than what is being given to us at the moment. So yes it's a historical limit at the moment I would say and it stands in place until change but it really does need investigation. So at the moment we have a queue with three people in it. And I would recommend that people use the Adobe Connect if they can to get into the queue just because it's

easier to track but we will take questions also from those who aren't on Adobe Connect and I'll add you to the queue when I see you, when I see that you're asking or when Jeff sees that you're asking. So at the moment we have Paul McGrady, Steve DelBianco and Donna and Michele so Paul please.

Paul McGrady: Thank you Avri, Paul McGrady for the record. First of all I love seeing the return of overarching issues to any agenda. It harkens back to happier days. So thank you for that.

Secondly this is meant to be a true skeptical question and not designed to move us in any particular direction. But have we done any work with regard to identifying whether or not there is in fact pent-up interest? I think that if there is pent-up interest then we need to know that. If there's not actually pent-up interest then we need to know that. Thanks.

Avri Doria: We have not done that that I know of. We have had various participants claimed that they have done it and have seen it but we have not done an analysis of pent-up interest. Yes Steve DelBianco please.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Avri and members of this PDP Working Group, appreciate all the efforts and look forward to listening to all these tracks that you have in front of you. The BC submitted an extensive set of responses to your latest thoughtful questionnaire. And with regard to this question of batches versus continuous we saw it as a gating question, an overarching consideration that will affect so much of the rest of your work. So we're keenly interested to see how close the PDP Working Group is to resolving that gating question so that the rest of your work can fit in. The BC went on record suggesting that a three-month application window was sufficient and could be appropriate for the scheduling of work and staff and monitoring.

We did note that having a regular window is essential that people - so that people don't perceive it's a now or never situation. And regular doesn't mean

annual as I know Jeff sort of threw out annual but that sounds rather too regular and it might well be biannual or every three years. So we didn't specify that. We just said that regularity and reasonable expectation that there would be on another three-month window open in the next one, two, three years. We do a lot to smooth the demand if there's credibility that that next round would in fact happen and that the rules affecting that next three-month window weren't subject to being whipsawed and changed as the community reacts to what went wrong in the last window and then read out the rules for the next window. So regularity, realistic expectations and we support the notion of a three month window. Thank you very much.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And just to note that in the discussions of Windows the intra-vote was as short as six months annual and longer. So the candidates for period between six months was the minimum that I believe got discussed, just wanted to add that. Okay so thank you Steve. We have Donna please.

Donna Austin: Thanks Avri, Donna Austin from Nustar. Jonathan just back to your question on the 1000 delegation limit my understanding from Trang is that the board is actually going to consider that CDAR report sometime in the next month or so. I think that's what you told us some time ago. So I guess the question for this group it's great that we're going to consider from a policy perspective but we need to understand what the board considering that board and the recommendations actually means because if they decide to stay with 1000 per year is there any opportunity for us to come back and try to change that based on additional work that we do within this group?

Avri Doria: Thank you. One of the things one would almost hope is that the board would consult the group before making a decision but that is aspirational. But certainly after any decision they make there is also going further with it. But I would hope that the board would come talk to the community before it made that decision.

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff Neuman. If - and I think it's a great question Donna and I see no reason why we as a group cannot ask the GNSO Council to actually make it more formal request to the board to basically acknowledge or at least bring to the board's attention that this is an issue we are considering as well and to well, excepting, the board should accept the report of the group, it - I mean just accept it, not accept all the recommendations.

We can actually submit a request, let them know what we're thinking because we can't just - I don't want to just rely on the board will just on its own figure out that we need to respond. So perhaps we'll put it as an action item for us to send a note to the council. I know there were members of the council here and I know Paul McGrady is our council liaison. So we will, Avri and I will draft a notice sent to our liaison to send to the council seeing if the council was interested in sending something to the board letting them know this was an issue we are considering as well.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Next I have Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Avri, Michele for the record, just picking up a couple of the points on the 1000 per year is not purely a technical issue. I mean you also have administrative overhead. I mean you have to have human beings checking validating going through that. So based on the average working year of 260-odd days I'm assuming that people actually take holidays and get sick and get hit by cars, et cetera, etc. You're still looking at an average of about four TLDs delegated per day on the 1000.

Now obviously you could increase that but just saying it's purely a technical issue isn't entirely true. So I think there's also a question which needs to be asked of ICANN org in terms of what they see as being the actual limits in terms of how much manpower how much time and everything else is involved in doing that. Now I'm not saying that you're going to end up in a situation where they're going to say oh, but we can only do four a day but just assuming that at a policy level you can go past a thousand a year doesn't

mean at a practical level you can actually do that properly. I mean I honestly I don't know the answer. And I'm not saying that which answer is correct but I think it's still something that needs to be factored in.

In terms of the entire frequency of rounds versus first come first served and all that personally I think the regular window concept I mean a lot of what Steve DelBianco was saying makes a lot of sense, I mean something predictable, something that people can count on that removes a lot of that kind of false sense of urgency. First come first served I see as being something that benefits insiders. I don't see that as being beneficial to the wider public to the wider and community out there, the wider Internet community.

But the key thing I think when you're looking at all of this is driving awareness in general. I mean how do we get to a point where I don't have Dublin City Council ringing me three months after the application window is closed going, "Hey we'd like to have, you know, .Dublin," for example or having a groups of people milling around some concept of some super-duper funky TLD about a week before the application window closes simply because nobody was aware until like two, three weeks, two or three weeks out.

But that (Jen) that public awareness piece is something that we - that was sorely lacking the last time around. And ICANN the organization apparently did a PR drive around it but it didn't seem to work from what I saw. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks Michele. And I think that, you know, absolutely on the last point that is an issue, outreach is an issue for, you know, our Worktrack 1 which Sara is one of the worktrack leaders and Christa Taylor who's not here for this meeting but absolutely that is certainly an issue.

And on the question of, you know, not just purely a technical issue in terms of the number of applications you process I think it's a great question. I think it's a question that needs to be framed in terms of, you know, if you, you know,

what ability does the organization have to scale up because presumably if you had 25,000 applications, you know, you're going to make the application feel have at least monitor resources to scale up. That doesn't mean that that's an infinite ability to scale but certainly getting the organization to weigh in on whether they believe that there is a limit is a good idea.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Just doing – this is Avri again. Just doing a time check on it we've got about seven minutes left on this topic. I've got Jordan and Jonathan on the list so Jordan please.

Jordan Buchanan: Yes so just a quick – one last thought hopefully on the or maybe Jonathan is going to talk once more about the 1000 one - oh, I'm Jordan Buchanan from Google. But on the 1000 limit first of all I think you don't really need to worry about it to this stage. You know, as indicated we don't really know how big the pent-up demand is going to be. We've never yet managed to delegate 1000 TLDs in a year.

To the extent that it is a limit like it comes at the very end of the process right? Like you go through, you get the queue of TLDs ready to be delegated. And if there is a limit then that's where you worry about it. You don't need to worry about it at this phase of like figuring out who and when to allow to apply. As Jeff pointed out these are 25,000 coming right off the bat, that's going to happen regardless of whether or not of which of these mechanisms you choose. And if there's only 100 in the backlog then this is never going to be a problem. I just wouldn't try to optimize this question too much around that particular topic because you can deal with it sort of as it becomes a problem or not.

As to the general question I mean you guys have heard from me before. I think the answer to this is super obvious that first come first serve eliminates a host of problems that I think really created a lot of problems in the previous round. You know, we talk about - Jeff talked about string contention and community prioritization as being issues that, you know, you have to deal -

that we would sort of lose out on if we went to a first come first serve. I don't know - we're not losing out on that. We're just eliminating problems. Like the only reason why we care about those issues is because we like force people into a model where contention can happen.

And if you just go with the first come first serve model then you never have to worry about those issues at all. Now it's true that you can't give communities an advantage in this model. But and, you know, Michele said this favors insiders. But it's not really true because anyone that didn't know about the last window or a community there was interested in applying and didn't hear about the last window or Michele says Michele points out applied a few weeks too late they don't have a chance to like exercise their priorities too.

We already have a first come first served by round. And if you miss your chance - unless you believe that every community that is interested is going to apply for their TLD at the exact same time as the other non-community that's going to apply in the exact same window then you already have a first-come, first-serve element where those communities will miss out if someone applies in the window ahead of them. And so, you know, let's like get rid of the nonsense and like all of the difficulties. We see so many reconsideration requests, IRPs as a result of contention in TLDs really tied up the ICANN organization and community in knots for years. Like we still haven't resolved some of the contentions from the last round.

I just don't know why we would put ourselves through that again or make an expectation of the program that we want to continue to have those sorts of problems. And there's always going to be people unhappy with decisions as a result of a subjective evaluation process. And so, you know, let's just simplify things. We're going to have to deal with the pent-up demand. We're going to have to go through this one more time but let's like put an end to it after that and just say, you know, whoever gets there first gets the domain. We can do that continuously.

It addresses all of the issues that Steve talked about as well about expectations. You know, you can apply whenever you want. We can tweak the program as we see problems. And, you know, frankly we just know that we're not good at actually getting a continuous set of rounds in place. We said after the last time we were going to do this within a year.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Jordan Buchanan: We're years and years and years later and I just don't think the expectation's realistic other than making sure that it's a continuous process from the outside.

Avri Doria: Thank you. You wanted to say couple of words although I do want to point out that there've only four minutes left. But two things that I was reminded of is one -- and Jordan did remind me of it -- say your name when you're beginning. And two, we should try and keep our comments somewhat concise.

Jeff Neuman: Yes Jordan thanks. And I appreciate you coming to the mic because that is a perspective we're hearing. When you say we would get rid of some of the community problems I would say that there are a number of members of the ICANN community that do value the notion of communities and do believe that it is valuable at least in some way to have not just the first person that thinks of the idea of having a string to get it but does value the notion of having strings go to organized communities.

And something that was pointed out by I think it was Jamie Baxter at the last meeting was that when a community does form with an idea it takes them a while to get their community supported. And what they were worried about with the first come first serve model is while they're trying to build their support to apply for a top-level domain someone hears about it and puts in their own application for it and takes it away. That was a concern that was

expressed by some existing communities that have applied for top level domains so I just wanted to make sure that that's reflected. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thanks. This is Avri again. We have one last comment from Jonathan before we and this topic they move on to Worktrack 1. So Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Avri, Jonathan Robinson with Affiliates. I – when we step back from that 1000, 1000's one very specific point but I thought I heard some really good comments from people like Paul and Michele about what demand is in the market and what capacity we have to deal with it? So in some ways I mean a lot of these specific questions might be more helpfully framed or more helpfully answered if we had some idea. So Jeff when you were thinking about the letter to the board it makes sense to me in saying look you're going to look at the CDAR report and by the way what about this 1000? But it might be worth going even further than that and saying how does - how is the ICANN organization positioned to scale because and to deal with demand or what capacity exists in the organization because clearly one of the lessons from the last round was there was a demand that exceeded what was expected and we got into all sorts of difficulties in terms of processing that pent-up demand.

So I think the thought of trying to in some way assessed demand, market survey and assess capacity would seem to me like the sort of thing one would do with any project in any of our commercial organizations would go out. They would try and understand what's the market for the product and what our capacity to build for that is. And in some ways that seems relevant that some of that thinking applies here. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. This is Jeff and just the last comment, I think there was doing a market study for demand for top level domains is a very difficult thing because if people are considering it they may not admit it. Certainly those of us that represent clients that have expressed interest are not going to come out and say what our clients may or may not be interested in.

And I will note that there was a market study done prior to the 2012 round which indicated a maximum of only a couple hundred that came out of that and then we saw 1000. So I'm not disputing that we should - that something may want to be done. I just am not sure how reliable something like that would be. But it's something that we should all consider. Sorry I'll give Jonathan the response.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: A quick response and we do have a remote comment that will be the last comment on...

Jonathan Robinson: Very brief response. Just because we didn't get it right previously doesn't mean we shouldn't try again. I mean, you know, it's possible that we could learn from what we did wrong in the market survey or we multiply by five whatever the answer is. There's many ways. And it doesn't mean we shouldn't do it necessarily.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I'll ask Emily Barabas to read the remote comment and I saw that Kathy Kleiman got her hand up just as I said the list was closed which there is always one person that gets their hand up as the list is closing so please Emily Barabas.

Emily Barabas: Thanks. This is a comment from Anne Aikman-Scalese from the IPC. It is the first come first serve - oh, if it's first come first serve from the beginning of the next round the application system will crash, end comment.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you and Kathy Kleiman on the last comment on this one before we go to Worktrack 1.

Kathy Kleiman: Thank you Avri, appreciate the opportunity, Kathy Kleiman. I just wanted to note that I think it was Jeff who said communities need time to apply. I just

want to note communities need time to respond as well. And one thing ICANN did really well -- and this is a comment in favor of having rounds -- is ICANN announced the new gTLDs in a very big way and brought about a lot of awareness on the announcement day. And a lot of people who don't normally follow ICANN did see that there was an announcement, did see that there was a list. Communities did notice what was going on and it did still take them, you know, months to respond and file objections and things like that. But that was part of the process that actually worked. And so first come first serve wouldn't have that but we did have some successes in the first run.

And that was one that there was a lot of awareness raised when we had almost 2000 applications. And the world kind of mobilized and not just, you know, Western Europe and North America but other parts of the world mobilized and looked in communities got involved. So to allow that time for communities around the world to respond as new gTLD applications come in is a very important. And that was an important part of round one. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. We have not obviously finish this conversation and I apologize to those who may have raised their hand after I had closed the discussion. For the second time please take the discussion to the list. It's obviously a discussion that's not yet completed and at this point I'd like to move to Worktrack 1 and you're taking it okay.

Sara Bockey: Sorry I didn't see the slide change. Yes this is Sara Bockey with Worktrack 1. And so today we thought we would discuss the applicant support as well as RSP. Those are two areas that we have had a pretty significant amount of discussion but we haven't had a lot of progress or we have a lot of ideas but definitely need more feedback from the community.

So starting with the applicant support we know from final report that some of the possible reasons that may have contributed to the limited number of applicants in this program was that measures that were introduced prevent gaming of the program and that may have discouraged some of the

applicants. There was also a lack outreach effort for the program due to the short implementation time and a lack of financial support beyond the application fee reduction.

When we were in Hyderabad Krista and I spoke with (Alice) from the GAC and she indicated that they would be reaching out, they being the GAC would be reaching out to the three applicants to find out what find out from them what went wrong. And they were planning to put together a workplan with a new approach to understand the challenges and also gather some data to help enforce their findings.

From this conversation it was clear that obviously ICANN needed to do more. And they also express the idea that ICANN should partner with the organizations in the regions first before doing anything further. So from this we know that we need to find a balance between outreach and the information being impartial, definitely need to set the right level of expectation as well as making people aware of the program.

We've had a lot of discussion and ideas of how we could possibly make this program more appealing to the community. Some have mentioned the idea of broadening this support to IDNs or some other criteria. When we had our discussion with (AIPAC) they had mentioned the idea of having a middle applicant, the idea being that that it would be a developed but struggling region as opposed to an underserved or underdeveloped region. Our discussions around this have been a little hit or miss. There's concerns about coming up with a definition of what a middle applicant would be.

But during our last discussion -- and this is what I'd like to discuss today -- is during our last discussion Kurt Pritz brought up the idea of developing a set of principal, policy principles guiding the applicant support implementation. So for example the - some of these guiding principles could be that the applicant support should be more about coaching and mentoring than financial support. And that financial support could be awarded for the applicant fee in early

registry fees but be focused on making the registry more self-sufficient. The support program should be publicized as broadly as possible and that the program should take into account the applicants may be unsophisticated and that the evaluation should take this into consideration.

So the idea of that being that we would have the simple set of principles that we could turn over to ICANN to start implementation now for reiteration and discussion within the community. So I was going to open it up now for input. How do people feel about this idea of just sort of coming up with some guiding principles? Do you like these four examples that were put forward? Do you think there is something else that can be added, something entirely different that you think would be fabulous Edmon I see you have your hand up.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung here. So I'm curious what the I'm looking at the four points. How does it differ from the previous JAS -- called the JAS I think -- recommendations as well as implementation from ICANN because from what I see here it's kind of similar or if not almost the same?

Sara Bockey: Jeff go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. Edmon this has been one of our difficult areas because there -- we have not gotten much in the way of feedback or participation. This issue seems to be one that although we know there's interest in the community it hasn't shown itself in our working group either because those that have an interest in the subject aren't participating or those that - so we're throwing it out to your right the criteria does not differ from the Joint Applicant Support which is what JAS refers to. But that's why we're looking at the community.

We recognize that so far the people participating in the group on inactive bases are the ones with this expertise. So I will just say that we are looking to you and to others that have an interest in this program. We've reached out to

members of the GAC and try - we're trying to coordinate with they have a committee looking at underserved regions have not been very successful in joining up with them to give their comments. Any help from anyone who's interested from the community on this we would certainly appreciate your thoughts or your putting us in touch with those. And that's why we put it on this schedule for today.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Trying to keep to a schedule and people - I mean to things. And I'll put you in the queue. You managed to get a quick jump on the conversation. I had Kavouss trying to get into the queue. You would need to come up to one of the microphones though and we don't have a standing mic. Jonathan I wanted to check while Kavouss is coming up to a mic Jonathan your hand is up. That's a previous, a remainder okay. And I have Michele which is new okay. Okay yes. Okay so Kavouss please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Good morning to all of you. As you have noted on previous call I have mentioned the difficulties complexity of the first come first served. I have dealt with this issue for more than 20 years and identified with other people that this is a series of complexity in the application. First you have to consider the issue of equitable access. Second capacity of processing. And third is the procedure of processing.

First come first serve immediately requires that to establish a date of receipt in order to treat them in a sequential manner one after the other. One complexity that comes is the impact of one to the others how you have to avoid that. If we do not properly address the issue of capacity then the last come last served may not be served at all because you may never get a time to be served because of the extra - an excessive amount that you put even talking about 1000 particular time.

So with this approach need to be very carefully studied before being proposed for application studied from various angles from various aspects and in particular the capacity of the processing. Otherwise you will end up a

big backlog but never be able to absorb that backlog. This process has been done elsewhere outside ICANN and there are considerable amount of experience on the complexity and difficulty of that. So this is something that I wanted to share with you and request that we need to carefully examine the situation. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you Kavouss. Two things, one I want to recommend everyone first give your name when you're starting. And second I'd like to know since you're at the - and that was from the previous topic did you have a comment on the applicant support that you'd like to add while you're at the microphone?

Kavouss Arasteh: Not for the time being.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you very much. Then I'll go on to Michele please.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Michele for the record. A couple of things. I mean the – I was involved with the what the hell was it with the JAS, the Joint Application Support Working Group back in I don't know was that in the last century? And one of the things that I think we have to be very, very careful about is how you frame certain aspects of this.

So like look at appointee there. We probably should take into account that applicants may be unsophisticated of evaluation should be conducted with that understanding that that's perfectly fine if you're looking at it purely in terms of their ability to fill out complex documents and, you know, the kind of disjoints between I don't know say insurance requirements -- all of those kinds of things which are more down to the kind of legal corporate framework -- all that kind of stuff.

But the thing that I would be very, very wary of is allowing them to creep over into the technical side of things because when you're a TLD, a domain registry whether it's being applied for by somebody in a "first world country"

or somebody in the global South or wherever it has to be something that will work properly globally. And it has to meet certain technical requirements.

You know, that's at one level is pretty obvious in many respects. A second part to it is being that if it's not - if you're not careful you could end up a situation where somebody says oh, I'll apply for this pretending to be one thing and I'm going to be the other. In terms of how do you get engagement from the people with the expertise there I honestly I haven't - I am a member of this working group but I have only been kind of following it from a distance because I have hashtag day job and various other things.

Maybe some of these ICANN global stakeholder engagement people might be able to assist. I know that they've been doing quite a bit of work around capacity building in certain parts of the world. I've been involved in a few of those things and there is I think under the previous CEO and some other people there was this kind of concept floating around that everybody should have their own TLD. And I think there was a kind of a weird expectation that somehow you should have all of these registries and registrars all over the place whereas a lot of those places they didn't actually have the domain registrations to begin with. But I think talking to some of those guys might be helpful thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I should - I don't know whether it was you or someone else who had mentioned GSE and reaching out to them at our previous meeting. And I did reach out to them but didn't follow-up on it. So thank you for bringing it up again so that following up on it does become more of an action item so thanks for that. Jim please.

Jim Prendergast: Yes good morning, Jim Prendergast with the Galway Strategy Group. Michele must have been reading off of my notes here because a lot of what you said about Point D I 100% agree with. I don't think it's the intent but I think we need to make it clear that we're not talking about allowing less technically

qualified candidates to operate TLDs. And I think if that's the case I think we need to make that clear.

Looking at Point C I think if we don't get Point C right everything else fails the publicity. We saw that with the publicity campaign that was run during the first round. It didn't...

Avri Doria: Right.

Jim Prendergast: ...work. So we could design the best program out there but if people don't know about it then nobody's going to be able to take advantage of it. I do like a in the sense of coaching and mentoring because it does sort of take the shift away from the financial issues. I think we all know and especially those who are actually operating TLDs right now the application fee was probably the smallest expense in your sort of scale beyond belief.

But, you know, the cost of running a registry involve fees to ICANN, fees to your registry services provider, new fees for things that are going to be mandated upon TLD operators the we don't know about such as GAC wish lists and things like that. So the costs certainly add up and waiving the application fee I don't think really does the true service to an applicant. It doesn't provide the full picture of what is involved in total cost of ownership of the TLD. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Just going to do a quick time check. We've got about ten minutes left on this topic. Jeff wanted a comment in there, have a remote from Emily Barabas (unintelligible) put yourself in the Adobe Connect only (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: (Unintelligible) a lot of comments on (unintelligible). There are (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) Edmon and then (unintelligible) the second topic. Hopefully we have enough time for it.

Woman: So we have two remote participant comments. The first one is from (Maria Marciano). It's a question, "Why not create a roster of potential applicants from underserved regions that receive support a mentoring to eventually apply for a gTLD? Support in the midst of the application process seems to pose challenges for applicants. These challenges could have been resolved before if applicants had a program to bring them up to compete." And the second comment is from Christina Rosette question, "In Subpart D does evaluations refer to evaluations for support or evaluations of TLD application?" End question.

Avri Doria: So Donna please.

Donna Austin: Thanks Avri, Donna Austin from Nustar. I think another principle that might be helpful here is that I think it's the long term sustainability as a principal should be included in this because it's to some of the points that Jim has made there are ongoing costs so that the applicant should understand what those are and they should have a business case in play that demonstrates that they understand what the requirements are and how they're going to meet those in the longer term.

I mean it's one thing to provide support for the application fee itself but obviously that's just a small part of it. Even waiving ICANN fees that's good for, you know, 12 months but if the applicant or the community or whoever it happens to be don't have a plan for the long term sustainability of the TLD then I think it's not going to get off to a very great start. And I think it's important in terms of, you know, once a TLD is delegated we would hope that it stays there for a very long time. So to kind of mitigate any risk that it's going to potentially run into in the early days I think it's important that they can demonstrate that they have thought about how they're going to manage this through in the longer term I think that might be a good principle to add.

Avri Doria: Thank you and Edmon and then will move on to the next topic here please.

Edmon Chung: Oh Edmon Chung here. So financials split just for the application fee definitely is not enough. There's also the option part of it which is even more interesting right, I mean not even getting into actually operating it. But that aside I think in terms of the sustainability if you look back at the program previously in fact the application process requires the applicant to spell it out how the initial funding support would actually help in the longer run well, the longer run meeting five years in the application which is synced up with the larger financial requirements.

So with that actually I think it's important probably you look back at what is already there and you're looking for people who would give some feedback I think at least start with the three applicants that actually applied for the financial support program last time. And there were also a listing of those who sought I think at least the listing of those who offered mentoring and coaching support. I think, you know, those are probably good starting points.

And also there was an evaluation panel that was formed to evaluate those three applications. So I think those are good starting points and probably go back to those four groups, the three applicants and the evaluation panel from last time and get some feedback from them because personally in our organization we have supported one of them and we have also supported like the NexGen program at ICANN a couple of times that we helped run it, actually took this specific topic and ran with, you know, ran with the use to think about this issue.

And it's an issue that's is very interesting and it's good to get their input as well. So actually there were a couple of times that there were outcomes there and probably we could share those to the group as well although those are very, you know, those are, you know, not necessarily, you know, representative of anything. It's just the program that created an output. But I think there were lots of people that should be interested and, you know, those I think those two starting points would lead to much more people being interested I think.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I was going to turn this over back to Sara to go to the next topic but yes oh now there's a mic. Please but please keep it brief.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: God.

Andrew Mack: No it's not working yet.

Avri Doria: Just grab one of the desk ones.

Andrew Mack: Great. This is Andrew Mack. I'm speaking both on behalf of BC and also as a former member of the JAS group. I just wanted to say that we're very much did a lot of work on this in the BC, put in a lot of comments. Think that the approach that's up on the board makes a great deal of sense. Agree very much Edmon we've got to take advantage of all of the things that we learned and really focus on sustainability. This isn't just a short time kind of thing to get the communication out there as often as much as we can and as widely as we can and to make our focus as much as possible on grabbing again this is sustainability including tapping into the interests of people within the community who would like to offer some technical support as well. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And going to basically follow-up I think and the questions that were asked and the good suggestions that were made for the information I'd like to turn it over to you. We'll stretch the time a little bit and go to the second topic please. Oh you had two remotes to read. Just one remote I'm sorry. I forgot about the one remote to read.

Woman: This is a comment from a remote participant, Bruno Santos regarding the application process - sorry, regarding the application process granting support for applicants from developing countries whether it is financial or not

is key given the fact that increasing global diversity and reduces the disadvantages that may keep applicants from these regions from participating in the new gTLD program. We believe that either a better advertisement of the existence of the applicant support program to these countries or the implementation of an exclusive round of applicant from developing countries would raise awareness and eventually result in increasing the number of new gTLD applicants applications. Another suggestion would be to announce either by a Webinar or open call for an application tutoring process prior to the submission dates. End comment.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Sara please.

Sara Bockey: Great thanks. Can you hear me?

Avri Doria: Right.

Sara Bockey: Thank you everyone for your feedback on the applicant support. I know I'm running out of time or I'm out of time basically so I will make this really quick regarding the RSP program or a potential RSP program. We've been sort of drafting some principles and proposed frameworks that we could potentially use if - closer to the mic?

So yes we've been working on some draft principles and proposed frameworks that we could potentially use if a RSP program were to be put in place. I did attend the meeting yesterday that the registries held regarding their RSP discussions. And I noted that some of the worktracks that they put together were created under similar principles. And so I'm going to name those as we go through this list of draft principles that this working group has put together. So number one security and stability of gTLDs must not be negatively impacted and preferably improved. And during the discussion yesterday with registries they actually created two worktracks that were going to be addressing similar principles. And those were creating a more secure,

stable and resilient RSP operation and enhancing the security and stability of the DNS.

Our second draft principle is having efficiency and evaluations and pre-delegation testing for ICANN applicants in the RSPs having those efficiencies be improved. During the discussion yesterday with the registries they also touched on this topic and created a similar worktrack that they are going to be discussing which is to improve services by creating the option for direct communications between ICANN and RSPs. Our third draft principle is a valuation and pre-delegation testing must be consistent, predictable and to the extent possible objective. Next we have the RSP program should be designed in such a manner as to not increase ICANN's liability.

Similarly during the registry RSP discussion yesterday they have a worktrack that they are looking at the idea of reducing financial and administrative burdens for the registry. Next principle would be that the applicants must have access to a list of RSPs and a list of functional areas that have been preapproved. They've been preapproved for through the RSP program.

Next we have that the preapproval of RSPs should be done in such a way as to take into account the capacity of such RSPs the type of TLDs that they are supporting and the services that they provide. I think this is an important one because we realize that there is a challenge and that not all registries are created equal. Some are for private brands, some have multi million dollars or multimillion TLD registry and they have different customers, different requirements. And so the expectations for them would be different.

Similarly during the registry discussion yesterday they have - they're looking at similar principle and that the transition from technical testing to an ongoing - sorry they are looking at the transition from technical testing to an ongoing monitoring solution. And that was one of the ideas that was discussed under this concept of considering the capacity of each RSP.

They're also looking at creating a worktrack that is going to discuss streamlining the process associated with changing RSPs with the understanding that they will also need to ensure that they are having these discussions with the registrars because not all registries are aware of how these changes will potentially affect the registrar. And so they're aware of there may be challenges should a program be implemented.

And finally our - one of our draft principles is that if an RSP program were to be agreed upon solution would we need to have different categories of providers? The different potential levels of RSP accreditation could be having the proven providers, pre-certified providers or post application certified providers and that was an idea that was put forward by Donna Austin. So this is where we are as far as these discussions go the draft principles we have. And I know I'm probably really short on time and don't have a lot of time for input but Avri?

Avri Doria: No I think we're going to put it down to bad time management on my part. And basically since we have to break in 15 minutes for the required coffee break in any case and we're going to be stuck splitting Worktrack 2 into 15 minutes before coffee, 15 minutes after coffee we'll just try and adjust the other three worktracks. I will apologize to them and get beat up by them later for having given more to one than another. I have Donna in the queue please.

Donna Austin: Thanks Avri, Donna Austin from Nustar. Thanks Sara for the overview. I just wanted to make a point sorry, in relation to the discussions that are going on within the Registry Stakeholder Group. There's a smaller working group that we formed some time ago to look at RSP issues. There is a distinction between what this group is doing the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Group and the Registry Stakeholder Group, smaller working group. And that is that the subsequent procedures is looking at, you know, how to provide efficiencies in the application process for future rounds.

The Registry Stakeholder Group is looking more at immediate issues that with regard to how to provide efficiencies we're swapping out in RSP because that it's come to light that there are some challenges associated with the way that that happens at the moment. So we – it's one of the things we're going to look at.

And also there were some – there was a DNS symposium recently in Madrid and there was some stats that came to light about some of the, you know, RSPs reaching the (evero) threshold levels. And the smaller group that we have within the Registry Stakeholder Group were actually going to look at that in terms of what monitoring can be done and how we can try to understand the root cause of those problems in order to provide some solutions moving forward.

And I would note that, that smaller working group actually has Francisco Arias and Cyrus Namazi on it from ICANN staff. So it – we're kind of the Registry Stakeholder Group is looking at this from the perspective of problems that have - that are current and exist with 2012 round in terms of what we see that's happening in terms of monitoring what ICANN is doing and also some efficiencies with the RSP swap out. And we would hope that there's some information that we get out of that that we can fit it into this group but we would note that there's kind of - there is a distinction between what the two efforts are doing so I just wanted to mention that. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I've got Emily Barabas I guess with a remote or oh, that's an old one. Okay then Jim please.

Jim Prendergast: Yes thank you, Jim Prendergast. I would say two things. One I think the discussions within the worktrack on this particular topic are still ongoing and vibrant. I don't think there is universal, you know, universal agreement that an RSP program is the way to go forward so I want to put that out there. I think that's far from settled.

I do have one question and I'm not sure who can answer it but we see the term up there, you know, preapproval. If preapproval doesn't mean accreditation or pre-accreditation or something like that then what does it mean because I'm still not sure what that means? I figured Jeff would be answering the question. So go ahead Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks Jim. This is Jeff Neuman. It's one of the most challenging parts of this issue is coming up with the right turn to describe what we're talking about. There's been issues with any term that we use. But by preapproval it means that you are doing the same technical evaluation that you would do during the normal process. Like let's say in 2012 it would be the same technical evaluation whatever's required but you're doing it before you start a application window for top level domains.

So you are being – you are approved. You passed the evaluation is really all it means. You've passed the same technical evaluation you would do during the window. You just do it a few months earlier or whatever it is. That's all it's meant to apply. It's not that you're, you know, you get a seal of approval or whatever connotations have been put on to that.

We are trying to distinguish that between accreditation because people have pointed out that they don't necessarily want agreements and that applies. And then we've used a whole host of other terms. I would encourage people to think about that framework as opposed to the word that's being used because we've found that there's no word that doesn't cause any issues. But that's what's meant.

Jim Prendergast: Can I just ask a follow-up clarification? So going through them being preapproved for using the last reference Questions 31 through 39 but not pre-delegation testing is there technical testing involved in preapproval or is it just answering the questions in an application?

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff Neuman. That hasn't been - that still subject is being decided right? Worktrack 4 is looking at whether testing could occur prior to - sorry I'm trying to find the right way of saying it without I'm not determining an outcome. Worktrack is looking at when is the appropriate time to do testing. And if it's determined by Worktrack 4 that it's prior to applications being accepted then in theory that would apply to an RSP program.

If it's determined in Worktrack 4 that it should be not until you're ready to get delegated into the root then it would be the same. We're not talking about creating a differential. So however Worktrack 4 comes out on that issue we would apply to the RSP program just like if the - if Worktrack 4 came out and said we want to make a technical criteria more difficult or we want to make - we want to look for these additional items that would be applied again to the RSP program which is a voluntary program. Thanks. So I don't want to take up too much more time, sorry.

Avri Doria: Yes, no and we're just about running out of time for the second time here. So I have (Sarah L.), Donna and Emily Barabas has a remote and then that will be it on this one before a coffee break. I cannot go over twice. So please (Sarah).

(Sarah L.): Thank you. And so I'm in the Registry Stakeholder RSP discussion group that Donna spoke of. And my comment really relates to increasing the stability and the resiliency of the RSP operation and I guess the fact that an RSP accreditation program is one of the many ways that this could be addressed.

So ICANN's let us know about the SLA violations that some RFPs have created. A number of them being a borough trigger and even though a borough has never been triggered. At the moment we don't have enough information to tell us if increased pre-delegation testing for example or ongoing testing could have caught these problems and resolve them early on and before the problem occurred. But we do have to remember that all the

testing in the world's not going to stop a box from unexpectedly failing and falling over and causing some of these problems.

And after the GDD meeting in Madrid there was a DNS symposium. ICANN gave some statistics out, Donna touched on that. They as suggested that 11 out of 37 RSPs have had at least one TLD that reached the borough threshold and at least one service. And yesterday at the RSP discussion group Francisco from ICANN said that that they were typically seeing around two borough triggering failures a quarter. And, you know, so RSP accreditation voluntary could be one way of helping to create a more stable RSP service but there are a number of ways that this could be achieved outside of RSP accreditation and the current data is telling us that this is a problem that we need to solve. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I've got Donna please.

Donna Austin: Thanks Avri, Donna Austin from Nustar. Jim just to your question on preapproval. So that was a term that I came up with probably 12 months ago in a presentation that I made during Hyderabad meeting. So the concept that I was working on at that point in time was that you had preapproved providers proven providers which are the RSPs so that have been proven from the 2012 round. And then you could have RSPs that, you know, post application you could do it that way.

But as Jeff said I mean the idea is in order to provide efficiencies in any future application process rather than having an RSP have to go through that because, you know, what we've come to understand from the 2012 round is that there are a kind of a finite number of RSPs that supported the applications in the 2012 round and now we're repeating the answers to the technical questions and also the repeated PDT that we come to know about as well. So to try to take away from that what we were suggesting is that you could actually do that testing or that process up front during RSP once and

then that would qualify them to, you know, be part of the application for any applicant moving forward.

I think what we need to understand as well is that one of the questions that's come up in a discussion a number of times is how do you assess whether an RSP can scale? So how do we know that an RSP can support 300 TLDs? And does it matter that it's a brand TLD or does it matter that it's a generic TLD with the expectation that over a period of time they will manage thousands of domains, millions of domains under management?

And that's a question that we haven't necessarily got our head around at the moment and potentially it's something that I think the RSP, the registry Stakeholder Group Working Group will tackle as it discusses monitoring in the longer term and how we manage that. So in my mind it's kind of the what we're trying to do here in this working group is efficiencies for the next round process. But what I'm hoping we tackle within the smaller registry group is that monitoring and how do we actually understand what needs to be in place to understand whether an RSP can scale.

And maybe that's what we can feed back into the subsequent procedures work. So I think, you know, there is a number of issues we need to understand where it properly fits is that is it something we should discuss in subsequent procedures or is this something that we will actually the discussion we have in the stakeholder group will morph into what's that capacity to scale? So I don't know if that helps but that's my thinking.

Avri Doria: Thank you Donna. We're pretty much out of time but we have one remote comment and then it's break.

Woman: So there's a question from (Mitice Pfeiffer) from .Berlin. "Can someone explain Bullet 5 in more detail? It is about types and services to provide. Does that mean that in the future an RSP is allowed to serve a special set of set of services for a special type of TLD?" For example have a brand TLD only RSP

to implement the TMCH related extensions and phases like sunrise and claims?" End question.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I think that one is going to have to go to the list and further consideration because otherwise we will not be able to move on to the other thing. So we're on break and we're going to come back in 15 and start even if the room is empty.

END