

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN64 Kobe
GNSO – New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Part 3
Wednesday, 13 March 2019 at 15:15 JST**

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://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Jeff Neuman: All right everyone hello. Welcome to the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group Session 2. I know it's been a long week but we did meet just a few days ago. It says Session 2 on the slide I'm reading. Okay, apparently it's Session 3. Sorry I was reading the slide, my fault Steve.

Anyway I thought we had a good couple sessions on Saturday. It probably seems like a very long time ago. But if you recall we spent some time talking about some of the well next steps in the status but also then on a couple of the topics where we seem to be in general agreement but certainly needed some more details and to discuss some of the lower - so we were in agreement in the - or general agreement on the higher level but needed some more detail. So we talked about the limited appeals mechanism for example and some of the other questions that came up if we were to have such an appeals mechanism.

So today for this session we're going to spend some time on topics that might warrant closure. This is really going to encompass a couple different points. One is to show you how we have assembled the comment review that we've

been doing. Specifically these some of these topics are from Subgroup A, where we have discussed the comments that have come in and where we see general agreement from the - or for the initial recommendations that were made as well as agreement from the comments that came in. And so these - this will show you how we've assembled those as well as how we can try to bring this to closure and then talk about some next steps and then any other business. So if we can go to the next slide.

Okay, so actually this covers some of what I already talked about. So Cheryl and I believe that we want to start with some of these we'll call low hanging fruit where we think closure is possible and where it'll help us towards beginning the writing of the final report and ultimately taking a consensus call. So this session will be spent in testing at these preliminary assessments that we Cheryl and I have made along with ICANN policy staff Steve and Julie on certain topics and to see if we're - if you agree that we're on - we're moving in the right direction.

Now some of these that you'll on the next slide because these are PowerPoint slides we may have paraphrased or certainly used for brevity we've condensed it. But each of these the - each of the preliminary recommendations as well as the comments were considered in putting these summaries together. And obviously they can all be accessed by going to the particular subgroup in this case I think they're all from Subgroup A to those sections to see where we got these from.

So there are - even within some of these areas where we think are getting - that we think are getting close to closure there still are some we call them potential open topics that we can decide this may be something that should go to an implementation review team and then we could just wait for implementation or where we can decide that it is a little bit more substantial and do a little bit further work. So you'll see that in these next couple of slides.

And with some of them we're also going to talk about the difference between making policy recommendations and issuing implementation guidance. So of the way we think about implementation - I'm sorry the way we think about policy recommendations think of it as the recommendations that we believe ICANN the organization must do that these are the instructions that you have to do it this way. But if we label something as implementation guidance it's more of a should so, you know, if feasible ICANN should do this and again we'll get some examples. But that's the way that we think about the difference between policy recommendations and implementation guidance. Does that make sense? Any questions on that?

Okay, why don't we go to the first topic, so one of the topics that we talked about in Subgroup A was the structure, and format, and general high level principles over the Applicant Guidebook. And from the comments we believe that there's general agreement that the Applicant Guidebook should continue to be used though made more user-friendly which includes focusing more on practical user processes rather than historical context making the Applicant Guidebook more searchable. So for example terms and conditions, links to different sections online. And also the guidebook should have certain sections that may be more specific to an application type. So that was the first thing that we've gleaned from the comments.

But obviously there is a set of guidebook elements that will apply no matter what type of application it is. And we wanted to ensure that you're able to - or sorry this is too brief here. We wanted to make sure that there were click - if there were click through agreements like click through terms for the use of application system that, that was provided for in advance or finalized and provided in advance of the opening of the application window.

So there were other topics that either came as new ideas or that were not - did not necessarily have support from everyone. And I think most of these actually were actually labeled as new ideas. So there were comments that said that there should be language support. And there were comments that

supported the notion of going beyond the UN six languages. So if the last guidebook had the translation for the UN languages one of the potential open topics is should we consider additional languages?

There were some new ideas raised as allowing for the negotiation of those click through agreements. Now if you remember those agreements were as click through agreements often are you had to click through it. You could not negotiate any of those terms and conditions. There was a comment that well actually this is not an open topic but it was basically going through some of the specific items that were subject to recommendations and parsing out which of those we actually wanted to make policy recommendations and which ones we wanted to have as implementation guidelines.

So on that - and we can get more - a little bit deeper into the weeds on those. And maybe in the Adobe room Steve you can post a link to Subgroup A document and specifically this tab of that Subgroup A. So I saw Kathy had her hand up. Does anybody - oh no you didn't I'm sorry I thought - oh I thought that was a hand up. Okay, Jim, please.

Jim Prendergast: Yes thanks Jeff, Jim Prendergast for the record. So just help me understand so we're generally speaking on this slide. And what I mean by that is the third bullet point, ensure any click through agreements are finalized and agreed in advance. We will have very specific language around what our policy recommendation is that differs from what we see on the screen or is tighter than what we see on the screen is that correct?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Jim. Yes, this is again I - because we haven't done a consensus call I'm just using the term general agreement. But yes this is for brevity to fit on the slide. We will include these concepts and yes write it out a little bit tight or - not a little bit we will make the language tighter in a final report absolutely. No other comments?

Okay, well that's - maybe we're ready to go to number two because this one is a little bit more substantive. So with systems the topic of the - this is not just the application system although a lot of the recommendations initial recommendations were focused on the application system but it also deals with the pre-delegation testing system basically any of the systems ICANN uses to interface with applicants or even system used to file objections and those other kinds of actions that were taken either by applicants, or objectors or any of the users of the system.

So there's general agreement -- again I'm using the term general agreement because we haven't taken a consensus call -- that adequate time should be allowed for ICANN org basically their development of the system to do a robust Q&A so quality assurance, user interface and penetration testing. And also to have some sort of beta testing for end users or beta testing period for end users. Any questions on that general one?

Okay, in addition there was general agreement that the applicant facing system should be usable and integrated preferably with single sign-on, integrate other usability elements such as supporting non-ASCII characters in certain fields, better real-time technical support, submission of multiple identical applications, disseminating answers to questions across applications for portfolio applicants, receive automated alerts, bulk update information across multiple fields meaning that you could if you were going to update one you'd have the ability to update if you submitted 100 you'd be able to push that out to the other 99.

Now I want to stop here a little bit because while almost all of the commenters supported this there was a concern expressed from ICANN staff that the more prescriptive we get in these kinds of things and the more we introduce into the systems that could increase costs, risk complexity. And that was a general comment. So one of the areas that is sort of open to discuss is whether we can get some more clarity on which specific items that we discussed with respect to systems were the ones that could - that for which

there was a belief that it could increase all of those or let's say which would increase those in a material fashion and if so how would that increase the complexity, or risk or cost.

And so I think it's one thing we should ask ICANN staff, you know, particularly Trang, (Christine) and others that had participated in this group if they could drill down a little bit further on those. So now am I seeing Kathy's hand? It looks like a hand. Yes okay and then Donna.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay, we're on the second bullet point now right we're including the second bullet point?

Jeff Neuman: We could talk about the first or the second, sure.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay, so submission of multiple identical applications I seem to recall that there were some objections from the Intellectual Property Constituency or the International Trademark Association regarding kind of the public portions of the application that should probably -- if I remember correctly and I think we might be looking at some of these -- that might differ across applications so that the communities that are evaluating these would know what it is that they're looking at and what purposes they're serving. And that there was some concern raised about percolating certain fields across applications that were really quite substantive in nature.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thank you. This is Jeff Neuman. Those comments from the IPC were more about the bulk update information across multiple fields as opposed to the ability to initially submit initial applications. But certainly those were some comments but other than those comments again there was general agreement that we do that or that we allow bulk update. But we also as a - well I mean one of the things we've asked for clarification on or should ask for clarification on was if I remember correctly -- and I'll actually pull it up -- but it was on - I think we had discussed as a group whether we could mitigate the

potential errors that could happen with those kinds of bulk updates. So let me
- I'm going to look that up while I go to Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks Jeff, Donna Austin from Neustar. So just a question on these two sort
of star points they're implementation guidance as opposed to potentially
policy recommendations is it or...

Jeff Neuman: So that's something we should discuss. I mean, you know, these I would say
probably the first one would see more of a, you know, I'll take off my chair
hat. From a personal perspective that one is high level enough to be more of
a reg of a policy or one that a must. The second one I think is we should
discuss because I mean how do you feel Donna about that? What do you
think?

Donna Austin: Thanks Jeff, Donna Austin. So I question whether the first one is actually a
policy statement because adequate time is you'd have to define that so you'd
have to be very specific about it. Certainly the second one is - would be
implementation guidance in my mind. I also note that it has been a real-time
technical support which assumes that we're benchmarking this against what
happened in 2012 I assume. But we probably -- this is nitpicking -- but I take
better out it's just real-time technical support is what we want not to we can't
kind of benchmark against what happened in 2012. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Donna. I think the word better is in there as a result of trying to
be brief. I think the point you made because it was not real-time technical
support in the first round it was - there's actually a couple other things in the
Subgroup A document that talks about 24 by seven, it talks about some other
things. So we kind of just again editorial error where trying to be brief made it
to say better but you're right. When we put this into the final report or we write
this out it will have much more the information that was actually in here.
Anybody else in the queue? Martin, thank you.

Martin Sutton: Martin Sutton, I think - I tend to agree with Donna in terms of questioning where these fit in terms of policy versus implementation. My sense is on both of these. They head towards more of implementation process. First one I would say that there could be an overarching policy applied to that which is using industry best practices standards for security and the implementation of those systems. And then the detailed element that this is trying to push through is more about process than similarly with the second those would need to be prioritized and questioned as to cost benefit time for implementation. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Martin. If I can drill down a little bit further on those, do you see anything in that second bullet point that should be something we have in implementation guidance should we create time for? Like I noticed at the end of that you said if there's time to do those. But do you really, you know, we're trying to get down - drill down to the specifics. I would think some of those may be or maybe it is all of them. I guess that's my question. Are all of the ones you see there you would only say if there's time to do it, time resources or are some of them more important than others?

Martin Sutton: Absent of any, you know, feedback from ICANN staff, you know, things like integrate other usability elements such as supporting non-ASCII characters I think if there are certain fields where it's lacking it needs non-ASCII characters those should be a priority to ensure that that's put in there. So that's what I was saying about prioritization would be key. What is needed out of those to actually fulfill the application process and build into the system. But it may well be that a one user login to many applications if that adds more complexity and time to develop that's nice to have in the future progressive development in the system.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thank you Martin. Anybody else in the queue? So I think again - what's that? Oh Christa is? Okay, sorry Christa. You go ahead.

Christa Taylor: Christa for the record. Just a clarification point on the real-time technical support is an issue when we were talking about this is that you can submit a question to customer service and it would take two or three days. And then we wanted something where it was or the feedback was people wanted some real-time information where they could actually talk to somebody. And then to make sure that any of those questions that were submitted through customer service were posted for everyone else to see in a relevant more quick I guess more quicker manner, so just clarification.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thank you Christa. And so again that's probably your correct in that this is one of the things of trying to put together the slides. If you opened up -- and maybe we can Steve -- is there a way to open up and display here the Subgroup A document or no? If that's too difficult don't worry about it. Okay, so it's more difficult to put that Subgroup A document up on the screen. But essentially each of these items that were discussed by Subgroup A -- and we will write these up and more tighter language and more detailed we've made them more brief for the slides -- but yes we'll include all of those items for which there were - was general agreement in that tab which is 2.4.3 of that Subgroup A document. So hopefully that will answer your question Christa. Sorry it will help towards your clarification about the different types of or the real-time definition what we were concerned about. So there's a hand up. Julie, please.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. We have two comments in the chat they need to be read out and they're both from Christopher Wilkinson. The first is start begin comment, "I have a general reservation about language which would facilitate multiple applications from a single applicant particularly with regard to geographical names," end comment. And the second, is begin comment, "Submitting portfolio applications will result in further concentration, more warehousing, and speculation and threaten the interests of international communities," end comment.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thank you for the comments Christopher. Kathy, your hand is up in Adobe...

Man: That's a new hand, new hand.

Jeff Neuman: It's a new one okay. Okay, so I have Kathy and then Maxim.

Kathy Kleiman: So Kathy Kleiman. So still have a question about this multiple identical applications. And I don't quite understand the rules of the session and whether concerns can be raised but again my sense was that the Intellectual Property Constituency had raised this and now let me say the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group should be raising this as well that public portions of the application are scrutinized heavily by the community. That's what we're looking at in order to file objections, concerns complaints comments. I mean it fuels an entire other section of the Applicant Guidebook.

So it seems like creating multiple identical applications is kind of a race to the bottom it's encouraging bare-bones, it's encouraging lack of detail, it's certainly including lack of specificity as to that string and what it will be doing and how - what communities it will be serving in working with. And so I don't again flagging multiple identical applications may not - does not seem to serve larger other much larger purposes of the Applicant Guidebook process. Thanks - of the submissions and of the comments and responses.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thank you Kathy. I'm looking at the document and it was a comment from the Business Constituency specific to being able to answer a question once and using that one answer for all of their applications. It was not a comment on just the ability to put a response to the original application in multiple it was really a response to questions. But let me - let's examine that - and I know we have Maxim in the queue. So those that are in this room that applied or used the application system, do you all have those concerns?

Christa Taylor: It's Christa for the record. So when we were doing this in Work Track A what the issue was is people were getting frustrated that they had to copy and paste 1 million times. So what they wanted to do was they just wanted to be able to say this answer applies to these applications and have a better method of doing that rather than just having to go into every application and putting in the same answers in case that helps.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks.

Kathy Kleiman: It does but -- may I respond -- that's not multiple identical applications which implies all the fields are the same.

Woman: Yes.

Kathy Kleiman: So what I - what you're saying makes sense and we should just, you know, but it's different than the wording up there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I made Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Kathy I need to remind you the words on here are very brief and really shouldn't, you know, be taken down as holding too much power in the process. Yes it was badly formed as a sentence and we apologize for the confusion. But you've had the clarification that it was an intention for having us consider making it easier for the applicant to be putting in identical information across multiple applications, okay?

Kathy Kleiman: Can we exclude the public portion of the application that describes the mission and purpose of the gTLD from that field that might percolate across, so you might have officers and directors that are the same, you might have locations that are the same but mission and purpose shouldn't be the same across applications. So I don't understand the processes that we're in and how we - what goes forward from these discussions and whether we need to modify these words to reflect what Christa said and what you said.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, let me just - I want to make sure I have everyone in the queue. I know Maxim was actually next but who else...

Man: We've got Jim and Susan.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so Maxim, Jim, Susan, (Christina) or no?

Woman: Justine.

Jeff Neuman: And Justine.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. First about similar fields it's not same it's usually similar because for example if you're a gTLD you have backend and you have few cities which are close by most probably they will have similar ideas. And the second thing we're completely forgetting about IDNs, yes? When city wants to have its name in few languages by definition everything is almost similar the only difference is the language part. And I don't understand how it should be punished and why. That's why I recommend to be more careful with the language here.

The second thing is about similar to fields. If you approach from yes I'd say software perspective not many applications have totally similar descriptions because you have to change at least TLD name. So either we talk about similar items and then we have issues of how to define if two fields were similar or not or short story we either say which particular fields are mentioned as same or we add some small clause (unintelligible) while some other fields might be different.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, next I have Jim, and then Susan and then Justine.

Jim Prendergast: Yes hi, Jim Prendergast. Kathy, let me - I think I have an example that may help clarify this for you. Let's say there's a portfolio applicant that applied for 250 TLDs in the last round. All their technical backend questions are identical

regardless of what the string is. All of their public facing questions are probably identical as well but they are whether they should be or not they are.

So, you know, Questions 18 or, you know, rights protection mechanisms, or abuse prevention mechanisms 28 and 29 chances are those were all identical answers. So what they're just looking for is instead of having to cut and paste two dozen times, three dozen times, 100 times they're looking for the ability just to I think hit one button and have it populate for all of their applications. And it would still be public and everybody would still be able to review it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks Jim. I have Susan, Justine and then to Julie because there is an online comments.

Susan Payne: Hi, thanks Susan Payne. Yes and just another example Kathy. I think if you think about, you know, a brand owner who maybe has, you know, sort of say eight brands that they wanted to apply for .brand applications for the chances are that again many of the sections in those brand - in those applications would be inevitably pretty much the same, you know, similar identical, you know, depends - but the ability to be able to copy the text over and have it the same or make, you know, minor tweaks by that method would be very beneficial. And, you know, and the reality is they would be, you know, the content would be the same because the brand owner has got, you know, these eight brands and they clearly were applying for the same reasons for all of them and planning probably to do the same thing with all of them.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, I have Justine, then an online question, and then (JC) at the mic. So - and (JC) feel free to if you want to come up to the table or however you want to do it but let's go with Justine.

Justine Chew: Thanks Jeff, this is Justine. I think for better visibility can we get staff to or, you know, can we have a list of all the questions that are proposed to have this functionality of duplicating replies or answers and a list of questions that

are not so we know what we're talking about per se? I'm not asking for it now I'm just asking if there's a possibility for us to review it at an, you know, at the next meeting for example.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, let me - this is Jeff Neuman. Let me ask a question before we do that because I think we're getting pretty far into the weeds when we may not need to. And I would ask -- and it doesn't have to be at this meeting -- you know, what are we - by being more prescriptive what are we trying to prevent protect against and who really bears the burden of that? And so just to add in I mean, you know, Kathy said that the people that need to file objections -- and I'll take off my chair hat because I'm just trying to understand the concern -- if we allow - the burden is on the applicant to make sure that what's in the field is correct and accurate regardless of how they get the information into the field.

That's not going to change by making it automated or actually sorry it will change because the burden will become greater. But at the end of the day whether the person that's reviewing it for objections I'm not understanding the connection between those unless we're trying to help an applicant -- what are the words I'm trying to use -- help the applicant prevent their own mistakes. I don't think we need to be that in that position and that's what is sounding like. So I'm going to put Kathy back in the queue but still go and the order. So it was online, and then (JC) and then back to Kathy. And then sorry, and then to Christa and then to Maxim. Thank you. So sorry it was online, (JC).

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. We have a comment from Anne Aikman-Scalise. And she's saying, "Answers to Questions 18 should not wrote fill in an identical answers." And Rubens Kuhl is noting that for those who do not know Question 18 was a mission question. And I think there's actually also there is a question I'll go ahead and read it out since that's also online.

And that question is from Paul Foody. “He asks questions the other day Samantha Dickinson tweeted the Donna Austin said, when the ICANN Board approves policy and many such policies are global in nature there’s no obligation for ICANN to conduct any general awareness raising amongst those outside the ICANN community who are also affected,” end quote. Assuming that quote was accurate and if it isn’t could Donna say what she did say? Is that a sentiment to which the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group agrees,” end question.

And I’m sorry there is also another comment from Anne Aikman-Scalise. Let me just get this and then I’ll be done. Her comment is, “Plus one to Justine’s request and to Kathy’s with Question 18. We don’t want to encourage super general language that is made more vague so that it can be applied automatically in numerous applications,” end comment.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks Julie. The first comment I know it’s question Donna I believe Donna’s answered that in the chat. And because it’s not really related to the subject we’re talking about now I would ask that that be taken off line. But then let me go to (JC), then Kathy, Christa, Maxim?

Man: (Jean-Christ Venya) (unintelligible) registry. Apologies not really related to systems per se but Kathy question I think open an interesting door. I mean as a former registry provider working with many applicants of course I’m all for the copy testing mechanism. But I think I’m also an even I’m for clarity on what’s expected in the answers.

We’ve all seen when everything was said and done and we had access to all the other applications that many applicants didn’t go through the same shall we say trouble of finding original answers for specific TLDs and get away with cookie-cutter answers. And I guess fair play to them. I’m just saying that for the next round if we could know in advance the extent of what’s expected of us I think a lot of applicants would have an easier way applying which could benefit to all of us.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks (JC). And in fact that is - that goes towards some of the recommendations when we get into the topic of the evaluation. So that is - that's in there and certainly relevant. As you said not necessarily for the systems but certainly for making sure the evaluation criteria are clear, well known in advance and that applicants know what's expected of them. So I have Kathy, Christa, Maxim, anyone else that I missed? Okay, Kathy please.

Kathy Kleiman: Thanks Jeff, Kathy Kleiman. So in light of what I think I just heard you say I think it sounds like we should certainly take out the wording multiple identical applications unless you're talking about IDNs that are , you know, just translations of the same literally the same term. But, you know, any fields related to purpose and mission should not be allowed to be let me pause it should not be allowed to be duplicated again unless we're talking about a literal straight, you know, IDN equivalents because each brand is different. Goodness knows my mother was in public relations each brand she dealt with was different. And so what would be done with that spring string will be different.

But certainly the, you know, the ideas each gTLD we look at these sections we scrutinize whether it's Question 18 now or, you know, I don't know what it'll be in the future but anything related to purpose and mission. As Anne said in the chat we don't want to encourage super general language that is made more vague by this automatic application. So, you know, the technical, the backend the operational certainly. You know, if it's the same backend you're probably going to want to replicate that language across applications whether it's a cut and paste which is probably what people were doing last time or, you know, fields replicating but not purpose and mission. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, and if I can ask just a follow-up question to that. How would we prevent an applicant from just cutting and pasting from a Word document the same answer? So I understand what you're saying about - and I'll let you answer. I understand what you're saying about potentially not letting, you

know, one answer populate multiple Question 18s for different applications but what would stop them from just cutting and pasting?

Kathy Kleiman: Well first is the expectation. So we'll defer to my colleague across the tables but also not making it easy to take a shortcut. Not making it easy to, you know, get out of jail free, and just take the shortcut and come up with super general language. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks. That makes sense. Let's go to Christa and the Maxim.

Christa Taylor: Christa for the record. Just for background in Workgroup 1 it was more a discussion around efficiency and convenience for applicants. We never really got into the individual questions and what would be appropriate or inappropriate being able to apply say to fill in that. I think it was more around just like basic information fields but we never went that far into the weeds to actually get into the, you should be able to do it for these ones and not these ones. So that could be something maybe we want to go back to and investigate as Kathy has just brought up on, you know, the ones that are really critical to show that the individuality of the TLD is reflected properly is very different from say the company information or the personal information so just for a little bit of context. And going one step further is there were things like we didn't want to limit the character field because that was a real problem for applicants and those types of things. So just to give you a bit of a feel for where it was which is a little bit more different than did we get into those weeds and what was right or wrong in terms of the feel of the application so in case that helps.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Christa. I'm going to go to Maxim. And then I'll - there's an online question and then I'll put myself in the queue.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. First, why do we expect companies and organizations who most probably will pay more than \$100,000 not to be able to hire someone to be a bit creative with the text. It's quite a huge

assumption. And it's something called diminutive returns. We're spending time on that panelist will spend more time on similar fields. I remind you those people will have to have to yes to spend basically more time on translating from was read into formal logic because they have to analyze the contents in the end.

And all for example someone may say okay we have the mission attached. And you have nice PDF of like pages thrown to the floor and photos of those formally the still description, yes? So - and also you will have classical situation you see in university when the teacher has to identify who has stolen text from whom yes? And sometimes the person who wrote the text is punished because he or she is told yes I saw this and most probably you took it from someone else. So I would recommend not to go into this because I remind you that even using some engines which understand language will allow you to allow you to have like way more creative things. And if we don't want to analyze like instead of five I mean instead of 30 lines of text in description mission 2000 lines or something because it's could be automated. I would recommend not to do this way.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks Maxim. Let's go to an online...

Man: We have two.

Jeff Neuman: There's a couple on lines. So Julie please I think.

Man: Or I can...

Jeff Neuman: Or Julie's hand was lowered but are we good?

Julie Hedlund: There are more.

Jeff Neuman: Oh okay.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, sorry. I put down my hand and then there were more. So Christopher Wilkinson has a comment, "Boilerplate replies for multiple applications will facilitate gaming to avoid substantive comments from other stakeholders and interested parties," end comment. And a question from Paul Foody, "Thanks for the offer to answer my previous question off line but as it is midnight in Vancouver is there any chance you could answer my question online and give me some idea when I might be able to pose it with the help of a live answer," end question.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, I'm just reading the comment. Sorry this is Jeff Neuman. If this was the question to Donna I thought Donna had responded online but I'm not 100% sure. So let me just while I make another comment and go - or is there another one Julie?

Man: No, this is...

Jeff Neuman: No, okay. So I will - sorry for Paul Foody let me just see what that's referring to after I make my next comment and then we'll see if we can get back to that. The comment I wanted to make is I think we need to - we can look at the questions from the last round but there's no saying that the questions in the next round are going to be the same. So we need to take a step back and to the extent that we feel like we should create some sort of restrictions on copying or however we want to talk about that in the future we need to step back and make it as a high level principle as opposed to, you know, Question 18 or something like that.

So we can take back the notes from here and see if we can come up with a high level principle without being so prescriptive. But also noting the comments of ICANN staff for more complex we make the system the more time cost, risk, et cetera, will go into it. So if we say well these fields or these answers you can copy but these you can't and start introducing those types of things now, you know, we really should do a cost benefit analysis as to whether that extra complexity is really going to change the behavior in such a

way that we'll get the benefits that we think we're going to get. So I think that's something we need to take back and dig a little bit deeper on. Yes, understandable, no? Kathy is shaking her head no. Kathy, can you explain why and (JC) as well?

Kathy Kleiman: Yes, my understanding was ICANN staff didn't want percolation at all the copying at all. But we're not dealing with the comment in front of us so this is really hard to remember what everyone said as we were going through it. But I think what you're hearing from those of us who were going to be part of the community that will be filing the comments, filing the objections, looking at these closely is that when it comes to purpose and mission we're looking for more detail not less.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Kathy. But that's a little bit different issue than just cutting and pasting. That's a different principle. And that would relate to the specific question of mission and purpose. I'm looking for help to understand how restricting the copying of answers is going to make it more difficult to file objections. I'm sorry how the functionality of allowing copying answers is going to make it more difficult for end-users to comment or file objections but maybe (JC) has got an answer, so (JC) please.

Man: I'm not sure I do. I meant to agree with your general principle approach first of all. Second of all to my esteemed colleague -- she knows it's not just a phrase -- I guess I don't understand it's not - it's never been easy honestly -- many of us have been in those trenches - it's never been a question of an easy thing and however the questions and the sides may differ I don't understand how allowing copy pasting or anything of the sort could be conceived as a get out of jail free card as you said.

As Jeff said it's a question of evaluation. If you believe -- and we have no reason not to -- that ICANN will evaluate copy pasting text as any other kind of text and decide that I don't know to fail the question for lack of originality

that I don't see how it would be quote, "Too easy to apply for a TLD which would have required significant investment and planning to get to that step."

Kathy Kleiman: I think you should look at Anne's comments for the last I don't know ten, 15 minutes. She's trying to respond as well, you know, if you'd like to get...

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so I was just going to call on Julie. Can you read those comments please?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. The first is read. "Public comment on applications cookie-cutter answers are contrary to the principle of transparency. Applicants might easily construct such answers for the purpose of avoiding public comment. Justine's request is important," end comment. And there's another one. Also from Anne Aikman-Scalise, "Comment it's demeaning to the comments to say that they are quote unquote in the weeds and that they are not quote unquote, high level. It just means you oppose them," end comment. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks. I did not mean to say that I oppose or that we oppose it was more of a point of we should be higher level in principles. And then not get so far into the weeds in our report and be so prescriptive as to say this field you copy this field you can't that we should state the principle. And maybe the principle is for those questions that relate to mission and purpose of a top level domain these are fields that - or these are responses we would not like to see this functionality but for others we may not mind it. Horrible wording on the fly I know I'm not meant but that's the - without saying well Question 18 or Question 40 we shouldn't be going that deep into the weeds that's what was meant. Okay, and I got a thumbs-up from Kathy. Donna, anyone else in the queue? No, Donna please.

Donna Austin: Thanks Jeff, Donna Austin. I think to address the issue we'd almost have to have a - some kind of principle or policy recommendation that you can't submit the exact same information across applications. And that is a, you know, I don't think I'd be in favor of anything like that. So that's a - yes I - yes

it is. You know, we - it's up to the applicant to decide what information they are going to provide in their application. If they want to provide repetitive information in that application whether you can duplicate that in - on the system is irrelevant because you can still key that in any way so I don't - I'm not sure I really understand what we're talking about here.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Donna. Let's because I want to move on to some of the other potential open topics let's see if we can on a more higher level figure out what the concerns what is the problem we're trying to solve and figure out if what we're suggesting is actually aiding in solving that problem. So we have the notes for here and we'll see if we can boil that down for the next time we talk about the specific subject. Martin.

Martin Sutton: So if I can just add on to the end here that I mean at a high level principle of this it's more about responding to what the comments and feedback have been through the working group deliberations and the public comments which is, you know, a sensible approach to the application system improve it. And these are good examples of how to improve it. And it would be good to at least try and push those forward rather than undo them before they've got any scope of going anywhere. I do tend to agree that if you can cut and paste you're going to cut and paste. If you can put the same information in by the click of the button you'll use the click of a button. Yes it will speed up the process but I don't think it will avoid the concerns that may be of that may have been flanked here. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Martin, and (Collin).

Collin Kurre: Hi there, (Collin Perry) for the record. I put this in the chat but I'll say it here again on the record. It seems to me that the problem that we're looking at is just or the problem that Kathy was speaking to was the ability to review or the pace of submission outpacing the ability of the community to review the volume of submissions received. So I'm not sure if changing or disallowing people to copy and paste like if they're not allowed to submit the exact same

text then they'll just copy and paste and change a few words. So that's kind of looks like a hammer searching for nail to me without addressing the real problem. So if this is the problem that the pay - the volume of applications received is - if we're trying to keep that in line with the capacity to review then maybe we would want to be just trying to come at it from a different angle. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks (Collin). Yes (Michael).

(Michael): (Unintelligible) of the record. But I was actually thinking originally with all the applications came up with a tool online that actually compared text and went in to see where they used similar text in certain applications. It was really helpful to actually use that (unintelligible) so we can figure out what these applications (unintelligible). I think, you know, one applying it in, you know, having all-nighters copy and paste in the text from hundreds of pages there's several applications (unintelligible) hundreds and hundreds of applications maybe we want to look at (unintelligible) is much easier are telling us which questions would apply the same application perhaps maybe not something exactly like we saw in third party created in the first round but (unintelligible) rounds maybe similar going in a similar output for us to compute (unintelligible) we go down that line.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks (Michael). Anybody else in the queue (unintelligible) Julie's got online (unintelligible)

Julie Hedlund: All right (unintelligible) from Anne Aikman-Scalise she says, "It's not about solving a problem it's about creating a new problem by making this recommendation. Jeff's suggestion to use language that accepts the practice in relation to questions that go to mission and purpose that is not a policy change," end of comment.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thank you. Anyone else in the queue? I see (Sarah). Sorry (Sarah).

(Sarah): That's okay. And so, you know, maybe we should consider that this could be a new idea that's being put forward that maybe you should be prohibited from using duplicative language if you're portfolio applicant because if that were the case then it might make sense for the tool to police it but if that is not a rule then why would we have the tool try to police something that doesn't exist?

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks (Sarah). And that is in fact a new idea that was not in our initial report or in the comments we got back but we have notes of it now and it will be in the record. And we'll - when we come back to systems we'll certainly come back to this - the new idea. Julie is raising her hand so probably another online.

Julie Hedlund: There is. There is indeed. This one is from Christopher Wilkinson. And I think let me just make sure that's - okay. One of the -- it keeps shifting pardon of me -- one of the objectives is having several specialized rounds or batches is precisely to limit the volumes of applications to the capacity of the evaluation resources over time," end of comment.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you. Julie, actually thank you Anne. And that is related to another topic on or several other topics on prioritization and categories and all sorts. But so we have that - that's not 100% in this particular topic on systems but we will bring that up again on multiple occasions. All right, the next topic communications. And I thought systems was the easy one but this is a great - this is actually really good discussion so I'm actually very happy that there is a lot of comments.

So in general from the initial recommendations we made and from the comments in general there was agreement that there be at least four months from the AGBs - sorry the Applicant Guidebook finalization and the start of accepting applications. And the reason I'm stressing at least or minimum is that there were some comments and said there should be six, there was some comments that said five, there were other comments that may have

had some higher amount. But certainly if looking at all of the comments the minimum was four.

There should be adequate time for program outreach and education especially for applicant support. And this is brevity or shorthand for when we do the outreach and education it's a strong recommendation to leverage the expertise of the global stakeholder engagement GSE of ICANN. Stop to see if there's any comments on those first two. Okay, we should look online. (Collin), your head is still up but...

Collin Kurre: Sorry.

Jeff Neuman: That's okay, it happens to us all. And it will happen to me multiple times probably in this month. Okay the communication, the next one is the communication period should be at least six months with a potential shorter period if there is some form of continuous application period. Okay the communication period as a reminder is the period in between which the applicant or is the period in which ICANN engages in an outreach campaign which could but not necessarily could overlap with the minimum of four months from AGP - AGB finalization and the start of application acceptance. Jim, oh I'm sorry Susan and then Jim.

Susan Payne: Yes, I'm starting to take it personally Jeff. I actually wanted to talk about number one the minimum of four months. I understand what you were saying that, that was the minimum and people said various different amounts. But I think that - there's various different amounts are pretty crucial. So, you know, if there was a great deal of support for six -- and many people feeling it should be six -- then coming down to a, you know, a recommendation of a minimum of four hasn't really addressed that. So maybe we need to drill down into that a bit more?

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks Susan. And while Jim is making his comment I will try to bring up those comments.

Jim Prendergast: Sure, Jim Prendergast. Susan, touched on exactly what I was thinking in bullet one. And then on bullet two I don't know if we've done this and we could - you know, I don't think it changes the specific recommendation in the second bullet about leveraging global stakeholder engagement but it might be beneficial for the group as we make that recommendation. I don't think anyone is going to oppose it just to know was in that GSE toolbox that may help get the message out there for us. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks Jim, Trang, please?

Trang Nguyen: Thanks Jeff. This is Trang from ICANN org. It seems that these bullet points at least the first two in here talks about timelines for outreach and education but there's not a lot of mentions here with regards to setting objectives and goals for such outreach and education particularly around the applicant support area. And I know that that's one of the things that we had asked for org, you know, in our participation and this group has asked for was, you know, some setting of objectives and goals for what it is that you are looking to achieve as it relates to applicant support?

Are we talking about the number of applications from a specific region, are we talking about a percentage of overall application? What is it that we're looking to achieve via the communications and outreach? And that would be very helpful to then measure and then determine whether or not, you know, we've achieved those goals. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Trang. And I'm going to go back first to Susan's comment and then - but I don't want to forget Trang's. So I'm going to put Christa is this on Susan's or is this on Trang's? Hold that one sec. And I know there's an online, is there an online common? Is this online? Is that related to Susan's question or Trang's?

Julie Hedlund: It's just related to communications.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so I'm going to go, so to Susan's question first. So the recommendation in the initial report was what it says here there should be a minimum of four months. That was supported by the Brand Registry Group, the business - the Business Constituency, Neustar and FairWinds. And then Valideus which is Susan's comments was a shorter one of three months. And then the ALAC believes that the amount of time between which the final Applicant Guidebook is released and a ton in which applications would be finally due is a function of clarity of policies, rules and procedures for the program. And two how well they are set out in the Applicant Guidebook and made accessible.

So I actually misspoke I think the five and six was actually related to the third bullet point the communications period. So the recommendation was four months. And then there's agreement but then Valideus said three months and ALAC put in a formula which it basically says it just depends on those two items just to clarify. Thanks. For - now back to Trang's I know we had Christa in the queue. So Christa, please.

Christa Taylor: Yes, so even though we're not really talking about applicant support right now when we were talking about applicant support there were a variety of comments that came back with everyone on how we should measure success in the future whether that be say the number of applications, or how many went out versus came in, how many did we actually go through the process and apply versus didn't supply et cetera, et cetera. So that was I think it's probably captured in a different section not in communications but I'll confirm that.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Christa. And I think if I'm understanding Trang there's a subtlety in that that's judging the success of the applicant support program. I think Trang was bringing up judging the success of the communications which is a little bit different I think. Is that correct Trang?

Trang Nguyen: There we go it went out for a second there. They are different applicant support awareness building, you know, activities. And then there is also overall communications as it relates to the program. And I think both we need to take a look at both right? Applicant support I know that there were only very few applications from last round. There were questions with regards to whether or not end up with (unintelligible) promoting the applicant support program. But, you know, similarly I think there were a lot of criticisms with regards to just the overall communication on the program prior to the opening of the application window. So to the extent that, you know, there are goals and objectives for one or both of them or it would be helpful to understand that - what that - what those are.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Trang. Any other comments or questions on that one? Steve, I'm sorry.

Trang Nguyen: Thanks Jeff, this is Steve Chan from staff. Sorry got to hold on for a second. No problem, bless you Kathy. What I was actually just going to point out I don't know if anyone saw me click over to the next slide I just cover some of the things that were just talked about. So I think Trang was a little bit prescient. If you look on the next slide it talks about that second bullet there. It's about identifying the metrics for determining success with the communications plan.

And the fourth bullet I think refers to what Susan might have been talking about in the first bullet on the previous page about the communications period the length of time. So rather than trying to determine or select an arbitrary time period for the communications period rather try to determine whether requirements are for that communications period and then set it accordingly. So I think probably the second page maybe sort of speaks to some of the things that were just raised. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Steve. And I think with - and there's a couple ways we can handle these open topics. So something like identify criteria or metrics for

determining success of the communication plan we can either do that as a working group is option one. Option two is we can give that to an implementation review team and tell them that they should do it or option three is that we can just say the ICANN org should or must define criteria or metrics for the determining of - determination of a communications plan prior to or, you know, something like that but push it off to them.

So there are three different approaches we could take as a group. And as we - and there will be this type of implementation guidance that will come up with a number of different items right? But I'm just using this one as an example of different ways that we can handle it as a working group or does that make sense? Head nods, okay.

So the third one was a comment that ICANN org had made which wanted us to be clear in the initial report that we pointed out where our recommendations are different from the way the ICANN org implemented it the last time. So to the extent that we can make that more clear and make their job easier when they are implementing it that would be - that's what ICANN org had asked us to do. I think we went over the fourth bullet, yes. And then they last bullet -- and then I know there's an online comment -- parsing out and agreeing on the core principles right? So this goes a long with setting the high level principle and then either pushing that off to the implementation team or pushing it off to ICANN org. So Julie, I know that there's an online comment.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. Actually there's an online comment and an online question. And the comment is from Christopher Wilkinson begin comment, "Communication periods will be critical for geographic names because very few of local stakeholders worldwide have been participating in Work Track 5, et cetera," end comment. And the question is from Anne Aikman-Scalise begin question, "Was there something in the public comments relating to real-time chat available for applicants," end question?

Jeff Neuman: On the second question I'll have to double check. I think we did have that in there. I know that the ICANN organization raised an issue or a concern with that increasing the complexity cost, et cetera. So that was in the comments as a new idea. And now why did I forget the first - oh Christopher Wilkinson. Okay, that comment seems not to just relate to geographic names but also to communication period critical for all types of applications.

Okay, the next one next topic. Good, all right universal acceptance. So in general there was agreement or is agreement from the initial recommendations and the comments that came in that there should continue to be support for internationalized domain but also that applicants should be made aware of universal acceptance issues that we've found throughout the years now that we have internationalized domain names at the top level in the root. It's pretty noncontroversial. Looking around, okay.

So then the open topics was or is, should the Universal Acceptance Steering group play a role in informing potential applicants in other words should we make an implementation guidance - an implementation guideline ask - formally asking the steering group to supply that information? And then the second one was several commenters' support the notion that the universal acceptance initiative and the UASG should lead the community effort however there's a suggestion the ICANN org itself has a role to play.

Another suggestion was that registry registrar verticals in particular should fully support IDNs especially in email and that should actively seek to ensure their suppliers are UA ready. So on that last part probably deserves a little bit of an explanation. There were some comments that said that any registry or registrar that was offering IDNs -- so for registry at the top level for registrars at the second level -- that they themselves should support all aspects of IDNs including email. So in order to be accredited I guess -- for lack of better language -- in order to be accredited to sell or register those IDN names. That

was one commenter that raised that. It was a new idea. Throw it out for discussion.

Man: Maxim.

Jeff Neuman: Oh sorry, Maxim please.

Maxim Alzoba: About second point the thing that registry or registrar supports IDNs on some particular server - mail server actually doesn't help a lot because until the biggest mail providers supported this same way I'd say yes it will not fly because station where you for example have two big mail providers supporting differently it will create more confusion than it will resolve. And the registries raise - actually I see this requirement is quite formal. You ask registrars or registries for a mail server they will give you some box saying yes it's there. It's not necessarily going to be used thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you Maxim. Let me - is there anyone else? Okay, so let me ask a follow-up to that. Is there - understanding that there's different email providers out there some may and some may not I think the comment was more that the registry or registrar have the capability to receive and communicate in internationalized domain name characters or scripts. I may not be using the right word so I apologize. Is that what you were responding to as well? I just want to make sure I understand. So Maxim, please?

Maxim Alzoba: Yes, for clarity usually registrants they users of hosting providers yes? And registrars registries mostly registrars somehow - sometimes they can be hosting providers but not necessary. So asking them to provide services which are not directly tied to registrants it's - anyway nobody use mail of a registry but yes ICANN compliance and registrars that's it. So and if the intention was to say that oh yes all those TLDs everybody will use IDN emails it's a bit misleading because it's up to mail providers and hosting service providers who are outside remit of yes our group.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks Maxim. Anyone else in the queue? Yes please.

Frederic Guillemaut: Yes hello, Frederic Guillemaut for the record. Yes just to follow-up on Maxim for registrars and registrar we can do whatever we can to accept IDNs. But then the registrant wants to use emails and they don't really want to know whether it's a program at the registrar level or the registry level. And maybe it's the software so if we will support IDN more and more but we also need to like topic three the universal (unintelligible) and the outreach to be higher and higher to be able to - for email software for example to be compatible with all IDNs with global work.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Frederic. I believe this was a suggestion or a new idea from the ALAC. So I'm hoping I described it correctly. Maybe Justine can help out.

Justine Chew: Thanks Jeff. This is Justine. Certainly the first sentence I recall in our statement I'm not too sure about the rest of the - where it says another suggestion is registry registrar verticals, et cetera. So I will have to come back to you (unintelligible) posing a question to ALAC. But...

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Justine.

Justine Chew: Yes, sorry I was just going to say that UASG has been rather successful in terms of promoting UA. And in fact they have I believe -- if I'm not mistaken -- they have managed to get several major email providers to be UA ready. So then it's a question of whether the registry registrars, you know, are using those email services.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Justine. Anyone comment on it? Maxim please.

Maxim Alzoba: Yes, the registry incurs control with the registrars I might say that it be disconnected because requesting us hypothetically like registrars and registries be responsible for what hosting providers do and mail providers do is a bit too much to my understanding. And the intention is good the way that

it's explained here might be like corrected. Maybe anticipation of the technology or support when it's required by registrants not necessarily use mail service of registrars and not necessarily - and of course they don't use registry mail services maybe in some rare case.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Maxim. And the other - the question I would also add is this sounds like more of an issue with all TLDs as opposed as opposed to just the new ones. And so I would ask the question of why we would just put it in as a condition of a New TLD when it's not in as a condition of the 1200 that are already in place. Is this something that we put in as a - I don't even know what it would be but something we would ask the GNSO to look at separate and apart from the New TLD process? I'm just throwing that out there. Donna please.

Donna Austin:: Thanks Jeff, Donna Austin. I tend to agree that I think this probably doesn't fit with us. I think it's somewhere else. Well it might be with the Universal Acceptance group but I'm not sure that this is a topic that we need to address in this PDP.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks Donna. Anyone else on this? Is there a second? Is there a - oh...

Man: I guess not.

Jeff Neuman: Apparently Siri can't help us with IDN.

Woman: Ask it another question.

Jeff Neuman: That was interesting. I don't all that happens. I'm going to put that in my pocket now. All right application submission limits, yes topic - well actually we have till 4:45 right? Okay so I'm going to go through this one...

Man: We have a question.

Jeff Neuman: ...relatively - Justine please?

Justine Chew: Sorry, just to interject. I'm looking at the ALAC comment now and we were recommending that in so far as if the registry and the registrars are owned by the same entity. So there is some commonality in that sense but it's only a suggestion.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks for clarifying that Justine. On the application submission limits -- and we'll try to just breeze through this one because I think we're actually making some really good progress - there's general agreement that there should be a minimum of a three month period for an applicant to submit an application assuming that the next procedure is a round. However some believe a longer period makes sense but most agree that a fixed application period makes sense. I'm trying to remember except shorthand that I'm trying to remember that last sentence. Steve please.

Steve Chan: Thanks Jeff, this is Steve Chan from staff. And I just noticed there is a boo-boo on this slide. It should actually be application submission - yes period rather than limit. So just want to make sure that's clear. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. So this is not relating to the number of applications you could submit but actually the length of the application submission period. And so the first general agreement was a minimum of three months. The second one was that if the subsequent procedures are series of application windows evaluation and delegation of applications may overlap with the opening of a subsequent procedure. The third one was in opposition to the preliminary option. I'm trying to remember this short hand.

You know what it is getting late. This is a bigger topic than I thought because I was actually initially thinking it was the number of applications. So I'm going to like - we're going to redo this fifth topic on the next call and start there because we are kind of running up against time anyway. So does anybody

have any kind of any other business? And just forget these slides we'll correct it and start over from here on the next call. Anyone with questions? Well thank you everyone. I know that this has been kind of tedious and I know we've gone through a bunch of stuff and everyone is exhausted but I do think we've made a lot of progress. And this really is helping us to write a final report so thank you very much. Bye.

END