

**Transcription ICANN London
GNSO - New gTLD Applicants Group (NTAG)
Wednesday 25 June 2014**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#jun>

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

Man: So welcome everyone to the ICANN 50 NTAG meeting. As you can see there's an agenda up.

Just a couple of housekeeping issues. The meeting is being recorded as you can see.

And so please announce yourself and your affiliation for the benefit of the recording. We'll be making every effort to stay on schedule.

But of course if there's substantial discussion we'll be flexible to accommodate that. The agenda today will begin with a brief update, status update from the chair, from myself.

Then a dialog with ICANN staff, issues that we might want to raise with the new gTLD program and with the generic domains division. I'll also call out ((Chris)) (unintelligible) the ICANN ombudsman who's here who will be able to answer questions.

Thanks ((Chris)) for joining us. Then we'll proceed to updates from the working groups.

Name collisions, auctions, GDP feedback. Then Samantha is going to lead a discussion on the future of the NTAG.

As we know as the number of applicants decreases over time the role and nature and shape of the NTAG is going to evolve with that. So looking forward to that discussion.

And then Deloitte will discuss and give an update on the trademark clearing house which I'm sure will be of interest to many. And finally the most exciting part of the agenda -- we'll introduce the new slate of NTAG officers who have kindly volunteered to bear the cross over the next six months.

Next slide please. So you can see in terms of the membership we actually have been pretty consistent.

This is almost the same number that we had in Singapore in terms of membership. So 37 nonvoting members, 64 voting, total membership still over 100 members.

These numbers are from yesterday, from the ROASG secretariat. So it's still a pretty sizeable group.

And I think representing a large number of applications that are still in the queue. Next slide please.

So what did we do from March to June? The NTAG provided detailed feedback on the (unintelligible) names collision report.

We responded to the ALAC proposal for policy advisory boards. And a ton of work was led by (unintelligible) to craft a detailed GDP feedback letter which has already been discussed in detail in the ROISG and other sessions.

We also did some work to gather feedback from applicant who have exited the program. And we define that as people who have signed at least one registry contract with ICANN.

The new gTLD retrospective is a bit of an experiment and a community led dialog around the application program. And that'll take place directly after this meeting.

And then we've kicked off a charter review to look at the NTAG charter and how it might evolve. Next slide please.

So I'm just going to go through briefly some of the requests that NTAG members have made to ICANN and the status of those requests. The auctions comment denied - it's at the top here denied is probably not the best word.

But so sorry about that. Wasn't actually denied, you're just a bit behind schedule on it.

But you can see that there's some good issues there that have been resolved and some outstanding issues that we'll discuss later. Next slide please.

This is a key issues letter that was released on February 28. A number of those issues have been resolved so that's great to see.

And we'll continue to monitor the ones that are still there in yellow. Next slide please.

The name collisions comment. I think allowing both wildcarding and alternate (unintelligible) is still potentially on the table so it's something to discuss down the track.

Some other issues. This is just a basic status update in terms of what came out of the ICANN report on name collision.

And the next slide. And the GDD feedback letter I think even though there's a lot of yellow here we do see that there's a lot of commitment coming forward.

And particularly notable that a response plan to the GDD letter should be forthcoming in July which is great news. So we should be able to see some structure building around responses to these issues.

Next slide. Updated public comments.

You can see that there's a number of public comments that are wrapping up in July. After that it kind of drops off.

So it's looking a bit quieter. Nothing in here jumped out at me as being particularly in the critical path for applicants.

But there may be things that are interesting for applicants to consider contributing to in the future as they anticipate becoming registries. So something to keep an eye on and I'll be happy to turn a detailed discussion of those over to the next XCOM.

Next slide please. All right. And with that actually we're missing a slide here.

We won't go right to name collisions. We'll start the ICANN discussion.

So next in line on the agenda is a discussion with ICANN and the GDD. And I think we'll just open the floor up for comments from the members, follow-up to discussions earlier in the week, issues that we wanted to raise regarding the letter.

Please go ahead.

Man: Just don't expect much at 8:00 am. Just a caveat.

Man: Yeah no I thought (Rubens) and (Jordan), are they here?

Man: Sorry the slides - it's a mistake in the slides. The actual agenda -- if we can actually go back to the agenda.

So this discussion - at this point we'll - we're at the interaction with the GDD dialog with ICANN staff.

Man: Thanks sorry about that.

Man: In fact actually (John) one of the things that you floated earlier this morning was a potential letter. I don't know if this would be the time to...

(John): Yeah I mean we could do it during the name collision discussion. It's just a reaffirmation of the discussion we had yesterday and the - at the registry stakeholder group meeting about name collisions and ICANN fees and how they intersect.

So if we're delayed 90 days for those TLDs that can't take the alternative path or alternate path -- we were hoping as part of the name collision proposal that ICANN agree to waive its fees for that same 90 day period. So I'm hoping that we'll consider here a letter to that effect and hopefully we'll be able to get that out soon.

(Cyrus Namazi): Thanks (John). (Cyrus Namazi) here with ICANN staff.

We heard you. We'll definitely take that back.

Man: Other questions, feedback for ICANN staff on application related issues? Craig go ahead.

Craig Schwartz: Thanks (Jacob). Craig Schwartz from FTLD registry services. And the community TLD applicant group met yesterday and shared some concerns with particular issues around the process.

And one of those issues relates to the accountability and review mechanisms, you know, whether it's the reconsideration requests or the IRP. But in particular the ombudsman's process.

And the general feeling that there hasn't been a lot of good communication coming from ICANN or even the ombudsman's office around the status of these mechanisms that would cause an application to be on hold. And I invited (Chris) here this morning because he and I have had some conversations about this as it relates to our particular applications.

But there are other members of the CTAG and other applicants in general I think that have questions and feel like there could be some more clarity around the way information is shared from staff when an application is on hold. In particular the reconsideration request process as well as the IRP are fairly well defined in terms of when they can be invoked, what the process is for resolution.

And there's more of a clear timeline which helps for planning and certainly communication with stakeholders around the resolution of an issue under those two processes. The ombudsman's process is a little less opaque.

And I understand that it's confidential. I do think that rather than staff replying back that the application is on hold because of an accountability and review mechanism that there could be some more specificity.

For example that there could be - that there is a complaint pending, you know, with an applicant in your contention set with the ombudsman. So that was a long winded way of saying I think there can be more transparency and more information forthcoming from staff and maybe even from the

ombudsman himself that when a complaint has been filed with an application that's in your contention set that there should at least be some notification that that's in fact what's happened.

That the process going forward in terms of when the ombudsman has jurisdiction to hear complaints and how they get resolved I think there could be a little bit more specificity. I don't know if that would undermine the value of the process.

But as we look at different elements of the program and how they can be improved for the next round and where more predictability can be created for applicants that may be a place to focus on. So I just wanted to bring that to the attention of NTAG and to (Chris) who's graciously agreed to be here today.

(Jacob): Thanks Craig. Would you like to respond.

Woman: Sure. I'd be happy to let (Chris) go if you have - if you want to make a statement before I talk about the staff side of it.

(Chris): Yeah thanks Craig. I agree that the process does need perhaps less opaqueness if you like and more light shed on it.

Part of the problem I face is as you observe is that when a complaint comes to my office it's confidential. So I can only share it to the extent that people want me to share it.

And sometimes that's fine. And I do ask if people want information to be shared or even a complaint to be shared.

But the problem is that the default position is always confidentiality. What I have been doing is talking regularly to the team at ICANN to tell them what complaints have come into my office and status of them.

So we are working with those. But you have to also understand that because I'm not strictly part of ICANN but I contract to ICANN I'm not within the information loop necessarily.

And that's established that way for of course very good reasons. But I do agree that perhaps we do need looking forward to improve the communication on that.

But if anyone has any other questions about the process I'm here, I'm a target. There's a big couple of circles on my chest at the moment so go for it.

(Jacob): Go ahead (unintelligible).

Woman: I think as someone for whom - or rather against whom an objection was filed with the ombudsperson's office I understand that you need to be circumspect about what you tell the public. But it would be nice for me to have more information because I just simply don't know why my TLD is being delayed.

And so I keep getting emails from ICANN saying don't forget to sign your contract. And I honestly don't know what to tell them because I - my only understanding is that there is an issue in your office.

(Chris): Please feel free to reach out to me. I'm pretty easy to contact, ombudsman@icann.org.

You can even ring me up. People often ring me up.

One of the lawyers in France rings me up every now and then at about 5:00 or 6:00 in the morning. But hey, it's - that's ICANN.

Woman: I'll try not to do that.

(Chris): I promise if you ruing me at 6;00 in the morning there won't be any prejudice to your - to dealing with your objection. But no, please - I'm being slightly facetious about that.

But I sincerely mean if you want to find out something please just reach out to me. And I'll get back to you pretty quickly.

(Jacob): Thanks (Chris). Other questions for (Chris) on the ombudsman issue?
Donna?

(Donna): Hi thanks (Chris). Do you have any stats on how many actual complaints you have at the moment and the timeframe that it's taking to resolve those for the kind of applicant related?

(Chris): Not in front of me. But I do have statistics.

I think the oldest complaints go back to February. The way in which complaints come in is not bound by any particular process.

By that I mean that unlike a court procedure there aren't time limits by which things have to happen. And I'm always careful to ensure that parties have a full opportunity to comment.

So it can get slowed down when I'm waiting for comments to happen. And I do nudge people but, you know, we all have busy lives and don't always have the time to respond as quickly.

But I'm - there are some which are going to come to a head very shortly. And that will tidy up I think the last few.

So I think we're just about at the end of my involvement in the process. If that's of any comfort.

Thank you.

(Jacob): Thanks (Chris). You know, I think one of the things we've heard there is that, you know, the information loop, being looped in on the information and thinking about time limits and efficiency because ultimately the ombudsman process is on the critical path for many applicants.

And making sure that everybody's linked onto it and that there's transparency there. And certainly appreciate the openness from the ombudsman to communicate with people about what's happening and the status.

(Christine Millett): Thanks (Jacob). This is (Christine Millett) from ICANN.

So transparency and visibility to status ombudsman issues reports and the impact on applications is a very fair complaint and I fully appreciate where you're all coming from. Really honestly we didn't anticipate a year ago having as many ombudsman complaints affecting applications -- reports, sorry as there have been.

You've seen us evolve the status information about applications over the last several months. We're considering evolving that status even further to provide as much clarity as possible about the unique state of each individual application and the contention set as well.

So we were not always made aware of reports being made with the ombudsman. I would say in the last six months we started to become aware both by the filers of those complaints, reports as well as because we've gotten inquiries from the ombudsman himself and we respond with information, et cetera.

So staff is not aware of all issues again as (Chris) said. We're only made aware of things that either applicants or filers share with us directly or things

that he's allowed to share with us because the filers agreed that it's not - it can be shared with staff.

So we'll look at providing more clarity around statuses. I know for a while on hold meant either there's an IRP or there's a reconsideration request or if you don't see one of those filed well I guess it must be the ombudsman.

So that's not a good answer. So we need - we're working to improve that.

So I apologize -- we're catching up on that and we - it was just not anticipated at this stage.

(Jacob): Thanks (Christine). Any other questions for ICANN staff while they're here?

I know it's early in the morning and everyone's waking up. I do see Francisco Arias with ICANN in the room, the names collision guru.

And it's an issue that I think dear to the hearts of many applicants. So if there's any questions about name collisions that people wanted to raise...

(Christine Millett): (Jacob) before you go to names collisions can I just ask (Russ) to make a statement about auctions? I know names collision will be...

(Jacob): Certainly. Thanks (Christine).

(Christine Millett): Extensive. (Russ) do you want to make mention of - I saw the comment about the denied on indirect?

(Russ Weinstein): (Russ Weinstein) ICANN staff. So yeah going through those items related to auction -- and I know it's later in the session so don't meant to disrupt the meeting.

But we are still working on the rules for indirect contention. We're hoping to have something out later this summer.

I think we're still undecided as to if it's public comment or if we can live within the - on the bounds we set in the original public comment. And move forward without a public comment.

But we'll keep feeling that out as we get closer to a solution. So not denied, just delayed.

And I know that one's an action item for us. And then yes and we'll continue to interact with the auctions working group or whoever else NTAG wants us to work with on that topic because it's been real helpful so far.

(Jacob): (John) go ahead.

(John): Thanks. Quick question on that. And I know the NTAG letter on indirect contentions adds to that, you know, in a timely way.

And I understand the complexity of that especially if they're speaking with the auction committee and ICANN staff at the last ICANN meeting. But I guess the request probably would be that instead of public comment being a first step that you - if you have a draft work with the applicant auction committee and the applicant group to come up with something that's acceptable and see if we can work out a, you know, negotiated solution and get some compromises that way versus going to the public comment route which will take a lot longer.

(Russ Weinstein): Okay. Good suggestion. Definitely take that back and make sure it's all kosher internally.

And then the other item I wanted to talk about auction wise was in relation to the name collision we had talked about because there won't be a resolution

and finalization of the framework this week. Looking at what that does to the schedule and to the obvious auction specifically.

And so I talked about yesterday in the ROIST meeting that we were going to delay the - or post -reschedule the contention sets from August into September and October. And the one thing we're still trying to work out and I wanted to talk with NTAG here was whether we should go ahead and make those postponements and you'll tell us if you wanted to come back and pull it back into August.

Or if we should reach out proactively before we change the schedule and just with those contention sets if they wanted to maintain the August auction date or honor the postponement. But they have pretty - they requested for name collision.

So I'd like to get your feedback. I think we're open to do it either way.

And just want to make it easy for everyone to participate.

(Jacob): See (Jeff)?

(Jeff): Yeah actually if anyone's got auction comments I'd rather hear the - I have a comment that's for the GDD. But if anyone's got auction ones first.

Okay. So my - the topic I want to talk about is on the pre delegation testing -- something we haven't brought up in a long time. So (unintelligible) for a number of TLDs and I think 20 or so of past PDP.

We're still getting inconsistent results or comment from evaluators based on different things -- things that have past let's say 19 or 19 PDPs all of a sudden don't pass because it's a new evaluator. Or because there's new standards or something else.

And one in particular is -- and (Russ) and I have talked about this and I was wondering if anyone else has had these types of experiences -- is with IDN tables. So certain IDN tables past literally 15 or 16 PDPs and then all of a sudden on the 17th or 18th one it doesn't pass because there's the Swedish PDP provider decides that those two characters or there's two characters that are no longer allowed.

The issue we have is that there is no and has been no standard upon which we're being judged against in PDP. And I know this is after auctions.

But it's definitely become a problem. The refusal for whatever reason to publish a standard if we're being judged against something that something needs to be made available to everyone to know what we are being judged against.

But for whatever reason there isn't - there's either uncomfortableness, unwillingness or whatever it is to publish that standard. Our comment to the evaluators has been the same.

Okay if there is something we're being judged against post it. We'll meet it.

We're okay. We're big boys and girls.

We'll meet the standard. But please publish it.

And for whatever reason it hasn't been published. So if (Russ) I know you're working on that.

If you can address that question. It's really unfair to be tested against something by which the standard is not known.

And by the way in the IDN context just for everyone here these are tables that we have had and have been in operation for 10, 12 years. And all of a

sudden now because one provider decides they don't like those characters or they don't think those characters should exist we have to go through all this steps.

So if you could address that. And really all we're asking is please publish the standards.

(Jacob): Thanks (Jeff). (Christine).

(Christine) Willett): Thanks (Jeff). (Christine) Willett). So it - I would not position it as one provider or with an opinion.

I don't think that it's - it is the outsourced third-party provider ICANN has established. And no one individually is being targeted.

I appreciate that there have been changes and shifts to the pre delegation testing criteria over time. And as you might imagine the more tests which are executed with the more IDN tables the criteria are being refined for sure.

And I understand that leading to things that have previously passed and are no longer passing. so I would position it as refinement which you say is inconsistent.

I don't think that we're opposed to publishing the criteria we're using. But I think you all would be opposed to staff publishing a standard.

So...

(Jeff): No. Actually I think it would be great to publish a standard. Again in the IDN case for 12 years we've been doing it this way.

And all of a sudden now for whatever reason - the point is with IDNs the ITF - - nobody's been able to publish a standard. But now because of discussions

taking place it - things that have been in existence for 12 years that have always passed, that have always been in accordance with the guidelines all of a sudden are decided now it is not.

And we don't understand why. I for one am not opposed to ICANN staff publishing what we're being judged against.

(Jacob): Great, (unintelligible) and Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yeah so this is Jordyn Buchanan from Google. In defense of the PDP providers and I - (Jeff) we had the exact same experience.

We submitted tables, we passed, we went back for another TLD, back submitted tables, you don't pass anymore, very frustrating. But in defense of the provider I think two points.

Number one is when we went back and looked we realized our tables weren't consistent with IDNa 2008 which is a requirement in the guidebook and in the contract. And so we adjusted them so they were and then they passed.

And number two I think that is the standard that they're measuring against. And it's relatively well specified in the IDF documents.

And number three it's IDNa 2008. So that should hopefully help explain why stuff that's 11 years old doesn't necessarily pass the IDNa 2008 requirements.

(Jeff): Yeah but that - okay with all due respect that may be Google's issue. Ours is compliant with 2008.

It's just all of a sudden they went through and they said we don't think those two characters are still in use. Please remove those two characters from the table.

Jordyn Buchanan: I can't speak to your specific issues because I haven't seen your tables. But I think the RFC is relatively clear.

I didn't - the only ambiguity comes around things like context (unintelligible) characters. And you have to have a policy for sort of when they're allowed.

But I think the proxy is relatively unambiguous as to which characters are allowed and which aren't.

(Jeff): I - obviously the fact that we're having this discussion it's not unambiguous.

Jordyn Buchanan: I mean maybe if this is - like I know that there was an effort amongst applicants early on to work on things like reserve lists by coordinating to make sure that we all had a common understanding of like which strings needed to be on the reserve list based on all the crazy requirements to like get like different country names and stuff like that. Maybe there should be some effort to coordinate on IDN table efforts as well so we can make those consistent.

I don't think there's any competitive advantage of having weird inconsistent IDN tables between providers. So that might be a way to make this easier for all of us.

(Jeff): Also - right. But the other thing is you have to keep in mind that there's been registries that have been in existence operating these things and to all of a sudden say well now these two characters shouldn't be allowed. And then by the way we've been told that we don't like those two characters so you need to go back and redo all your IDNs even if you've allowed registrations in the past to have those two characters before 2008 or whenever the things were changed you have to now somehow delta those or not allowed those.

It's got actual impact. So it's different for someone that's been in existence for a while.

But I think what we're saying is we've looked at charts, we've submitted things and what we've asked for is a clear consistent table that we can just use. And if ICANN wants to post it that would be fantastic.

Like I said Nustar will comply with whatever as long as we know what that whatever is. And it's not as simple as the 2008 for all the languages.

(Jacob): Thanks Jeff. I see a hand from Francis. Let's just go over here.

Francisco Arias: Thank you (Jacob).

Just to verify on the procedures for removing the tables from the DTP provider. The criteria is foolish in the PDT specifications, particularly in respect to the tables. There are two types of IDN tables - script or language.

In the case of script tables, the check is based on the (unintelligible) script property. And there are - all the factors have to be from the same script property. And some of the common of entering the script property errors allow, depending if they match the script.

I believe the case that you're referring Jeff, is the other one - the language tables. In that case the criteria in PDT says that the characters including the table should be used by the language. And they're right because they need it to provide evidence of use in the language or the scripts being using in the language.

So they're right because here - two options. You could find evidence that those (unintelligible) have been used by the language. Or you could have a script table so you could have a - I don't know if it's a good idea to enter into the specific cases.

But I know the details of the case you're talking about. And the table that is being referenced is a table that is in use, but it's not a language table. It's a country table that's related to geography in a country where more than one language are spoken. And that's very clearly defined in that CTLD that is using the table.

So I think you could accept either use of specific language table or move to a script table where you can have all the characters so long as they are in the same script.

(Jacob): Thanks (Francisco).

So I think there's a clear call for consistency. And there's a couple of ways that we can do that. I think keeping a dialog open with ICANN staff. As Jordyn referenced, voluntary efforts are always welcome. And I think Jeff's call for transparency and consistency are well heard.

Jeff, a quick response if you can again so I can hold to the agenda.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I mean I would love to know because there's a ton of published tables that are on the IANA site. And I would love to know which of those tables - from any of those - you can pick from any of the providers - as to which of those you believe meet the standards to pass PDT.

And that's what I'm looking for is really something to judge against. And I know that many CTLDs and CCTLDs that are offering those languages do not publish their tables. Obviously there's no requirement that CCTLDs publish their tables.

But I think there should be more of an emphasis on trying to get them to publish their tables. And the GTLDs that are implementing the IDNs should all publish their tables. And I'm just happy to say hey, look - the ones that are

implemented by Charleston Road Registry, that's now the new standard. As I said, I'll meet it. But just tell us what that is. That's all we want.

(Jacob): Thanks Jeff. Okay, I think that's been heard. (Necrumb)?

(Necrumb): Yes. I just want to say Jeff, this is a symptom of bad communication. I don't think we should - this is a typical thing where if you have some issue, you should be able to set up a call and deal with it immediately.

So let's do that. Let's make sure that the - if this issue happens - if you can't get the call set up, call me. I'll set up the call. We'll go over it. And we'll settle it so that you're not talking about this kind of details here with everybody, okay? Thanks.

(Jacob): Thanks (Necrumb). And it's great to know that if people do have these issues and they're feeling frustrated, that they can call you.

(John)?

(John): Yes. A question - PDT capacity - is it going down? Seems like we had an issue in the last couple of weeks about not getting early appointments.

(Ross): No. We still have that 20 per week currently. And the issue we had with you is a possible typo when we were entering the dates. And we got it all straightened out within the week. But no, we're still at 20 a week. And we're still well under capacity right now with the buy point.

(Jacob): Thanks (Ross).

Great. Okay. With that let's move on to an update from the Name Collisions Working Group. (Reubens) and/or Jordyn, could you give an update on the status of where we're at on that with the INTEC?

(Reubens): Good morning from everyone - (Romiscu) for the record. Seems the last INTEC call with my committee, we have two developments. One is the lack of a development and one is an actual development.

The lack of development is the lack of the framework that was expected to be ready by now. And it's because ICANN staff - why is that? And development was (unintelligible) as that advice on the Jazz Reports.

Then the Collision Work Group already has answered the INTEC advice. That answer has already been taken into consideration by staff into preparing their response for the framework. And we are quite comfortable with that part of that development.

And the problem we still have is the lack of the framework. So I would like to take the opportunity that ICANN staff is here to clarify something on the framework. That's it Francisco.

Francisco Arias: We have some doubts that the framework is not published. We have been trying actually to get what's in there from the presentations and so far so - one of the questions that is implementing the wild card contracting time.

Let's say a TLD just signed an agreement with ICANN. And it wants to implement right now the wild card before going through pre-delegation testing because it don't actually have a live system. You only have DNS records or anything from the wild card.

Is that an option included in the framework?

Man: No. You cannot introduce DNS records until your TLD is delayed and before we delay the TLD, we need to follow the procedure that is already defined to test that the razor systems are ready to take the TLD. So the first option to - the first time available to start controlling direction will be the time of the duration.

Francisco Arias: Would you consider doing so possibly not with (unintelligible) DNS servers, maybe with ICANN operated DNS servers. Like let's say the L root servers - not the L root - (unintelligible) same machine, the same nodes or a subset of the nodes that would stop answering controlled interruption right away when a contract is signed so that can speed up time to monitor for actually a thousand TLDs right now.

So that could widely be anticipated while the TLD goes through PDT. And when the (unintelligible) takes ownership of the TLD, he can just do an IANA change from the current service to the then operating service.

Is that a technically feasible option if ICANN is ready to do so?

Man: So - thanks (Francis). Can we consider a fee optional similar to what you are talking? However that has certain drawbacks. For example we will set up an operation which we don't have ready right now. And you've seen groups that are - groups that are very infrastructure.

I'm not sure that that will be considered a good idea by our own security item for example, using something that is very similar to operate without the DLDs. That is absolutely the consideration of the DLDs that can be related at the same time.

So going to delegate a big number of DLDs when we have the finally meet of the number of delegations so we can do a server time is another consideration here. So what we decided to go was with the simplest option that could accumulate the existing procedure which is that the (unintelligible) itself operates the control interruption

Another thing to consider here is that there is an opportunity for overlap between the already existing 120 names and the (unintelligible) for activation of names for the interim names of certification that can overlap with the

control interruption so that the net effect to raise this minimum number of extra days that the TLD cannot activate names in the others.

Man: Thanks for that (unintelligible) from Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchanan: So a couple of quick points on this stuff at first is I think this is not (sheerly) a matter of take to market for registries which is a consideration. But there's also the question of providing the benefits of controlled interruption which is notification of an impending problem as early as possible in the process.

So there's a security benefit to the community. It's not just one to the - it's not just purely a matter of getting the registry operator to work as quickly as possible. The name's not going to be delegated for six months or nine months. And the controlled interruption happens right at contract signing.

That gives potentially an affected party a significantly longer window in order to react prior to the delegation. So I think that should be kept in mind in considering this issue as well.

Secondly I'd say if it's a matter of setting up the infrastructure, there's certainly - I mean I'm sure any number of registry operators here would be glad to host the DNS constellation that did nothing but return a bunch of 7.0.53.53 that we could delegate to.

So we have to give voluntarily. We have a big DNS constellation. I know there are other people in the room that do as well. So if it's - we'd be glad to work with ICANN to make that service exist if it's just a matter of spinning something up. We could do it in a week or two.

(Jacob): Thanks Jordyn. (Reubens)?

(Reubens): Next what we could derive from the framework, and if that's not possible to consider it an option. (Unintelligible) records and also delegate - give me all

the names that are not in the block list, so could both have controlled interruption for any other things than - for any names on the block list.

But due to the presence of the large cut and also delegate names while doing that so increase the ability to start serving (unintelligible) right away. Is that an option or an option you'd consider?

Jordyn Buchanan: The option to provide control interruption only on the C block list is for...

(Reubens): It couldn't be only on the C block list. The wild card will be there. But they don't give me a wild card and names delegated to them. But those names would then be on the block list.

Jordyn Buchanan: Oh, I see. So you're saying that TLD that is delegated after the framework is adopted will serve the wild card and activate names that are not in the SLD block list.

So this is an option that - it's explicitly not allowed in the framework. The reason being is there have been several reports in the past specifying that doing wild card in what is called a very strict glass (unintelligible). It's not a good idea.

(Unintelligible) suffered a big price. So there is plenty of buys from (unintelligible) I believe and IAB and others at the time of the (unintelligible) finder years ago. There is an ICANN report that was published together with an applicant guidebook four years ago. So that summarizes all that input and (unintelligible) is precisely that.

It is surely not a good idea to do a wild card when you are offering activation of names to give price. That is the reason why we are doing this. And that is a (unintelligible) solution I guess then.

Man: Okay Francisco, you have any...

Francisco Arias: (Jeff), I'd give it to you. Go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: So if that was to third parties, what about to yourself for the marketing and promotion of the 100 names? So I understand there's a resolution not allowing delegate - while you're delegating to third parties. But if I want to put up some names that are in my marketing and promotion list that are just for my use, would that be something that would fit within that definition that we might get an exception for?

I don't have to have nic.ny - dot nyc for New York let's say or nic.whatever to put information about my TLD. I could actually put a name - a real name that I want to draw people to.

Jordyn Buchanan: So then in that case we need to consider the other issue which is there is an internalized certificate (unintelligible) inactivation period. And there is also the consideration that we are trying to minimize the possibility of name collision. So we're limiting activation to the minimum possible in this case - only one name and I set up TLD so that we can offer - so the service can be offered.

Man: So Jeff, we have not allowed that the current alternate path to actually take names that are on the collision list and put them in the first launch that even if they are on the 100 list. So why would we do it differently now?

Jeff Neuman: Just to respond to that, I'm talking about names that may not even be on that list. Right now - under the new plan there is prohibition of any names other than nic.nyc or nic - I keep saying nic because that's our New York City site, so I'm so used to saying it.

So I'm talking about - look, the 98 - we're happy that it was reduced from 120 to 98. But the reality is that if you're going from the date of delegation, it could actually be longer than the 120 days from contract date in a lot of circumstances.

So while you've reduced it from - while the Jazz Report reduced it from 120 to 90, that's good in one respect. But in another respect it actually makes things longer. So we're just trying to look for things that are in compliance with the 120 day rule for the certificates that are - we're just looking for some flexibility here because this is really...

Craig Schwartz: I know. But I think that you're looking for that small exception that might delay everybody. The more changes we do, the more we're going to have to go put it up for public comment again. So, you know, remember that this is - this proposal that the Jazz put was already put out for public comment. There wasn't that much changes to it. That's why we're actually going to recommend to the board to accept it.

If we make too many changes, then it's going to have to go back to public comment. And then we're going to have to wait all this time and change it again. You know let's not go focus on these small advantages here of the day and then ten days and stuff, and then cause us a lot more harm, you know, to delay things even longer.

This is a better process to mitigate the collisions because it allows us to mitigate all the collisions, even the ones that are not caught in the little data. So it's a more comprehensive way to do it. That's why the board is more amenable to make it happen.

If we start changing everything again, we're going to get into delays - more delays. So why are we doing this?

(Jacob): Thanks (unintelligible). I actually have (Maxim) and Craig in the queue. And then we'll wrap it up on this to stick to time. Thank you.

Man: (Maxim) is going to fight it. It's small notes. We have nine collisions. We have RPMs. We have an end to our RPMs which is QE which is important for

dues. And now we see situation where QEP is 100 names for the benefit of local government. It is S and it's allowed only until the end of sunrise.

And the situation when sunrise is going to be over soon - important names for a lot of gathering are frozen. And there is no resolution because QEP appears after the name collisions issue.

So please take note that it will require resolution. Maybe we need to reserve some numbers from QEP to ask when these names will be unfrozen.

Craig Schwartz: I think we're mixing two things here. There is either you have not been delegated and therefore you're going to get delegated soon. And you go with the wild card controlled interruption for the 90 days. If you're going down this path, from the time you sign your contract, if you finish your PDT within 30 days and you are delegated within these 30 days, then you're 90 days and your sunrise could all happen at the same time as your 120 days, okay?

Now any slip in that first 30 days from contract signing to actually delegation, more than 30 days - that's the only time you're going to be delayed by. That's it. So if you take 45 days instead of 30 between contracting and delegation, then you're delayed 15 days from originally and you're done, okay?

Now if you've already been delegated, you have already a reserved list. Regardless of when your sunrise is, you cannot delegate this reserved list until you do a controlled interruption on each item of those one by one. So that will require - every label in that list will require 90 days of controlled interruption regardless.

You can do them all at once - 90 days for each one of them. And then see what you do with them. Or you can pick and choose to say, you know, I'm going to do only these because I have demands for these so I'll do those and then I'll do the other ones later. That's up to you.

Under this QEP addendum we allowed to delegate those before the end of sunrise. And now we see a situation where it will pass QEP for us - will be over. We won't be allowed to delegate it to government. And then we will have to pass procedures for the remaining names we can delegate.

(Jacob): I'm sorry. I've just got to keep us to time. So please take that discussion off line.

Craig Schwartz: Just a quick answer - the QLPs - the 100 labels cannot be delegated if they are on the collision list before or after - they cannot be delegated. Let's be careful on this, okay?

(Jacob): Thanks Craig.

Jeff Neuman: Just a quick question on timing - so I get the controlled interruption period is 90 days from delegation. The certificate issue that we've been talking about and the 120 days - that's from the day that you sign your agreements, correct?

Okay, thanks.

(Jacob): All right Jim.

Oh sorry - go ahead.

Jim Prendergast: That's all right. Jim Prendergast - Coalition Strategy Group. Real quick on the 25 or so applications that the alternate path was not an option for, they are now just subject to the 90 day controlled interruption period and then they're free and clear?

Francisco Arias: Yes.

Jim Prendergast: Okay, thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks - this is Jeff Neuman. Have any registries been granted an exception to the name collision requirements?

Francisco Arias: No.

Jeff Neuman: So if there are registries that have delegated names that are on the name collision list, I'm assuming I can't...

Francisco Arias: Compliance is on it.

Jeff Neuman: Can you give...

(Jacob): All right, thanks. Let's leave it there.

Jeff Neuman: I have just one quick procedural question to make sure we understand how to move forward with staff on this.

I know you guys are collecting feedback right now to present to the NGCP in order to move this to completion. I know based on the discussion here today and the discussion at the session earlier in the week - yesterday - there's some - I think there's a couple areas where we still have some feedback that we'd like to provide and make sure that it's considered by both staff and then the NGCP as this goes to the file framework.

A, what's our timing to get that to you? And what's the best way to make that happen?

Francisco Arias: We're assuming that what we put out is actually what we're going to go forward it. If we see a lot of interest - not from a single party, but from set of parties that they would like to make changes, then we would consider it.

Our timeline probably is at least two weeks before we meet with the NGPC, so probably no later than, you know, 15th of July. Because we need to - yes, I mean as soon as possible because if we want to get this done, we have to deliver any recommendations and resolutions to the NGPC two weeks before the meeting.

So we're, you know, we need to get all the information as soon as possible.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. That's helpful.

(Jacob): Thanks. All right. So a good timeline to work on there for additional feedback and create a video on how we get this issue resolved. Obviously the thing we'd like to avoid here is that it gets dragged out (intermenantly) at the NGPC level because that's a very difficult risk for (unintelligible) to manage.

So with that I'll turn over to auctions. (Ross) has a proposal. Let's hear from Statton and (Steve) on where auctions is at.

Statton Hammock: Sure. Good morning everyone. As (Steve) mentioned, the Auctions Working Group has been quiet since last meeting largely. The first ICANN auction took place in June - was a single string as most of you all know.

The two things we're waiting on are the indirect contention set rules which (Ross) has been very helpful with some information on that (unintelligible) approximately, included still in indirect contention. They're obviously waiting keenly for those rules. It would be good at some point if we could get a more clear guidance on the timing for those.

And the - I think just to go back to the point around the postponement requests that relate to the publication of the framework that's been the subject of this discussion. You had a question for the group about the rescinding of postponement requests.

And I know that I've seen the comments that make the postponement request notification to applicants. And I'm not sure that we know the procedure for rescinding a postponement should that postponing applicant wish to, and then the procedure for notifying applicants who have been affected by that.

I think for many applicants the issue is timing of wanting to either conclude their or resolve their contentions, but also consistency, you know, on a commercial basis. We're all businesses, and consistency is something that interminable delays with framework publications doesn't lead to.

So I think that's the two things would be - yes, postponements and the indirection contentions set, and in light of the information from this week, just some information about when you'll republish the new schedule of auctions with the new steps.

Anything to add to that one?

(Ross): This is (Ross) for the record. We could publish an updated schedule next week, postponing the sets from August into September and October like we talked about yesterday. There's 16 sets that I would need to shift. And our idea was to put ten of those into September and the remaining six into October.

That way we would kind of cap the September auction in the 20 contention sets and 18 I think for the October auction. So we're not exceeding that - making a giant auction in September and creating any challenges there.

So the options that we have in front of us are we can just go ahead and unilaterally do that. And we can give you a deadline for when if you wanted to pull any contentions that wanted to pull back into the August action. They can notify us by a certain deadline. And every member of the contention set would have to agree to that.

Or we can maybe take a week to - my team can send out targeted messages to all of the contention sets that would be delayed from August into September or October, and give them the opportunity to stay in the August auction before we update the schedule. Again that would require full consent from the contention set.

And then based on the response from that, we could make the update to the schedule. So I think we can do it either way. I was trying to get a sense of is there a preference from the operating groups. We're facilitating this for you guys.

(Steve): Okay. I think that's probably something that we can - I'm not sure if I want to get into that now or regroup with the Auctions Committee and get back to you on that.

(Jacob): Thanks (Steve). Any other questions, feedback on ICANN auctions for ICANN staff? All right, seeing none, thanks for the updates from that team. Next on the agenda we have future of NTAG discussion, right?

So at this point I'm happy to - the tenor of the discussion is going to change to thinking about what the future of the NTAG is going to look like. So I'd like to just thank ICANN staff. You have some ideas.

But thank you very much for joining. Really appreciate the feedback and the open dialogue. And we'll keep that open going forward. So I'll turn now over to Samantha who's kindly volunteered to take this on. I think we go to the next slide.

Samantha Eisner: Thanks (Jacob). (Jacob) gave a really good introduction, so I won't talk for very long, but the thought process behind the working group was that there are obviously a lot of questions about how the NTAG should evolve. And we thought the best way to get some of those answers was to start an open discussion here and one that will definitely continue over the e-mail list

serves, etcetera, to try to you know get a little bit more progress made by the next ICANN meeting in L.A.

So I'm just going to give a really quick background and then turn it over to you guys and we can start considering some of the questions at hand. So if you'll take a look at the slide, this is just an overview of the NTAG mission as stated at the very beginning of the charter as it's currently written.

So an interest group formed as part of the Registry Stakeholder Group, the primary role being to represent the interests of registry observers as they're engaged in the process of becoming operators.

And you know as it stands right now the NTAG is reserved for members, for applicants of the 2012 round. So that's obviously something that in the future we're going to have to consider updating.

The next couple slides just talk about the portion of the RySG charter that cover the establishment of interest groups. We just put it in for background. So I'll let you guys go through it instead of reading it out to you. And so now if you - (Jacob) if you want to just go through the next two slides, we'll get right into the discussion questions.

Okay so the first one that we started to think about is more of a short term question, which is has the NTAG adequately fulfilled its stated mission up to this point in the 2012 round of new gTLD applications? So were there any aspects of the structure operations that should be adjusted in order to better fulfill the mission as it stands right now in the current application round?

And the second set of questions deal more with the future of NTAG and whether or not it is an organization that should dissolve at some point. In the registry charter there is discussion about whether or not an interest group should dissolve and provide for that to happen.

So whether or not NTAG should dissolve at some point and then reform for subsequent gTLD application rounds, would dissolving for a period of time affect the current status within the Registry Stakeholder Group or the GNSO? Could NTAG pick up where it left off if it were to dissolve and then reform?

And then if it were to dissolve for this round, when should that take place? And at what point should it reform for future rounds?

And then finally the last question we'll go through today is what should the future relationship be between NTAG and the Registry Stakeholder Group? Are existing mechanisms sufficient? Or are there ways for interaction commission? Are there ways that can be improved? And does the current framework regarding the membership between the NTAG and the RySG need to be adjusted?

The thinking behind this was in future rounds if - future application rounds I should say - is if registries are applicants again, are the mechanisms in place for registries and those members sufficient? Or should there be a different kind of structure between the two to make sure that applicant interests are well represented?

So those are just the three kind of background questions. Like I said, this is the beginning of a conversation I think. So I'm going to shut my mic off now and just open it to everyone to get your thoughts.

(Jacob): We have Donna in the queue. And Reg.

Donna Austin: Donna Austin.

Man: Sorry.

Donna Austin: Can you hear me? Thanks Samantha for the work. I just have a question for (John) (unintelligible) that actually started the NTAG. Can you give us some

context as to the reason why it was established in the first place? I think that would be useful.

Man: Sure thanks Donna. When we drafted the charter way back when, it was almost an insurance policy that there were some issues coming up that while the registries were open to observers we did have a uniform voice in the Registry Stakeholder Group or in ICANN at large.

So we thought to the extent we ever disagree with the incumbent registries, that we wanted to make sure that the applicants for the new TLDs had a voice and that we could actually contradict the incumbents in case we needed to. And it turns out that we didn't really need to because we were actively participating in that group and our opinions ended up being welcome.

So we started it more as an insurance policy to give us a uniform voice for individual companies making policy statements. We were able to collectively make a policy statement which we felt was probably a stronger way to proceed and to represent our interests.

Reg Levy: This is Reg Levy. My sense is that the NTAG is an extremely useful tool for applicants in any round and that it should probably lie dormant until the next round. I mean not starting now, but once there are no more members for it to represent it should just lie dormant and then it can spring anew in the next round and it doesn't have to be recreated or reformed.

(Jacob): (Jeff)?

(Jeff): Yeah I agree with Reg. And I think it also could be a useful discussion list for future rounds. So as we start talking about - I know there are sessions about lessons learned and things - I think we can keep it as a discussion list to talk about how we move forward as a group with recommending additional new gTLD rounds.

So it kind of changes a little bit of focus. And then as Reg says, so we've got sort of a dormant period. And then as Reg says as soon as there is a new applicant round or we're getting closer, then this group comes back into being.

(Jacob): (John)?

(John): Yeah so I think it's a great tool for future applicants. So I think we should whether leave it dormant or recreate it, that doesn't matter to me. The more pressing question I think is do we set up an interest group in the Registry Stakeholder Group to represent the interests of new registries versus old registries?

And the question is can you see coming down the pike any issues that there may be a distinction of interest between a legacy TLD with a legacy contract or the new TLDs with the new TLD contracts? And if so then maybe we want to keep it more active as an interest group, not of applicants any longer but of new registries. And that's certainly something I've been thinking about and perhaps that may be a tool that would be helpful for all of us going forward.

(Jacob): Any thoughts on (John)'s suggestion? (Jeff)?

(Jeff): I would almost say it's kind of the opposite, right? The existing registries are or the legacy contract registries are so few it's almost kind of like the new TLD group becomes the registry stakeholder group. And then if there's separate interests of the legacy ones, that almost becomes an interest group. It's almost the other way around, but...

Man: That could be if there weren't weighted voting in the Registry Stakeholder Group.

(Jeff): Well with the weighted voting is - the weighted voting is not going to be enough power for the legacy registries to overrun any of the new TLDs. So

that's a whole separate discussion. I think we should save that for the whole evolution of the registry stakeholder group as opposed to now talking about different interest groups when we don't even know what that group's going to turn into.

(Jacob): (Susan)?

(Susan): (Unintelligible). I was just going to say I think there is a real discussion that needs to be had about the voting and the structure for the future, and I totally agree that we need to look at that.

Man: To that I would say absolutely. There's a lot of - the new TLDs are now more than existing TLDs, even with the weighted voting. Start the discussion within the Registry Stakeholder Group. Have it. Don't be afraid of it. You guys now have more power and we have more power. Let's do it. Let's not talk about how bad it is from the outside. You're all on the inside now. A lot of you are on the inside.

Man: So the underlying question there is if there's a potential for NTAG to transition into a sort of new registries group then we may not want to sunset it until that question is resolved. And that may be tied to an overall discussion (Unintelligible). Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Only one short notice. It's about the current life cycle of NTAG. I suggest it's going to be frozen after reaching only three persons left toward procedures because when two persons vote it's not nice. And when one votes it's even better.

(Jacob): It's a proposal for a fairly low...

Maxim Alzoba: (Unintelligible).

(Jacob): ...yeah, yeah, for the minimum threshold. Back to Tim.

Tim Switzer: Tim Switzer, Dot Build. I guess one question I have - I must confess I'm not an expert on the by-laws and all that. I think one of the things that made the NTAG so effective is that because it's got its official status, it was very recognized, very supported by the Registry Stakeholder Group, the GNSO, and quite frankly within ICANN. I mean the very first meeting we had ICANN board members, ICANN staff, and that's continued.

My question is again just out of not knowing this dormant status. I mean is there - what does that mean? I guess I'm asking to folks that are a little bit better experts on the stakeholder - I mean can it lie in a dormant status and then revive itself at the same level that it was before? Or does that mean something that it has to kind of get kick started again when we get it going?

Woman: I think that's a big question that we're asking. And I think, you know, talking about whether or not the NTAG should exist as an interest group going forward, not as applicants per se, but new TLD registries, then maybe one way to address this dormancy issue is to make a new charter with a provision that says in the future when new application rounds come up there will be a division of the new TLD registry group that provides for a group within it.

That's very inarticulate right now. I'm sorry about that but you know something that provides for a pass for applicants because I think that's still what we're trying to get at is giving applicants a resource that maybe is a little bit different than what is available for registries.

(Jacob): Good. Sarah than (Stephane).

Sarah Deutsch: I think to (John)'s point is I do think that there's going to be a bit of a bridge issue where one of the best parts about this group is that most times we speak with one voice. And so when we send a letter to ICANN, like these are the improvements we need on the GDD and this is what we need help with as we become new registries and things like that, it's becoming less of an

applicant issue and more of a we just got delegated and there's still a lot of challenges interfacing with ICANN.

And I think it's great that the RySG sort of is willing to sign on to those letters and things like that but in many ways it's almost not their responsibility. They're not having the same challenges that we're having. And so when we write a letter to ICANN or to the board or whomever, it holds a bit of weight because we're speaking for all of us.

Ad so I think that's the - and it's not about the RySG not being - you know, that we should take them over or that they're not listening to our issues. They're just still frankly just we have different issues still. And it's going to lessen as we go through, but I think losing that voice is what we really need to make sure we don't do.

And so I think if we - and it's not a new applicant, necessarily a new applicant issue. It's almost like a new registry issue. And I don't think we should continue to have the divide in the RySG. But I do think we need to pay attention to sort of losing that voice and how we all work together.

(Stephane): All right, yeah, I want to echo (Sarah)'s point and also going through we still have a lot to get through. There's still auctions. There's still delegation. And while it's nice to think that that's all going to go smoothly I'm sure there's still going to be opportunities for that unified voice, issues where we want to have this discussion forum.

And it might change and the structure might be different as we go forward. And the membership gets smaller. But I think having this at least through the next year or so - ICANN is projecting that we're going to keep delegating TLDs through 2017. So there's still some time where we're going to be working through these issues.

Also if we are to make the group dormant, I think part of the value of the NTAG is that it was folks like (John) who were the actual applicants were the new applicants that generated the rules and generated the group's focus. So if we are to make it dormant I would suggest that it not be too restrictive and you let the people who are the new applicants downstream be setting their own rules and be setting their own priorities for the group.

(Jacob): Thanks (Stephane). There's Donna and then Reg.

Donna Austin: I think some months ago (unintelligible) started the conversation about what's the role of the registry stakeholder group and what's the role of the NTAG? And maybe that's the conversation we need to go back to and just see if there is a - there's probably not a clear delineation, but I think we can probably identify what we think is good for the registry stakeholder group to pursue and perhaps where the NTAG still has a role to play.

Reg Levy: I agree with Donna. I think that those of us who have signed registry agreements who are new or who were applicants are now part of the registry stakeholders group. And that's our forum and that's our unified voice. And maybe weighted voting needs to be taken a second look at. But in the meantime our issues are registry issues. They're not just applicant issues.

(Jacob): (Unintelligible). (Jeff)?

(Jeff): I agree with that. But I also agree obviously with keeping the NTAG because I think there are going to be some divergence of interests. Frankly I am sure that when we start talking about another round of TLDs I think even some of the new TLD applicants in this round that became registries may not necessarily want new gTLDs. So there's going to be a divergence.

So I think this group is a good group to keep open or at least the mailing list open to discuss those types of things that talk about either the current new TLD issues or future new TLD issues. There's going to be a review of the

new TLDs. There's going to be different interests, especially from those that want new TLDs going forward and those that may not necessarily have an interest in that.

Woman: So do you then see a similar divide between new TLDs and legacy TLDs as there is between ccTLDs and gTLDs?

(Jeff): There's a parallel there. I see this kind of going back maybe six, seven years, or eight years now when there was some legacy TLDs that didn't necessarily want the new TLDs. I see that sort of happening again. I see that the new TLDs have become now legacy TLDs for that future round. I see the same types of issues coming up.

Man: (Jeff) raises a good point on the review of this round. So is there a voice for us that participate in this round that might be different than those who didn't participate in this round? And I think there probably is. So whether we do both an interest group inside the tent of the registry stakeholder group or NTAG or whatever, I think there will be issues that we as new TLD 2012 registries will want to have a voice I think going forward and continue to have that voice.

Obviously there are issues for us as applicants. We're all still applicants in this round and getting through the auction and delegation and what not. But looking long term I think there probably is a point for an interest group just like there's a point for an interest group with the GOs and the community folks and maybe the brands and others.

(Jacob): (Unintelligible). Go ahead.

(Sophia): (Sophia). I do think the NTAG group is a good start for new gTLD registries who are new to the industry and ICANN policies to have a good platform of discussing some of the topics because some of the topics and the requests discussed in RSG are just too far away from the real issues that we're having in the new registries.

But I also do think that it's important that we have a voice in the RSG in the future in terms of voting. When we kind of renew registries and we need to be more creative about some of the - we will need to have stronger voices in RSG.

(Jacob): Any other thoughts on the issue? All right.

Samantha Eisner: Okay I don't think we need to go through every single question. I think we've covered most of the stuff here. What I'm going to do is I'm going to compile - I've been taking notes on some of the feedback. I'm going to compile some kind of high level thoughts and I'll circulate it to the mailing list and we can keep the discussion going that way. If you guys have any questions or suggestions please feel free to reach out directly.

(Jacob): That's great. I think it's great to keep up the discussion and have this gut check. We've had the NTAG for a long time now, so it's great to think about how it's going to change and evolve and appreciate all the feedback and comments today.

Does anyone find it cold in here? Anyone freezing? Is there a way - I'm not sure - is there a way to increase the temperature in the room?

Man: Bring ICANN back.

(Jacob): It was nice and steamy in the GAC board session yesterday. Maybe we could pipe some of that in here. All right, we'll see if we can find anyone to help with that.

With that, and to keep us on schedule, we have a guest speaker, Vicki Folens with Deloitte to talk about the TMCH. Vicki are you here? Thanks very much. Then we can change the slide deck for (unintelligible).

Vicki Folens: Good morning everyone. So Vicki Folens from Deloitte. I also have (Peter) from (unintelligible) with me here as well, who is more from a marketing side with some interesting insights as well that we think might be of interest of you as you're going down the road.

First of all I thank everybody to be able to provide some information on the Trademark Clearinghouse. You know we've been up and running for a year and a couple of months now. And that's why we wanted to provide you some information on our stats, what's going on with the Trademark Clearinghouse, and also an update on the marketing toolkit for sunrise launches and similar items that we're doing with our agents as well to promote your TLDs.

Can I move the slides through here? No, okay, all right. So let's move to the next slide.

So currently we have over 31,000 trademark records in the clearinghouse. Does that mean that they're all eligible for your particular sunrise? Yes and no. We have still a few that are invalid that don't qualify and according to the clearinghouse guidelines, but that's 1% of the trademark records in there.

And a lot of you have asked us to provide you on a regular basis with stats. Some of you might be aware but we do have a stats page on our Web site where we provide the number of trademark records on a monthly basis, the number of notifications being sent. So you can all see those information on a monthly - or it's updated on a monthly basis on our Web site.

As for claims notifications and ongoing notifications, we can say that there are 51,000 - over 51,000 that have unique notifications, meaning that these are the notifications that are sent per trademark. So yes some trademarks that have multiple notifications being sent, over 51,000 are unique notifications.

And for those that don't know or haven't heard, we're providing the ongoing notifications because we're receiving some questions about that. So claims notifications is the mandatory 90 days claims notifications. The ongoing notifications is information that we provide based on the zone file to the trademark holders as to a domain name is in the zone file matches the trademark records.

And for over the 153 sunrises that currently have closed, we've been able to see that there are 19,248 unique sunrise notifications being sent. And if you look at the stats here per TLD you see that 55% of the TLDs have - 22 - 100 sunrise notifications if I can get that correctly. So these are interesting numbers that you might find interesting to see.

And following the next slide, so from over the 31,000 trademarks in the clearinghouse we actually have over 59,000 labels in the clearinghouse. So there are 59 potential domain names that can be registered in your sunrise as it comes from the trademarks.

Why is it more? Because you have the spaces that can be omitted and replaced by a hyphen. And you have the ampersand and the and sign that can be translated. So that's why we have more labels than trademarks.

And then over 5000 unique labels trigger a sunrise notification. But I'm going to hand that over to you because...

(Peter): Hi this is pages from (unintelligible). So we have receipted over 5000 unique labels for the notification because there are different - like Vicki said - because some brand owners have different labels. But cutting the corner a bit you can say somewhat that 5000 companies or 5000 brand owners registered a mark during any sunrise.

And for this we see that brand owners about just about 49% of the brand owners are only doing a single, only registered a single sunrise. Up until now, 35% have only registered two to five, into the five sunrises.

So this - that is somewhat of a conclusion. And that's also what we're hearing in the market and the feedback that we're getting since, that brand owners are no longer mass registering defensively. And this should also result in better registration data happening or really those who want to be active in a certain TLD.

Vicki Folens: There is definitely a trend from the (unintelligible).

Man: Just a quick question to ask you. So less than 10% of the labels that are in the clearinghouse have participated so far in the sunrise? Is that an accurate statement?

(Peter): That's an accurate statement.

Man: Okay thanks.

Vicki Folens: Of course, for example, when they go through (TTML) they're not receiving sunrise notification also. But we definitely see that there's a definite chance that by numbers you're looking at the TLDs from a different perspective and not only from a defensive because in the past they started registering defensively, that they really wanted to use the TLDs for their different marketing purposes.

And following the next slide please. So what are we doing for you? Currently first of all we include - we have a sunrise calendar as well on our Web site. So we include your sunrise dates on our Web site.

We also have an entering page on our Web site for you as a registry to market your TLD so that people look at us and see as well. And I think how many unique visitors have we already had on our Web page?

(Peter): Don't know (unintelligible).

Vicki Folens: It's in your bag, so you can see the numbers there. So it's some good traffic on our Web site. So brings attention.

We also have entering space on our sunrise calendar as well. I'll come to that in a couple of minutes. And then we also reach out to you if you're interested because we have our clients of course, the trademark holders and trademark agents. They are interested in hearing about the TLD.

So if you want to have a Webinar session with and so that you can explain your TLD, the sunrise language, all that information that you want to get out there, it is possible. You just need to reach out to us and we can set up. We have the platform. There's no extra charge of that for the registry. So we're happy to accommodate those needs.

And we also have customized marking materials and videos. So we actually have videos where we can put your TLD in essentials so that you can mark it as well for obtaining more sunrise registrations so that people are more aware of the fact what you're doing and that they first have to go through the TMCH.

We've also in the past tried to help as much as we could with a fact check validation meaning that people who get in two days before are still able to participate in your sunrise, although we can take up to 20 days. We do try to help of course the people that are last minute there but they want to get a sunrise verification, they wondered if there is a sunrise domain name registration. So we do help that out.

And then we've also implemented the sunrise agent page, but if we're following the slides, I will visualize it. So this is what we call the sunrise agent page. So what we're seeing is that all of trademark holders, they want to get a domain name registration, they go to the registrar sometimes - not the registrar - it's not an agent. They say you need to get an SMD file.

The holder has to go to our Web site, get the SMD file, go back to the register. It's a little confusing sometimes. So we've created the sunrise agent page for the TLDs that are cooperating with the TMCH where we actually list for TLD the agents that are in the clearinghouse and your registrars who are providing sunrise registrations so that trademark holders can just go directly to them for full stop service.

So they don't lose interest, they don't lose track of time. Sometimes it takes a while for them to actually know which process they need to take. So we hope that that will also create more awareness and simplify the process from our end.

And then following the next slide, so currently our sunrise calendar just provided the sunrise dates. We are optimizing our sunrise calendar to provide all the information with your sunrise launched limited registration period, claims period. All of that will be now mentioned on our Web site.

And the clients will also be able to actually put the dates for the TLD in the calendar so that they can keep track of when it's launching so that they're aware of when they need to participate in the sunrise or whichever period that they want to participate. So there will be a nice feature.

Again we get our information from ICANN. It's not replication of ICANN. It's not ICANN calendar so this is just on our Web site because we have so many people coming to our Web site and looking for information on the different sunrises. That will be coming out soon.

And then following the next slide. So what we've learned is a lot of awareness is still necessary. People, trademark holders are not always aware of TLDs. A lot of information is out there. They're being sometimes - as I call it - because of the fact that there's so much information and each day they're doing a TLD coming up.

The more information you can provide us to understand your TLD better, the better we can also assist the trademark holders in understanding and explaining to them. So it's helpful if you can provide us with information on your strategy. Who's your core market? Because for specific TLDs you want these kind of companies, others, it's more open. So that's up to you, but the more information, the better for us.

And also if you have a marketing toolkit, forward it to us. We will publish it. We will provide it to the clients so that will benefit all of us. And of course one of the key messages is don't overcomplicate it (sic). Keep it simple because at the end of the day the simpler it is, the easier it is for all parties to get an interest.

And we also note that a lot of people are not aware of what a sunrise period is. So even though that we are in this community very aware of the sunrise period, we see that priority registration for trademarks sometimes works better to advise and to explain what a sunrise period is. So be aware of that as well when it's just about TMCH.

When you want a successful sunrise, it's also keep it simple an explanation as to what they need to do. I think that follows all of the slides.

So again we're open for any discussion. If you have questions now, please go ahead and come to us or ask the questions. We have our e-mail address as well there. So we're happy to communicate in any way we can. If you also have suggestions of what we need to do better, please let us know and we're happy to take a look at what else we can do. Thank you.

Man: Thanks very much, and thanks for taking the time this morning to speak to new gTLD applicants. I had a question in the queue from Reg and please go ahead.

Reg Levy: Thank you Vicki very much for coming out. Can we go back to the second slide? Thank you. So it says, "Sunrise notifications per TLD - 19,000," but then it says, "The number of TLDs with between 20 and 100 sunrise notifications is 55%." So I don't understand what that means.

Vicki Folens: So total sunrise notifications is 19,000. And then it's per TLD that you can see how many (unintelligible) verifications and that percent (unintelligible).

Reg Levy: Okay so that's (unintelligible) total. And then the next slide. Oh, that's per label. Okay, got it. Thank you.

(Jacob): Any other questions/feedback on the TMCH? All right, hearing none, thanks very much for presenting. Really appreciate it and appreciate the open channel. I think that's really one of the themes of this meeting.

Vicki Folens: Yep, thanks.

(Jacob): Okay with that the last item on the agenda is the introduction of the new incoming NTAG executive committee. So I will ask them to stand up please so we can see who everybody is. The chair is Steve Machin.

Maxim Alzoba, Vice Chair.

Donna Austin, Treasurer

And Susan Payne, Secretary. So thank you very much. Really appreciate your taking on the role going forward and we'll look forward to supporting you

to make sure that we get through this process efficiently in the next six months.

I also wanted to call out Keith Drazek, Chair of the RySG and just really thank him and the executive committee for being so open. It was a great dialogue throughout the six months between the executive committees. I think it resulted in wins for applicants and registries. So Keith if you wanted to say a couple words.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much (Jacob). Yeah, just a few notes. I mean one I think a real sincere thank you to the outgoing ExCom for all the hard work and expertise and energy that you've brought to NTAG, also the Registry Stakeholder Group. And as you said, our joint ExCom meetings I think have been extremely productive. So a round of applause for sure.

So I think just a general note. I think folks who have participated in our registry and NTAG calls have heard me say this before, but I am very, very excited about the energy level and the expertise and the interest and focus, contributions that applicants have brought to the registry group.

I really do feel like the NTAG is really part of the registry group. And then I think the work that we've accomplished together over the last year plus has really shown that. So I'm very excited to see applicants finally signing contracts, getting delegated, and becoming full members of the Registry Stakeholder Group.

So this is a pitch as much as anything to say we hope that you continue. The policy work that we do as a stakeholder group is far from done. We're going to have plenty of challenges a contracted parties, registries, and registrars and as you transition from applicant to registry, where the stakeholder group is there to support you, to protect you.

And it's critical, I think, that we keep this momentum going. We need new blood in the Registry Stakeholder Group. It's been great what we've had so far, but we need more. So look forward to working with everybody. And thanks again to the outgoing ExCom and I look forward to working with the new.

(Jacob): Thanks Keith. All right, and with that we'll wrap it up. New gTLD retrospective is in 15 minutes. For those of you who'd like to join we'd love to just have a real open and frank discussion about this round and what might happen in the future. Thanks everyone for coming and wrap it up.

END