

---

SINGAPORE – At-Large New gTLD Working Group

Tuesday, March 25<sup>th</sup> 2014 – 13:00 to 14:00

ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. That's really too strong. Okay. Before we go any further... Are we okay yet?

Test.

Test, test.

Okay. So we have a microphone going, but I'm still in a situation of having more people behind me than in front of me. So, with your indulgence. Okay. Actually I was going to sit on the side so I can look either way, but this is fine too. Sorry, if the remote participants will just indulge for a moment. A number of people in the back are coming to the front, which is great, so I can make eye contact.

I'll continue to try to look behind me from time to time. But please, if you believe you would like to participate in the discussion, please feel free to come. There is still space in front. Okay.

So a little bit more of introduction to this issue. Public interest commitments is something that has been added. There are two kinds of public interest commitments: mandatory and voluntary. Mandatory is a template that is inflicted, or asserted, on all TLD applicants. I believe it has to do with things like law enforcement and IP infringement, that if they if there are complaints like that, that you must act on them.

---

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

---

And that ends up being a very... That's a compliance issue. So if somebody complains, there is a compliance process that goes through. That isn't the source of our problems. The issue at hand as to do with what are called voluntary picks. And so these are public interest commitments that are, as said, voluntary. They are put in by applicants, and essentially to say, well, if we're going to be going into a string that affects a certain industry, we will be sensitive to the needs of that industry.

The problem is, is that in the analysis that At Large did of these voluntary public interest commitments, we came to the conclusion that they are essentially useless. We found at least one applicant who put clauses into their optional into their voluntary picks, saying that they reserve after a while the right to revise them or remove them at their own discretion.

So, regard... I didn't hear that. So, what's the point then of having a pick if the moment that there is any complaint raised about it, that the applicant at their discretion has the ability to withdraw it or change it? So what's the compliance portion? What's the enforcement thing? Yes, we've just been told by the Board that even the voluntary ones are totally enforceable, but if the enforceable pick is essentially a blank page, there is not much for compliance to do.

So, for this, and a whole bunch of other reasons, the concept of a complainant about a voluntary pick has to go through a dispute resolution provider, which is a very big barrier to entry, if somebody has to incur a cost merely for asserting that a TLD isn't doing what they are volunteered, they said they are going to do. So, the At Large Advisory



---

Committee essentially, together with some members of the business community, approached the Board and asked for the ability to do a public comment process on the status of these voluntary picks, and proposed an idea of something called the Policy Advisory Board.

Now I want to be very specific. This is not to do with all TLDs. There is a very, very small subset of the TLDs that we're talking about. In fact, a subset of what the GAC called category one. Meaning specifically, TLDs operating in fields that governments normally regulate. And by that, I mean finance, I mean health, engineering, law, and other areas specifically that are normally regulated by governments.

Anything beyond that is beyond the scope of what we're talking about. So there is a very, very small fence. We're not trying to reopen dot wine or any of that stuff. This is about specifically industries targeted for regulation by governments. And so, the At Large Advisory Committee has put out a public comment process, because the Board rejected it when we put forward to the Board to start a public comment process of its own.

So what happened was, a number of members of the business constituency, and a number of members of ALAC, myself included, submitted to the Board a proposal to do a Board initiated public comment on the issues of public interest commitments. The Board rejected that request, and as a result, the ALAC initiated one of its own. And I believe the PCP actually started... When did it actually go open? It went open like the day before we came here, right?

Heidi? When did the public comments start? It started the 21<sup>st</sup>. So, the public comment period is open. If you would like to make a submission



---

on this, please do. It closes the 16<sup>th</sup> of April. We've received significant interest in this issue, from individual governments if not the entire GAC. From individual members of the business constituency, if not the entire BC. This is what we're finding.

No one constituency has a total consensus on this issue, but there is significant pockets within many groups within ICANN that this is a good idea. It was a subject of the discussion this morning between the Board and ALAC, a discussion which wasn't exactly the nicest one we have ever had. But, the issue is that... The push back on this is that the process is already underway, initiating any change would be one of policy which means essentially going back to a PDP, which is what? Another two odd years or whatever pain that causes on the community.

And while the locomotive is on track, and don't derail it. And while that is... ALAC does not want to derail a process, on the other hand, we find this to be a very big deficiency and a very big gap between what's inside ICANN and what's outside ICANN. You have a significant public trust issue, we believe, in the issue of picks. In the interest of... The example I use, Dr. Seuss applying to be under dot health.

And so right now, there is very little protection for that kind of thing. And in fact, I believe, there is an explicit issue that the Board says that you can self-certify, that is you tell a body, "I'm a doctor. I'm an engineer. I'm a lawyer." And there is no necessity for due diligence. Simply by asserting that you are, they'll take your word for it, and that allows you entry into the appropriate TLD.

Anyway, so Alan Greenberg is involved in this issue, so am I. And I say, this is out as a matter of public comment. So we have a lot of people in



---

the room that are normally here in ALAC sessions, which is great. And we're here. If any of you have comments about this or questions about the At Large position on this, please do. Just as we're trying to do with the public comment period... The actual deliverable from the public comment is undefined. Essentially it's, we want to see what the community thinks. We want to get public comments back.

When we see what's out there, then we'll figure out what the next steps are. There is no pre-defined outcome of this. We're simply trying to find out what the interest of the community is, in doing this. We believe there is a significant public trust issue. We believe there is a significant credibility issue with ICANN if in some of the most sensitive, most of the consumer trust sensitive issues, that there are no protections, no real enforceable protections with teeth.

We think this is a significant credibility issue with ICANN as a whole. And so this is why we've been trying to set the alarm bells on this. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just one point. One of the things that came out in the Board ALAC meeting today, is the Board believes that something akin to the Policy Advisory Board, that is something which would effectively try to regulate certain gTLDs, is say, policy issue and would require a PDP. However, I do not believe, but I may be wrong, consensus policies can only alter contracts if they are within a certain range of topics. Normally called within the picket fence. And I don't believe something that would be equivalent of a regulatory affect is defined within the contract, as within the picket fence.



---

I'm not sure. So it's something to look at, but it's conceivable that even if there were a PDP it might not be enforceable, as a consensus policy, something that would need to be checked. It's certainly nothing that I would recall as within the picket fence in old contracts. And the new ones do add a few things, like vertical integration, but it's not clear that this is within that scope.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay. Before I open up for questions, I just want to make a couple of points, since this is going out to a remote participation audience, please identify yourself before speaking. And given this is ALAC [French – you can speak in French also]. And also in Spanish, which I can't do, but we have headsets around in the table, so if you wish to speak in French or in Spanish, you're able to do so.

We have simultaneous interpretation here into...

UNIDENTIFIED:

Or Chinese.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Or Chinese, I'm sorry. So we have that interpretation. So if you wish to, if you're parental tongue is not English, please feel free to speak as you wish. And so we'll open up for questions or comments. Go ahead. Please identify yourself and because we're being interpreted, please speak slowly.



---

CRAIG SCHWARTZ:

Hi. My name is Craig Schwartz. My company is FTLD registry services, and we are an applicant for the dot bank and dot insurance top level domains. So we know that you're talking about us when you talk about this topic. Well, at least us. And so Alan, your question about whether this regulatory structure would be within the picket fence is actually a really good question.

That's something I never thought about. It's something maybe go back in and take a look at. As the applicant for these domains, we actually do have an advisory council in place, which is very similar, I think, in concept to what your proposal is all about. Although your proposal, I think, dictates the composition and role and some other elements that I think that we're uncomfortable with.

And we view the implementation of an advisory council as registry operator business, and something that we would choose to create and choose to operate the way our community sees fit. I should also clarify that we're a community applicant for both of these TLDs. So it's really incumbent upon us to have that kind of structure in place, and when we are ultimately approved, we will have them be an ongoing part of our internal development process.

Our council was just formed in December, but they're actually reviewing all of the policies that we included in our applications, just to make sure that they're comfortable with them. So with regard to Evan's remarks that there is maybe not consensus within the various constituencies about this proposal, I can tell you as a member of the N-TAG and as a member of the C-TAG, there is pretty strong opposition to having a



---

stakeholder group within the ICANN process trying to mandate, or force this, Policy Advisory Board concept upon, you know, private parties.

So I think there is consensus, and there will probably be a letter forth coming from N-TAG, perhaps even before the end of the week so you'll get to see, you know, what that position is. So I guess I'll close with that, and just wanted to share some ideas.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. A couple of things. If all of the applicants for these kind of sensitive domains were community ones, I think there would be a lot less concern. And having an advisory board of one form or another doesn't necessarily mean you have it a year later, unless it's actually part of the commitment that you made.

I think it's important to say that we are not particularly wed to the Policy Advisory Board model. We are wed to making sure that there are reasonable constraints and commitments made, so that consumers are protected.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

And if I can add on to what Alan said. It may have been a mistake in the way that we did the public comment process, in that we didn't sufficiently delineate between the two issues, being what we saw as being the fragility of the pick system, and a possible replacement. The path is one approach. It's actually two separate issues. The first one, the most important one, is that the pick regime as it currently exists is broken, and in our view, it doesn't serve the public interest.





---

What should come in its place, what you have in front of you with the Public Advisory Board, the Policy Advisory Board that was in the public comment, is one possible thing. But we probably could have, in hindsight, done a better job of splitting the two issues. One is saying, this needs significant rework, overhaul, whatever, and here is one possible solution in its stead. In conversations we've had with other groups, notably members of the GAC, there is significant support for our position about the problem with picks, but other opposition to what was proposed in the Advisory Board replacement.

As Alan said, we're not at all wedded to the idea to the PAB thing that was put forward, and if there is other proposals, other models that will do a better job than the pick does, I think we'd be as receptive as anyone.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ:

This is Craig Schwartz again from FTLD. I would echo your sentiments that picks are not the answer. And as soon as they came out, you know, the whole process was unveiled I think in March of last year. And I don't think the GAC asked for picks. The GAC said, "We have a problem." And ICANN said, "By the way, here are picks." And as a company, we wrote in, I think within a week of the publication of those and said, "This is flawed."

There wasn't a community process to develop these, they weren't well thought out, and the fact that they can be amended over time, it negatively impacted, or had the potential to negatively impact so many other processes that were underway, whether it was community



---

objections, or other avenues that applicants were pursuing to ensure that only the most qualified applicants got certain TLDs.

So I agree that picks are not the answer. When the Board came out in, what was it? Like October 29<sup>th</sup> and said, “By the way, this is how we’re going to implement all the picks.” We wrote again and said, “This is not strong enough for financially oriented domains and other sensitive domains such as health and regulated industries.”

So even though we’re an applicant and we’d be subject to all of these additional rules and commitments, we said many times, “It’s not enough. It needs to be more, it needs to be more.” I do think at this point that the train has left the station, and it’s probably... The ability to make substantial changes now is probably pretty minimal, but I think that, you know, continuing to fight the fight in a constructive way, I think is healthy for the community.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Craig, could I ask a favor of you? In the letter that you are going to be sending to this, could you make the points that you have been raising right now, very explicit? If the issue is that you’re generally agreeing with us on the problems with the picks, but disagree with the proposed remedy of the Policy Advisory Board, could you make that very clear in your letter and help us delineate between the two issues?

Because this is something that we need to bring forward, and I think we’re going to find from other communities and constituencies within ICANN, a similar sentiment. That is, we agree that there is a problem with the picks, we agree there wasn’t a lot of community consultation in



---

the creation of them. The path is not the answer, but we're not sure what is.

So if you can make that clear in the letter you're going to send in, that it's not just a, "We oppose this," but help us with that nuance distinction between the two different components of what we're trying to put forward.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Craig Schwartz again. So I can commit to that on behalf of my company. I can't commit to that on behalf of N-TAG and the communication that they're preparing right now.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: This is Evan. That's the best I can ask for. If you can take that back to the constituency and perhaps relay back to them that perhaps there is a more nuanced position, than the public comment as its currently written might suggest, if you can take back to the constituency, that would be appreciated.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: And so, maybe one final word on this. So the N-TAG meeting is tomorrow morning, from 8:30 to 10:30, it's open. So if ALAC members wish to come and express individual or collective views to that particular interest group, to the registry stakeholder group, tomorrow morning is the chance.



---

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Providing that we're not already triple booked, as we've been most of this week, we will try and do that. This is Evan. Is there any other comments? Oh, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was going to make a quick comment. The little talk you just gave before, you could be a poster boy for our position. That may not be to your advantage to advertise. But part of the frustration you're hearing from us is exactly what you sort of implied in the last thing. We have been saying, this is the third or fourth straight meeting that we've been saying, "The picks aren't sufficient. Your enforcement of the picks aren't sufficient. You've got to do something."

And to now be told that, "Sorry, it's too late to do anything." After basically stonewalling for that length of period, is sort of frustrating.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Are there any other questions or comments? We've got a whole bunch of people across the wall. I mean, I've seen nods and shaking of heads occasionally. Does anyone else have anything to add to this particular part of the discussion? Anyone at the table? Part of, I think, of what you're seeing also is within the people in the community, we're really getting tired of this issue.

We've been around the block with it so many times. It has taken up a big chunk of the policy component of At Large activities this week. It formed at least half, and I think more, of the conversation we've had with the GAC, with the Board, and with others. We basically have been



---

telling everybody we can for as long. And so we're just going to try and take this public comment period, see what comes of it.

With the submission that Craig and others are going to make into it, we'll see what the feedback is, and act appropriately. Whether or not this actually makes any movement in what the Board does, or elsewhere in ICANN, we don't know but it's one of those things. We have to try. We're here to assert our interpretation of what we see the public interest to be. This is the best we can do.

Okay. That was the major issue for this meeting, and some of this was to try and figure out next steps for it. I think a lot of that was sort of determined by, you know, the conversations we've had with the GAC, with the Board, and some of the feedback that we've received has been along the kinds of, you've got to do a better job of splitting up your opposition with the pick with what you're proposing as an alternative, and we're quite happy to do that.

Does anyone else on the committee have anything to say around the table before I move on? They're all exhausted from it too. Okay. The other thing was to just put some closure on an issue that has been circulating around with us for a while, and that has been the issue of the applicant support program. At Large and the GAC work really, really hard to put together an applicant support program that would enable gTLD applicants from developing economies the ability to apply at a reduced rate.

It's an understatement to say that the program, having been the subject of possibly thousands of person hours of really hard work between the GAC, the ALAC, and others, was under used. I think, as a result, I think it



---

was either zero or one successful applicants for that program. In previous meetings of this working group, we've had a number of times where we've tried to figure out how we deal with it, what are the aftermaths? How do we try and report on how well it went?

There was an attempt for a while to try and do a survey, and then we realized, well, how do you survey everyone that didn't apply? That would be a very large survey. So, that's been a particular difficulty. So if anyone in the room has an idea of how we bring in some closure to this. We're still really, really sorry that this did not achieve what we had hoped it would. We really wanted to see some more applications from the global south, that didn't happen.

We did what I thought was the best we could do in terms of getting widespread community support behind it. It was not to be. I see a hand. Glenn McKnight.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Evan, you're referring... Glenn McKnight for the transcript. You're referring to the number of applications from the south. Do you have any details on that?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

It's my recollection that there were only four applications. There were only three applications for applicant support. I believe, all were rejected as they went through the evaluation process. Sorry? Dave? Could you clarify?



---

DAVE: No, there is one, two applications that did not pass the evaluation test. One did pass, but it's in contention with another applicant.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: So we have, at most, and possibly zero successful applicants for this program. Like I said, we spent thousands of person hours working with, and it's very exasperating, but again, this is the kind of thing, we had to try, we had to do it. And Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess my position on where to go right now is probably unpopular with some people in this group. But, an At Large driven review, I just don't think it's going to have any force of weight to justify the effort that goes into it. I am presuming there is going to be a significant post mortem review of the whole gTLD process. And I'm presuming that the plan for that will be out for public comments and things like that.

I may be wrong on some of these presumptions. And I think that's the time to make sure that a significant review of the Jazz program is done as part of a general review, and certainly, we would need to participate in that actively. But something that we do on our own, I just don't think is going to have the credibility, the visibility, to really have any strong impact.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Actually, Alan, I don't think your position is as unpopular as you think. It's sad, but essentially what's happened is, we've met a number of times, tried to deal with this internally and I think we need to bring



---

closure to it. And what you're suggesting is, is just close it for now, hang tight. Wait until the post mortem is done, and bring whatever we can to the table to make sure that, whatever we try to do is either re-implemented better for a second round, or appropriate dealt with.

And I actually I agree with you. I don't think you'll find that you particularly unpopular here. Is there any other comment or opinion, either supporting Alan or against it? If not, then I think we'll just recommend to the ALAC right now that we give this issue closure for the time being, and be prepared to respond when the time comes.

Any comments? Questions? Okay. We'll move on. Those were the main two points of this particular working group. If anyone has any comments or any other business to add right now, I'm more than happy to entertain it. Does anybody, including our guests? Craig, go ahead.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ:

Thanks. Craig Schwartz again from FTLD Registry. So, you know, an issue, and I guess right now I'm kind of speaking in my capacity of the de facto Chair of the Community TLD Applicant group. The whole topic of CPE community priority evaluation, I think you guys have spent some time talking about it and have written comments about it.

And as you know, the first four results were released last week. The score is arranged by, none of them passed. And just as, you know, the applicant support project didn't really produce any winners, or really benefit anybody after how many thousands of hours of work, I think it would be an incredible shame if there is not one successful community applicant after the CPE process.





---

Now, not every community, all community applicants are not created equal, right? Some stand out as having clear support from their community, and every applicant had to provide a letter of support with their applications. But there is a very broad range of applicants within that group of what was originally 84 applicants. So to the extent that you all continue to talk about it, and have, you know, input on the process, and call for, you know, ICANN to be accountable, and transparent how that CPE process works, because we don't think that it is right now.

That you've spoken about this before gives you another opportunity to speak up about it again. You know, the GAC comes out with formal communiques at the end of each meeting, and I'm embarrassed to say, I don't know what you guys do after a meeting, whether you come out with – what's that? Did you say drink?

Okay. You may want to do that too, but to the extent that there is an opportunity for ALAC to be vocal again on the community applications and the CDE process, we would just ask that maybe you give it a little bit more energy.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Since our Chair isn't paying attention...

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

No, I am paying attention. I work with Linux, I'm capable of multitasking, thank you. Craig, we have taken up the issue. Regarding your issue on process, we don't do communiques at the end of each



---

meeting the way that the GAC does. We basically generate steady streams of advice.

Because we have frequent conference calls, we don't wait for face to face meetings. This is an ongoing process, so we turn out policy and advice throughout the year, and we don't do it specifically at meetings. It means there is an opportune time to do face to face, but we do virtual meetings. Both with our working groups, and with ALAC as a whole, so we're not bound by the timing of this particular meeting that we have to do something.

You probably find that ALAC speaks less at the public forum than many other constituencies because we don't need to work on the schedule. So, essentially, I can take it up with the rest of the group, either now or in conference calls later where we can see what we can do to move this forward. I believe we've already produced commentary on CDEs. We think that it has been an important part of the process.

And the whole issue of categorization and community, we've been working with... I recall myself that we were doing as far back as the Mexico City, the At Large summit, where we had people that were talking about it. And I remember specifically on the gTLD session that we had people in the back of the room, I won't name them and I won't name where they are now, but you might be able to guess.

And no matter what we were saying, well, no matter what you do, we're going to game it. And that was literally said practically any time we talked about doing community, or in general the idea of prioritization by categorization in general. Right?



---

And saying, here are categories, whether it was city TLDs, or gTLDs, or community ones. And we were trying to figure out there are some that serve the public interest better than others, let's try and figure out what does this. Every time we tried to raise the issue, we had people like literally in the back of the room, no matter what you do, we're going to game it.

And it's really difficult to deal with that. And so sometimes, as what happened with the application, with the applicant support program, because we were so conscious of the possibility that it was going to be gamed, we ended up putting in restrictions that may have excluded a lot of legitimate good applications, because we were trying to put... Tijani is here. You were knee deep in this with us, leading this.

Is it safe to say that because of the fear of gaming, we put in restrictions that probably shut out a lot of very worthy applications? Tijani, would you like to speak?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Evan. Exactly, you said exactly the truth. We were very cautious. We are afraid that the system would be gamed, so we put very tough criteria that excluded a lot of applicants. And we had budget for up to 14 support for applicants, and unfortunately only three applied for support. And from the three, only one got support.

So the rest, or I would say the [?], it was a pity, really.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Constantine, do you want to step up to the mic, identify yourself?



---

CONSTANTINE ROUSSOS: This is Constantine Roussos from dot music. So I would add to that, what wasn't anticipated was the level of competition by big corporations that if someone didn't get this community applicant, sorry, this applicant support, what was not anticipated was what happens if they have to deal with a mega corporation with billions of dollars, what would happen in that contention set?

They'll lose 100%. So by definition, you would even fail with this applicant support. You'd get an application in, but what does that mean? What does that do with diversity? Nothing much.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Before passing to Alan, I'll just answer to the best of my recollection. That was, in order to qualify for applicant support, you had to be a community application. That was my understanding that a community... A successful community application would always take precedence over non community application, in which case we thought that particular point would have been moot, but...

CONSTANTINE ROUSSOS: That's a double problem right there, because you are creating a situation where you instill the toughest criteria to be part of this applicant support program, and then in addition, you have to be a community applicant, which adds an additional layer of the most restrictive issue, you know, passing criteria.



---

And I would like to point out that the current CPE process, with the four applications we saw, there was some issues. There are three issues. One was transparency. They were told we would see who the evaluators were, they were not disclosed. We don't even know who the evaluators are. We just had a blanket statement, you did not prevail. The result was there and there was no, who is the expert who did this?

The second thing was one of discrimination, that we believe is – I believe is very strong. When you looked up the financial and technical sections of every application, which were scored, ICANN actually called applicants where there was an issue where they would fail, and they had clarifying questions. When it came to CPE, ICANN and the EIU never contacted any of these four applicants for clarifying questions, where there was some little doubt where they would not pass a certain score, and they just failed them.

So why is one process lenient when it comes to clarifying questions, but when it comes to community applicants, there is an additional standard that is not met and there is no clarifying questions? So, this is the frustration that I see in this entire process. Why are we being discriminated against because of this concept of gaming?

And if it makes sense, and there is demonstrable support, why isn't there clarifying questions and some kind of fair treatment? So that's our frustration.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Before I pass mic to Alan, I'll just say, welcome to our world.



---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just for clarity, I don't believe that we required for the applicant support that it be community. The one, [get C?] was a community, but I don't believe we had that requirement. But they're both sides of the same question. As Evan said, there was so much fear in ICANN, of gaming, that all of the places where we thought we might be giving someone an advantage, whether it's applicant support or community application, the rules were made so stringent to try and prohibit gaming, that they became almost, you know, I don't even know what the right expression is, but a sham.

And... Pretty close. And what Constantine is describing of no clarification, is perhaps yet another variation of it, of why was that done? Well, the whole evaluation objection process has not been – had the most clarity and the most transparency in this whole process. So I think, you know, the post mortem to come, assuming there is one, there is a lot of issues that I think we need to look at. Yes, yes, within ICANN, if something can be gamed, someone will try to game it.

There is no question about it. We have a long history. On the other hand, we're also here for the public interest, and we should be trying to make sure that we don't exclude the public interest issues for fear of gaming. It's like in a lot of things, if you provide charity, some of them will abuse it and that's just part of the business, and you're going to have to except some people will take advantage of you, and hopefully, if you make your choices right, not everyone will.

And I think that wasn't part of our overall design.



---

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I've heard the term set up to fail more than once in the processes, including, for instance, in the objection process. At Large put in objections to some of the dot health applications, and we were told that we didn't have standing. After originally being told, "Okay, you have the ability to raise an objection." And then to be rejected because of standing, regardless of the merits of what we said, it just is...

Yes, Constantine, we were doing the same kind of face palms that you're doing right now. Again.

CONSTANTINE ROUSSOS: We had some communities object with dot music that represented like a huge significant independent music community, and we've got no standing either. So the standing issue is baffling to me.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Again, welcome to our world. And on that note, are there any other comments? We are getting near the top of the hour. Are there any other comments on this issue? Any other business? Any new issues to bring forward? Okay. Dev, go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Dev Anand speaking. Well, I'm just wondering, do you think we need to reactivate the working group? Because protocol from new members from the RALOs, given that, I mean. Just looking at the members of the new gTLD working group, I'm not sure if how many of those persons are still active in it.

So do you think it's worthwhile? Or...



---

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Are you saying to maintain the group? Are you saying we should shut down?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: No. This is Dev. No, that is not the case. I'm saying a call for new members for the group.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Absolutely. I mean we still have some issues, such as the pick thing, going forward. And we'll do it as an action item to put out a call to new members, cognizant of the fact that the TLD process is already sufficiently mature. That right now, our window of what we can do seems to be narrowing, at least for this round, but there is a big opportunity of being able to get involved in the dissection of what happens, and going forward into future rounds.

Okay. Any other business? Any other comments? Okay. Thank you for coming. The meeting is at end. I invite you to participate in anything else that has to do with At Large. We're here for most of the day. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

