

**Transcription ICANN Singapore  
GNSO New gTLD Applicants Group (NTAG)  
Wednesday 26 March 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://gns0.icann.org/en/calendar/#mar>

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

Man: Thank you. Okay everyone, we'll get started. I'm (unintelligible), NTAG chair. One moment. Can we start the recording please? Great. Thanks. Thanks (Hendrick).

Just as a standard procedure, if you're going to talk, please announce yourself and your affiliation for the benefit of the recording. To my left, Andrew Merriam, NTAG secretary. To my right, (Bridge Levi), NTAG treasurer and (Rubins Cole), the vice-chair, is joining remotely.

Next slide please. Here's the agenda for this morning. A quick update from myself on where we're at as NTAG. Then we'll have a member discussion. ICANN staff will be present. And can ICANN staff please raise their hands? (Russ Trang) and...

(Kevin Kersher): (Kevin Kersher).

Man: Great. Thank you very much for joining today. So they'll be there to act as a resource for us as members and the community to discuss NTAG issues. You'll see that we're going to go through a name collision discussion, Jordyn Buchanan, policy advisory board (I think GAC) issues with (Stephanie), auctions, (Steve Matchin) and Statton Hammock, a short discussion on CPE with Craig Schwartz, then addition Q&A and then Kurt Pritz will join for a domain name association overview, the benefits for applicants and small members. And we will close hopefully on time.

Here's the current status of NTAG membership. Next slide please. So we currently have 99 members, 59 of which are voting, and 40 are non-voting. These numbers are in flux because people are joining the OISG all the time.

But to give you a picture that we still have a large and active membership on the NTAG with a bunch of issues still in play. Next slide please. Next slide. There we go. So just an overview of our approach, I just wanted to say that the team has been extremely active.

(Reg), Andrew and (Rubins) have given a lot of their time in the service of applicants. Extremely grateful to them. I think all applicants really should appreciate the hard work that they've all been doing to try and keep issues that are important to us on ICANN's agenda on the generic domain divisions agenda, and be a resource for the community and applicants going forward.

A couple of things we're trying to do are a bit experimental. We welcome any feedback as we go forward. Next slide please. So here're some of the things we've done in the first half of our term to get a (bead) on the membership, trying to hit the key issues for applicants and trying some new things, so again, just keep giving us feedback. I really appreciate it. If you think we're missing policy issues or dropping the ball on things, let us know sooner rather than later.

Next slide please. The last major communication that we had with the GDD was an NTAG letter sent on February 28th. In that was a number of key action items that we requested from ICANN. You can see the status of those here.

Spec 13, still hoping to get some movement on that. Have - we don't have it. No, I'm not going to - no. GAC had - sorry. Today? (Joe Printer), guest, NGPC's meeting today - just to take that one issue off, so.

Awesome. Appreciate the contribution. Thank you. GAC, category one modified public interest commitments. We believe those are now accessible as contract red lines. So it varies but we'll try and surface those for members. We've got some insurance from ICANN on CPE time periods, so we'll just have to monitor that and look forward to getting performance from them there.

Auction process, there is an ongoing discussion. We'll discuss it today. (Firm) day for auctions, which is great, and name collisions Webinar, ICANN was very responsive in getting that up and running.

Next slide please. So here's the list of the open public comment periods that ICANN currently has, and the comment and reply periods, when they're going to close.

So the - one of the one's that's closing very quickly is the review mechanism for string confusion objection results. We don't have any active dialogue on that yet. So if anyone wants to get something started, they pretty much need to do it right now if they want it to happen.

(IDN) variant TLDs, no discussion there. Not sure how relevant it is to applicants. (Unintelligible) collisions, we'll discuss that today. There's a comment in progress.

Whois accuracy and reporting system, this is something we may want to coordinate with the RYSG. ICANN future meeting strategy, I think this is something that, as you know, a good, sort of citizen of the ICANN community, we should consider commenting on, so I'll encourage members to review that and potentially get a comment together.

IGOs and INGOs access to UDRP and URS, that is an issue that the RYSG discussed yesterday and length and it's important to many registries. So we should keep coordination with them on that.

The ALAC policy advisory board proposal address is in progress. We'll discuss it today. And the strategy panels, I believe are being sunset, so it's not as relevant. But a lot of information in those, if you feel like punishing yourselves by reading them.

Next slide please. Just a couple of governance issues that I wanted to highlight given that we're at this sort of midterm phase, and the new gTLD program is also proceeding to the (contention) resolution stage of its implementation.

The consensus approach, our auction comment was full consensus comments and a number of points that were reflective of the majority of applicants were left out.

I'd be interested to hear from ICANN to what extent they valued the full consensus comments or would they have preferred to see a broader comment that reflected the majority of members?

In our charter, every effort should be made to arrive at decisions most or all members are willing to support. And there's a question that I'd appreciate member feedback on and engagement dialogue on. For the NTAG does consensus mean most or all? And if it means most, what does most mean?

We should think about those thresholds because it impacts our ability to communicate with ICANN and with others. My feeling is that I think we should strive for consensus but we shouldn't sacrifice information going forward.

We need to be able to provide good quality information to ICANN on what most applicants support. Next slide please. NTAG and RYSG, you can see from the first slide that I posted that there is now, I think, considerable overlap between the work of the membership and the RYSG, the registries group and the NTAG.

And one of the things that I'm conscience of is making sure that we don't duplicate workloads for people so that people are doing the same thing twice in different forms. NTAG needs to stay focused on application related issues.

Also I think those issues are likely to become less contentious. NTAG may transition into more of a monitoring and watchdog role over the GDG as these various policy issues begin to sunset.

And in general, it would be great to get some feedback from applicants on what they think the future of the NTAG should be. By London, I'd like to have a plan in place for the transition of NTAG and what it should be focusing on.

Should we continue to be active as a resource for applicants in the next round as a resource for a retrospective role for others in the community to draw on our experience and doing the policy development that will be needed for the next round?

So let's discuss that and find a way to keep the workloads down for applicants as they start launching registries and also make sure we reflect those that are not yet registries.

Next slide. So onward to London, you'll see some of the things that we're going to focus on. Again, welcome your feedback here and I think there's an opportunity for us to do something big at ICANN (50) in London to really represent the feelings of applicants in this 2012 round.

I've heard, through the grapevine, what (Ken) is (keen) to showcase the lessons learned from applicants and I think we should be excited to participate in that discussion. With that - I'm slightly late - I will turn over to (Reg) to start the body of our meeting. Thanks everyone.

(Reg): This is (Reg) for the transcript. (Unintelligible) from (Minds and Machines).  
And the first thing that I have on our agenda for this section -- I don't have slides -- is the...

Man: Next slide, please. Sorry.

(Reg): Ah, I guess I do have slides. Is a name collision update from Jordyn and/or (Rubins). Are either Jordyn or (Rubins) available?

Jordyn Buchanan: I'm here. This is Jodyn Buchanan from Google. I don't know if (Rubins) is on the line or...

(Reg): He's in the chatroom.

Jordyn Buchanan: Doing his usual chat working. Yes, all right. So that'll be slow if we wait for (Rubins) to type and us to speak out on the record so why don't we start with a general update.

As everyone knows, the draft report by JAS advisors was published recently and the public comment period for this has been open. Both ICANN staff and Jeff Smith from JAS advisors has been very available to answer comments and engage with some dialogue about the initial report in recent weeks.

At the - there's a Webinar on inclusion a couple weeks back. There was an update in the new gTLD program updates earlier this week and then there was a standalone session as well as an update in the registry stakeholder's group yesterday.

So we've had lots of chances to talk with (Francisco) and Jeff, both of whom are here again today. The deadline for public comment on (name inclusion) is the end of the month, March 31st, so we have actually a fairly small window.

And we have - I think there're three general (buckets) of points that we are likely to make as part of an NTAG response. I think at least two of the three of them, there's still some discussion around and we probably need to settle on a perspective - and maybe want some discussion today.

So at a high level, I think, the three buckets are - there's a timing issue around the proposal and the draft report to do what they call controlled interruption of intentionally breaking anyone that has a - that is using the names.

That is currently proposed to lapse for 120 days after delegation and considering that currently, it takes about 60 days from contracting to delegation in the best case, that means for most applicants, it would be a change from today where you have to not add additional names to the (zone file) other than (Nick) dot TLD for 120 days in order to resolve potential certificate collision issues to 180 days for the combination of the delegation dates plus the additional 120 days proposed by the draft report.

So we've heard three, I think, general categories of response on this point. And those is (worry for) applicants because many people don't view it as either necessary or reasonable to incur an additional 60 days away but before being able to use the names.

I think some applicants, including myself, thought the initial 120 days was overly cautious for most TLDs, so adding an additional timeline as well really impedes the opportunity to use, promote TLDs and, I think, gets in the way of program linking for tenants that would be helpful in making applicants aware of sunrise and so on.

So there's some tension between the ability to effectively go to market and this proposal. So the three sort of general classes of solution I've heard to this - and it's probably worth some discussion here today as to what we, as

NTAG should advance are, Number 1, just shorten the 120 days to some shorter period.

The JAS has reported - Jeff Schmidt, himself, has pointed out, these controlled interruption periods and other contacts are usually somewhat shorter than this in the 30 to 90 days. Jeff Neuman pointed out in the short code service, it's 60 days I think.

So, you know, one approach we can take is just say that's longer than it needs to be and we can shorten it to something else and still get most of the benefit. A second approach that's been discussed is to essentially just delegate all applied for names that are still in the running now and start controlled interruption on the theory that that would allow sort of the maximum amount of warning possible.

I know, staff, at least, have expressed some concern about, you know, both route scaling and the fact that there are some applicants that may not proceed to delegation, would get delegated under that scenario.

And then the third possibility is just to - at - almost simultaneous with contracting to (tell the aids) to start naming - start controlled interruption at that point which would at that - which would then allow the 120 days for the certificate collision and the 120 days for the controlled interruption period to essentially toll simultaneously.

And I think that hasn't been fully vetted by staff or others that, I think, (Francisco) yesterday suggested that might be something worth discussing further as well.

So those are the three possibilities I've heard on timing. I'll jump to the other two topics really quickly and I think that's the one that's worth the most discussion to come back to.

The second issue that we are considering including in an NTAG comment are essentially - is the correct approach for controlled interruption to use wildcards or to settle on just using the SLD block lists that were developed for the alternative path to delegation and using individual host entries for those to perform controlled interruption on the theory that that is the suggested approach for names that have used alternative path to delegation and it seems to be good enough for them.

So it might be good enough for other TLDs as well. Then there's no technical concern about possibly using wildcarding and in addition, presumably it'll allow registries to operate in the rest of the name space that wasn't affected by the SLD block lists.

So that's the second point I think that's under consideration in the comment and then the last is some discussion around corp mail and home and whether they need to be currently reserved as the comment suggests.

I think personally the correct approach here is probably simply to suggest that this isn't actually a topic for under ICANN's (remit) and that that's a - the IETF would actually be the one conducting such a reservation.

And so ICANN (should put) those TLDs on hold pending a discussion in the technical community as to what, if any name, should be reserved and then if there - if ICF were to reserve any of those TLDs for internal usage, then ICANN could, at that point, make the decision to not allow applicants to proceed under those TLDs. So that's a rough summary, I think, of where we're heading. Maybe if (Rubins) is on chat, if I'm missing anything, he could (call in).

Woman: So I just gave him the call in information because he couldn't find it but I don't know if he has actually called in or not.

(John): Oh, maybe we won't wait for (Rubins) then. So I guess maybe I'll just start - first off and (open the) call, are there other points that people in NTAG think ought to be included in potential communication? And it looks like (John) maybe thinks there is, and (Jeff).

Man: Okay, yes, one point we raised and should think about is which category of our TLDs or our applications fit into which plan. So do you fit in the old plan, the grandfathered plan, if you will, or the new plan?

And what's that trigger point? So from the proposal perspective, as soon as the board approves - let's say the effective date is May 1st. If you signed your contract on April 30th and you're not delegated yet, you'd be under the new plan.

Whereas we might want to argue - and certainly we will argue - that anyone who has signed a contract before the new plan is approved, should be grandfathered into the old plan in that you sign a contract with the right to file this alternative plan with the blocking, the (unintelligible) and then, you know, blocking certain names and then we (put it) with the others, that grandfather should be permissible in that we not exclude those applicants, especially ones because, you know, obviously there's this backlog that we talked about - the GAC category one, ones, the dot HIVs and others who've been held up for so long they've now signed the contracts.

They should be allowed to proceed under that existing plan that, quite frankly, many of us have already proceeded under and that should continue until the board approves a new plan and then changes those contracts essentially.

So I think we might want to argue for a grandfathering of the - of TLD applications that have signed the agreement prior to this new plan being implemented. Thanks.

Jordyn Buchanan: Thanks (John). Yes, you did raise that topic, I think, in the session the other day. And (Francisco), I think, responded at that point that ICANN's view, at least right now, is that the current contract contains provisional - while we might switch the new client at any time, so that's what they would prefer to do it sounds like based on the current (case).

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Francisco): (Francisco) from (unintelligible). Yes, we think the proposal for controlled interruption is a superior approach than (this on the block list) and we would prefer to use that as - once it's available.

Man: Right. But do you take into account the contractual requirements you have with the folks who signed the contract but permits the existing plan? I understand you prefer the new plan because that's why you approve it, right?

You don't approve a new plan if you don't think it's superior. But the question is, can - is there a reason why ICANN wouldn't honor its contractual commitment to applicants of signed contracts prior to the new plan being approved?

(Francisco): So, I'm not alone here but my understanding is that once the framework is finalized and approved, that is - that will be the requirement for those that have signed a contract. They will have to implement the framework rather than the old (delegation) approach.

Man: Okay, hol- okay, (Sirus) wants to jump in and then (John) has a comment and maybe (I do) as well.

(Sirus): Thank you. I'm (Sirus) (Unintelligible) with ICANN staff. This is a reasonable point that you raised, (John). Let us take this back, evaluate it and meanwhile, I would suggest that you submit that as a comment during the comment -

open comment period. And then ultimately collectively we'll decide on the best (way) forward. We'll definitely take that into consideration.

Man: And then, (John), is your proposal that depending on when you'll sign your contract, that is the plan you would use or would it be an applicant's option as to which of the two, like, will you use the alternative path of delegation, just the alternative path of delegation or the finalized plan?

(John): Yes it's currently under the applicant options...

Man: Please remember to announce yourself.

Man: I'm sorry, (John) is back and forth but there are people in the (same room), so.

John Nevitt: John Nevitt, donuts. Yes, I think the current plan permits that option for applicants so that shouldn't change it in any way. So if, to (Francisco)'s point, if the applicant thinks the new plan is superior and only wants to work under the new plan, that's fine. That's great. I think you'd be happy and I guess that applicant would be happy. But the applicant that wants to work on the full plan that's in their contract, they should have the right to do that.

Man: Okay, thanks, John. (Jeff) has a separate comment.

Jeff Neuman: I mean, do you have something to add onto that one? Okay, this is Jeff Neuman with Newstar. (Unintelligible) made a proposal on the NTAG (list) and also I discussed yesterday at the registry stakeholder group where (it relates) to the shortening on the 120 day period.

And I know that Jordyn was going on kind of the rationale for why to shorten the period, and everyone prefers the approach - not everyone but I guess not necessarily ICANN - but everyone that we talked to likes the approach of putting names into the route as early as possible to do their controlled interruptions provided that there could be some accommodation for the

thousand - no more delegations that 1000 per year, assuming we can fit that in there and get everything at once.

But if we can't go that approach because there're difficulties we don't know about with the whole (Iana) process and getting things to route, whether that's got to go to the (how it goes to) the Department of Commerce and if there're processes and procedures for (Iana) to do that with the Department of Commerce and, you know, it could be a whole bureaucratic mess that we just don't know anything about because we just don't have complete insight into that process.

If that's not going to work, then my proposal was we keep the 120 days from the date of contract signing to deal with the certificate authority issue and giving notice - enough notice.

But instead of doing 120 day controlled interruption period from the date of delegation, you separate kind of the issues of detection of the issues from the mitigation of the (new) collision issues.

And basically what you say is, it should be the greater of 120 days after contract signing or 30 or 45 days -- it doesn't matter which one -- from the start of the controlled interruption period because we don't all agree, I mean, you go around the room.

If you start controlled interruptions, if you're not going to notice a problem within 30 or 45 days, chances are you're not going to notice it within 120 or 365 days, it doesn't really matter.

So if you basically have that controlled interruption period of 30 to 45 days, and then if there're any reports made to ICANN that fall within the category of the standard that was set of - and I'm always forgetting this - (Jeff) help me out - the...

(Jeff): Clear and present danger to human life.

Jeff Neuman: Human life. Yes, clear and present danger to human life. Thank you. If that issue is raised and it's a credible one where there's some credible evidence, it's just a low threshold but not too low and people can file frivolous things.

With any respect to - with any names in the TLD, and you keep those names held back for the full 120 day period, but you're allowed to go with everything else.

I mean, it fits with every single - it meets all the rationale that everybody has argued. It allows us to move forward on a more quick basis and it just gets rid of this whole notion of 120 days which has got no basis in kind of - what's got little basis in reality.

So that was the first comment I had, that we should consider that proposal. Again, I like the put everything to the route fir- as kind of the first choice but because of the bureaucratic differences.

The second thing I wanted to address is there are some rumblings going on in other stakeholder groups and constituencies that are getting louder and louder about the fact that the JAS report didn't include 2000 pages worth of the data that supports the recommendations.

And there - I understand there are very good reasons behind that. We don't know exactly what those reasons are but there are many groups that are strongly arguing that until those 2000 pages are made available, that they can't, quote, "adequately respond to the report," and they're going to make a plea to ICANN to not do anything until those pages are released and then, of course, wait another 42 day public comment period until they can do that.

My understanding is those pages may not be released until June, July, August. I mean, it's going to take them time to work through that issue. And

so then you're talking about no resolution to this name closing issue until the late fall or early winter of 2014.

We need to be very strong and very firm that we have everything we need in order to move forward with this plan, that the data is just really for the purpose of checking JAS group's map.

And we can assume that their map is done right, that they have the expertise to do this, and that we don't need that for the report. I really, strongly urge us to make a strong comment to that effect because we know the other groups are going to make the opposite comment that everything should wait.

Jordyn Buchanan: All right, thanks, Jeff. This is Jordyn just for - I'm terrible at announcing myself but a quick question on that to overlay with (John)'s comments earlier, it seems like a lot of applicants are as happy or happier with the alternative past delegation as with the proposed JAS framework.

Let's - hold on. I said a lot. I didn't say Newstar was. I said many applicants are as happy or happier with the new - with the old framework, so it's not clear to me that everyone would be unhappy if we just stuck - you know, in fact, the process did drag out over a longer period of time. So I'd be sort of curious to hear other input on that particular point. But (unintelligible) briefly.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Yes, again - oh, thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. On that point, I still think they're waiting a - even if we go under that old framework, if we want to release those names from the names below the blockings list, there's still, you know, 120 days of this controlled interruption. I still think we absolutely need to make that comment that 120 days is too long.

That really all you need is a controlled interruption period of 30 to 45 days, again with the caveat, if there're any reports on those names within the 30 to

45 days and you see credible evidence that there's a clear and present danger to human life, then those names would get kept on this block list for a little bit of time. But I don't think we can just say that we prefer to go under the old regime. I think we still need to make the comment on the number of days.

Jordyn Buchanan: No, I'm not saying that we would prefer the old regime. I'm saying some people might not be particularly bothered that it takes another six months before the new framework's put in place.

Jeff Neuman: Well, if it takes six months for the new framework to be put in place, then we can't release any names on the name...

((Crosstalk))

Man: That block list for six months plus another 120 days.

(John): This is (John). One point that we're - I haven't heard much discussion about the 25 TLDs that are just totally blocked and obviously those applicants have a huge incentive of getting the new plan in place so those could be released.

Jordyn Buchanan: Okay, thanks, so (Maximo) and then Craig.

(Maximo Global): (Maximo Global), (unintelligible). Two small questions. First, why don't we just apply these (unintelligible) at least to those domains from the block list when they're required?

For example, someone wants the domain, then (the counting) period starts. You have 120 days to mitigate but you don't affect the other domains. It's (simple) when (this includes) interest of both types.

The second question, if the plan to have a (unintelligible) for 120 days is approved, then the (chosen) delegation date from the registrar agreement - actually the registrar agreement side of that, our fees start from the point of

delegation date. If you process it in the delegations, then we suggest (a side piece), then that fee is to be paid on the delegation date after 120 days.

Thank you.

Jordyn Buchanan: Thanks (Maximo). So to your first point, it sounds like you're endorsing the proposal that (Rubins) and made to (stick to) using SLD block lists for the controlled interruption period as opposed to using wildcard. Is that correct?

(Maximo Global): Yes, and we apply it only to particular domain. If nobody wants (anything) from the block list, they (unintelligible) in the special status. If someone goes to use these domains, (unintelligible) for these particular domains and we will, like, mitigate those things.

Jordyn Buchanan: Okay, so I think you want to respond to that. The two (Jeffs) want to respond to that. I'll start with Jeff Schmidt and then Jeff Neuman and then Craig is still in the queue.

Jeff Schmidt: Hi folks. Thanks for (hearing me). Jeff Schmidt, JAS. So a question about the wildcard versus the block list, this is, now couple of times and I guess I want a clarification as to, is the rationale for potentially having the option, let's say, to use the block list resource record approach as opposed to the wildcard approach, is that due to a concern with the wildcard, a - some appreciation of continuing use of the block list, or is related to shortening the 120 days? I'd like to understand why that keeps coming up.

(Maximo Global): The reason for it to come up is our - and ability - if this plan is implemented, it is our inability to market, to sell domains. In some jurisdictions, the transactions are not final until you give the domain actually.

So, for example, we had auction. We had lots of money. We think that we had loss of money. And then, guys said, "Okay, I will buy at the generic price."

The second thing - issue is we - if we want to resolve something - some issue, we can do it as a whole or maybe in part. And what the proposition to deal with each domain separately is that it doesn't stop us from - as a registry (unintelligible) because until we can delegate, we're just a (paper) registry. We're not a real one. We cannot sell, we cannot market. We spent lots of money and what we have? Just spending more money. Thank you.

Man: So clarification, whatever there is that is related to pulling back the 120 days and being able to operate as opposed to a - I'm trying to understand what it is - technical concern about using a wildcard or whether this is an effort to pull back the 120 days. It sounds like it's an effort to operate sooner.

(Maximo Global): It's both. Actually, if you say that, that was a (unintelligible) are dangerous, yes. Then we deal with it, these domains when they require it. We don't resolve issues which are highly hypothetical. We - you say that, these domains should pass the (currency time).

Okay, when someone wants to buy it, they start the procedure. They pass the currency (unintelligible). Everybody's happy because they are sure there is no present in clear danger, whatever, this particular domain.

Man: In the conscious of time and the fact that were running up against the limits of the 25 minutes we're allocated, so we'll have to move through this rarely quickly, so Jeff and - when we respond and then maybe Craig's going to make a comment.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, on that - sorry. This is Jeff Neuman. (Maximo), and that proposal, and I never quite understood it, because it seems to be based on the assumption that the names on the name closing list are actually a danger. And they're not.

There's a- we all have to come to the reality that there's a swag on one way to try to move forward, but there's never been any evidence that any of those names on any of those lists are actually, quote, "dangerous."

So I think starting from that assumption is just a wrong place to start. The names that have been blocked have any sort of relationship to something that may be dangerous are not.

The other thing is, your proposal was, start the name collision from the date that somebody wants it. I'm not sure how you measure somebody wants it or registers. And I think that could actually result in even more delay because after you delegated, is probably the earliest 30 days that you could actually start a meaningful sunrise.

Then another 30 days you could actually ended, really 60 to 90 days that you could end. Chances are, most of those names aren't going to be taken in a sunrise or nobody's going to express an interest in this and you're going to have to wait to general availability which could be, you know, again 60 to 90 days later.

And at that point, you would then, is simply one thing, you would reserve it for 120 days and then you have to keep that (date) registry until someone actually registers one of those names, you always have to have in your technical system some sort of clock running from the date that somebody expresses some sort of interest in that name.

I mean, that's not an easy technical thing to do and it's something that you would always have to keep operating. Someone once that name two years later, you just then do the 120 days? I think we all need to focus. We have these proposals out all over the place.

And I think when we go in with proposals that are all over the place, none of them have any chance of being adopted. I really think we all agree that the 120 days is too long of a period for all these names, whether it's maybe a TLD that's been delegated or whether it's names, no name, clothing list.

I think - I haven't heard any disagreement on that. We need to focus on that as a group. We also need to focus on, no matter what that period as a controlled interruption, even if it ends up being 120 days, that the better solution (here is) for ICANN to delegate all those names basically tomorrow.

I mean, I would love to file an RSTEP tomorrow on dot NYC for all these names and see what the heck happens but I know it's going to get kicked back on a security concern until this whole issue is resolved.

So I think if we focus our requests, if we have so many different requests, it's never going to be adopted and they're just going to go that too was in the report. And the report is a great report but I think the 120 days is too long for any of us.

Jordyn Buchanan: Thanks. So...

Woman: We have a question in the chat room. Are we able to take it?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Rubins), go ahead.

Man: Can you hear me?

Man: Not very well.

Woman: Kind of.

(Rubins): So (unintelligible).

Man: Hopefully you said you're going to put it in the chat because that's the closest thing that anyone came to understanding it. So while you're typing, (Rubins), Craig, do you want to comment briefly?

Craig Schwartz: Yes, Craig Schwartz on (web TLD) registry. I just want to echo all the comments that Jeff just made. I think the focus has to be on getting the 120 day period reduced.

As the registry that's potentially - that has, you know, 40,000 names on the block list for dot bank and about 7000 of those are real names that we think registrants will seek to have, we need to have a resolution in this and having an ongoing discussion pushes the decision on this into the fall is just not palatable. It's got to get on, you know, in May, June at the very latest. So let's figure out what we need to do and get it done.

Jordyn Buchanan: Thanks Craig. Do we have another comment from the chat yet?  
(Unintelligible), do you have your own comments?

Man: Yes, I was just going to make the process know because you noted earlier that the public comment periods, the first half is closing (the other ones) now. So I don't know, throw in a (hold) that we're still discussing this. We learned a lot here in Singapore and that will but are all comments here in that reply. Is that not what (unintelligible) you wanted to do?

Jordyn Buchanan: I personally don't like it when other groups rely on the reply periods to make comments because it doesn't allow replies to the comments. I think we can - I think we can fairly - there's a lot - Jeff is absolutely right. There are a lot of ideas out there. I think there're a few sort of core principles that we can articulate and maybe in the reply period, refine them essentially and get to, you know, more proposals.

One thing that might help us, (Francisco), in particular, is there's a lot of discussion about possibly delegating names earlier, at least the controlled interruption period. And I don't think - we don't understand, and I don't know, maybe staff have an understanding of what the sort of bounds of feasibility are delegating outside of the current process.

Maybe you don't. For example, maybe one constraint on route scaling is the sheer number of entries in the route. Another constraint on route scaling is the rate of change. And they certainly know, at least when SSAC has briefed us in the past, they've been pretty clear that the issue is not the sheer number of entries in the route but ICANN's ability to continue to provide service is the rate of change of the route zone increases.

So, depending on which of those two constraints are the primary driver of route scaling issues, you might opt for putting everything into one (channel) or doing it, you know, if contracts are signed.

So I think it might be helpful, at least, if there's some way for us to get some more information about what degrees of freedom ICANN thinks it has with regards to alternative approaches to delegation. Is there any way that we can engage staff to get more information on that point?

(Francisco): Thank you Jordyn. (Francisco) here. We have (unintelligible) discussions with (IAF) staff this morning to explore this idea. It seems that it will require a change in procedure our policy in the way (Iana) works to delegate TLDs outside of the current process.

So that may take more time than you would like to be done. And one of the things we have been discussing with some people is perhaps there's a middle ground here to - between - we have applicants which want to have a shorter period than the 120 days (inoculation).

We want some people that would like to have the controlled interruption to start as soon as possible and we may have some constraints in the (Iana) process to go and (say we'll just stop in the route) without the (end process).

So perhaps there is a middle ground here considering starting the controlled interruption (only after) contracting some mechanics that it's mostly using the

(quota) process so we have still a 120 day period which is in parallel with the (other) average of the 120 day period.

And there is less (watching) that is needed in the (Iana) process to proceed to delegation. I cannot say that it will actually work. It's just something that we have been discussing with some people and it seems to be an interesting idea.

Jordyn Buchanan: Thanks (Francisco).

Woman: So I know have (Rubins)'s comments. The technical issues and using wildcarding, some (DNSX) systems are not able to support wildcarding since some registries would prefer the block list only controlled interruption. That would not include the other registries from using the wildcarding, either wildcard only or wildcard plus non-APD domains.

Jeff Schmidt: Thank you (there). Real quick - Jeff Smith. Thanks (Rubins). And actually we look at the (DNSX) sign wildcard issue. You know, it's well understood that there's several (bug user recursive) resolvers that don't deal with signed wildcards correctly.

We look at that issue. It's actually commented on briefly in our paper. But that's a - if you have additional technical concerns on that, I would invite you to please comment on those. The - again, the issue is understood that if you think we missed something, please don't hesitate to comment on that. It's in the report briefly but again, you think we missed something, please let me know.

Man: All right, so (we're out of time). Thanks for the robust discussion this morning. I think the - I think I heard today enough that we should - we ought to be able to craft some sort of comment that will cover some of the key concerns that NTAG stakeholders have.

And then I know that, in particular, I think Google's planning on collecting some data to maybe cast light on whether quarterly or monthly events actually result in additional traffic to the route which would help understand how long a period of time we need more controlled interruption.

That data won't be in until the reply period, though, since there haven't been yet an end to the quarter since the report was published. So - but we should have some data - hopefully we'll have to do soon to help substantiate that conversation as well, so we can continue to (refine) during the reply period as well.

Woman: Thank you, Jordyn.

Man: This is (Unintelligible) real quick. I respect your point about respecting the reply period, so just flagging out to members that it's six days until this comment period closes so we'll for some language and (put) that on the list.

(Reg): I'm going to turn it over now to (Stephanie DeChanel) for GAC and (Pulse) advisory boards. But I have the next slide please?

(Stephanie DeChanel): Thanks (Reg). This is (Stephanie DeChanel). So I think a lot of applicants on February 5th, breathed a sigh of relief when the GAC category, (one advice was) resolved that the meeting of the NGCP.

But in the past couple of weeks, we've seen a couple of issues arise that suggests that the issue might still be open for discussion in different forms. First, I want to kind of note a few points that were made during the GAC board meeting yesterday.

The GAC stated that it's still seeking clarification about the implementation of the advice in a number of areas and preparing questions to be included in the communiqué following from this meeting.

Some of the concerns cited there were how - Whois verification, security checks, complaint mechanisms, et cetera, would be handled and how those would be insured in terms of implementation.

There are concerns expressed related to the validation language and how to ensure that the change request would - four category two strings that had proposed they would open up, would be monitored by ICANN.

So I just wanted to put those on the radar and say that we might still have some work to do in terms of addressing those when we see the communiqué from this meeting.

Another thing that we saw just before the meeting with the publication of the policy advisory board proposal that was organized by the ALAC and put forward by ICANN for public comment.

In this expressed concerns regarding the public interest commitment model for the - for handling the GAC category one advice. They expressed concerns and stating that instead, a better proposal would be to establish mandatory advisory boards with rotating membership to address this.

We previously supported the public interest commitment model and think that it was appropriate that it was resolved by ICANN when it was and that the GAC had previously voiced support, so we have a lot of concerns fact that this is being opened again for discussion.

In response to the NTAG let- on the policy advisory board proposal, a few of us met earlier in the week to discuss how the NTAG was to respond to this.

The - I put forward a draft of an NTAG letter responding to the policy advisory proposal that makes a number of notes about our concerns relating to both the substance of the pol- the substance of this and also the process by which it was put forward for public comment.

Some of the points that the letter raises, in fact, that the public interest commitment model for handling this in already been accepted and resolved by the (NGC) and (stored) by the GAC previously.

The letter also makes reference to previous communications by (Sherene Shalovy) in which the proposal - in which they say that the public interest commitments would be the final actions undertaken by the board on the GAC advice and stated that this policy advisory board had already been considered and rejected by the board.

That a number of the strings that were covered under the category one advice already proceeded to contracting. So to go forward and implement this retroactively would require that either the contracts are breached or that it (applies only to) a remaining subset which would be (equitable) to applicants because it would be pretty different mechanisms for handling GAC advice for those who had already moved forward and those who are still waiting to move forward with their category one strings.

And also that in putting forward the public interest commitment proposal, they were a lot of other expressions of interest from members of the GNSO and more often than not, these were supportive of the proposal, so to put this up for public comments at this instance - at this stage in the process would be inequitable and it would undermine different voices that have been raised in the process.

In terms of next steps on this, we are looking to get feedback from the NTAG as soon as possible, perhaps within the next two days. I think (Jacob) can speak to kind of your time. We have a little bit of time to get this done within the public comment period but it's been noted by the (CFIS) that it would be better to get it out sooner rather than later so that (unintelligible) put forward comments on the letter, expressions of support on a timely basis.

And there's been some discussion about including comments made from the (ALAC) (forward) discussion on the letter. I wasn't able to attend the session so if there's anyone in the group would be to take the lead on that, that would be appreciated.

And I know there were also discussions on the registry stakeholder group yesterday (as to) the letter, so possibly putting forward to the registries for seeing whether they want to support other inputs into the letter.

(Reg): Does anyone have any questions or comments for the GAC policy board issues? I've got Jeff and there's somebody in the back I can't see who will use that mic over there.

(Jeff): Yes, thanks (Stephanie). I think I agree with all those comments. I think it's extremely important for us to make there. There was a...

END