
SAN JUAN – ALAC & Regional Leaders: Work Session, Part 5
Saturday, March 10, 2018 – 17:00 to 18:30 AST
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

YESIM NAZLAR: Hi Christa, this is Yesim speaking for the audio test, can you hear me?

CHRISTA TAYLOR: Loud and clear. Can you hear me?

YESIM NAZLAR: Yes, I can hear you, thank you.

CHRISTA TAYLOR: Thanks. [AUDIO BREAK]

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, can I ask everyone to take their seats please and we will start. Oh, we don't have your speakers, you're saying.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We've got all the important people here. We've got enough of the important people.

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.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I could ask someone is in Staff to go outside and if there's any At-Large people out there, gather them in, more in the sense of herding. Wafa, welcome. [AUDIO BREAK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can I say something? Before resolving the problem of Mr. Tijani, I was in the Universal Acceptance Working Group and they were seeking some outreach and I suggested that the best place to make outreach is ALAC and ALSes but they said that they reached you, they didn't receive any cooperation message to make some outreach about universal acceptance.

They asked me since I was an ALAC member to try to contact you on this issue.

ALAN GREENBERG: [Inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I don't know, they said they contacted several people from ALAC to make some outreach about universal acceptance but they didn't receive any feedback. They did receive?

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly, at times in the past we have interchanged with them. I'm not sure which particular request or when, if you could find out and let me know, I'd appreciate it.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, I will try to have some names because I was attending the session without knowing the names.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, thank you. Welcome, this is the Work Session X, I'm not quite sure what X is, I think it's five, four? Alright, I think it's five but doesn't really matter, whatever number it is, it's now. Sorry, we're sort of informal here.

This is a session on New gTLDs Subsequent Procedures for Future Rounds of whatever and we have identified four topics that we'll be talking about and we have the team leaders from each of the groups who will be presenting and I will turn it over to Cheryl to introduce the individual speakers and the topics and I think we we're going to try to allocate about 20 minutes each. Probably seven, eight minutes or something like that, talking and an opportunity for questions and discussion. Cheryl, I'll turn it over to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Alan, I appreciate that. For our friends who are perhaps not as familiar with ALAC and Regional Leaders Meetings, the reason you've all got tent cards is because if you want to speak you do that with it. That is your universal sign for someone to note that you wish to be in speaking cue.

It also helps us know how's who and along who's who I'm going to immediately introduce our co-chair here Jeff and I'll do a little round robin of each of the Work Track Leads, noting that we do not have leads from all Work Tracks in our PDP Process here. We have Work Track Leads from the topic that you've identified you and your communities have a particular interest in. You call know me, far too much about me in some cases. Jeff, a brief intro.

JEFF NEUMAN: I apologize right now for my voice it's seem to have disappeared this morning, it's coming back somewhat. As Cheryl said, I'm one of the overall co-chairs of the PDP Subsequent Procedures, PDP Working Group. Our work is divided into five now Work Tracks. Each Work Track has a responsibility for a different area. Looking around the table to see which Work Tracks we have here. I know I see Karen Day she is with Work Track Three. Javier and Martin from Work Track Five. Sarah from Work Track One and Krista is listening in and speaking.

Again, we have on here the topics that you all had requested to talk about. If there is time and there are other subjects, we'd be happy to address them. I just want to have the Work Track Leaders talk because they are doing a fantastic job and I will fill in as necessary. With that, shall we just go over to the first topic which is the GEO Names Issue, Work Track Five.

CHERLY LANGDON-ORR: Start with the easy stuff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, we'll start with easy. I will turn that over to Martin and Javier.

MARTIN SUTTON: Do we have a slide for this?

ALAN GREENBERG: If we can put the slides up full size on the right-hand side also.

MARTIN SUTTON: Work Track Five has only been one of the most recent Work Tracks comments, so this was towards the end of last year. It was an issue that has a lot interests across the community in different pockets of the community. The approach to this was to

encourage wide participation and to focus on the specific topic. A lot of the other Work Tracks you'll notice have a vast quantity of topics they have tried to address through their activities. This is purely focused on GEO Terms.

The essential part of this is that there a gap between policy that was created in 2007 by the GNSO and the final output of the applicant guide book in 2012. Some of these were looked at, some of the geographic terms were restricted, so nobody could apply for a particular type of GEO term or there was some other treatment such as a request for approval by the local authority or non-objection letter.

There were different aspects provided to different terms specified in the applicant guide book. This has been somewhat confusing to some as to what they could or could not apply for or perhaps felt that it was too much of risk to apply for in 2012.

The difficulty is understanding if there was that demand because of the restrictions that were applied. We don't know who would otherwise entertained an application, including from local governments. It could well have been the restriction imposed prevented governments from actually applying for a three-letter country code or a country name.

The Work Track Five has specifically set out the end of last year to work through how the treatment was viewed for the 2012

round and for each of the terms specified within the applicant guide book, we're currently looking at the pros and cons if you like, of the treatment, what worked well and the purpose and intent of the treatment and what didn't work so well, so did it actually prevent things from being applied for that would have otherwise been opened in that space.

Going through those particular elements we will then look at whether that treatment needs to be adjusted or come up with alternative ideas as to those particular aspects and also, to explore what wasn't included in the applicant guide book. If there are geographic terms that were no specified there needs to be a discussion about whether there should be particular treatments applied in the future, this Work Track will also be looking at considering those as well.

To the stage that we are at at the moment, we've gone through and created a terms of reference for the Work Track, that was agreed in January, early February I think, I'm losing sense of time at the moment. We've worked through the terms of reference. One of the challenges here is obviously we have tried to attract a wide audience into this group, there are lots of different opinions to work through, so the terms of reference did take a bit of time to settle down so that we came up with a working document that everybody was happy to work with.

Terms of reference did take a while to get through, nevertheless that's given us a good platform now to start all of the actual hard work and discussions that are now going on. For the leadership of that we have a shared leadership as you'll note from ALAC, ccNSO, the GAC and GNSO, we have appointed co-leaders from each of those groups, illustrating that it's similar to a cross community type activity but it fits into the GNSO policy development work as well.

That's where we are at the moment. We have also experienced the point where because there is a lot of interest and we have, I can't remember how many sign ups but it was around about 150 once I looked -- 145, so quite a lot of members from different pockets of the community, some of which we're not familiar with 2007 policy development work, nor the applicant guide book activities that we're largely pushed through by demand from the GAC environment and ccNSO environment, so what we've worked on is also creating a lot of information resources for people to get up to speed and help with those conversations in that Work Track and we've also recently held a webinar session, very much going around the background, talking people through the background and the steps that have gone through to where we are now.

That's available for anybody also that wants to join the group, to work through a set a resource that brings them up to speed so

they can feel affective in terms of contributing to that work effort. I shall stop there and see if, one anything else to add from my colleagues? Thank you.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET:

Welcome to Puerto Rico, as you know I'm new at Work Track Five. I think what's -- and you know that the equities here on both sides are equally important and that's what gives it its complexities. One the one side Geo Names has collective concerns or even sovereign concerns and on the other right private rights and individual concerns like freedom of speech and freedom of communication or usage of words and is the type issue that brings a lot of attention to a topic.

You see all the effervescence into this type of discussion and that's why you have this shared leadership model to reflect all concerns. I just want to say that I know this is an important Work Track and I hope I can comply with its requirements and very happy to be in this position. Thank you.

MARTIN SUTTON:

And with that, I'm very happy to open up to any questions. Sorry, I forgot the rule that was just explained to me. Please go-ahead, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: You in the very beginning started off with there was a gap between 2007 to 2012; now, am I asking too much to say what was the nature of the gap that you talked about?

MARTIN SUTTON: There are a variety. Each of these specified terms, geographic terms that are contained within the applicant guide book may have a variation of what was originally set out in the GNSO policy, so what we have existing in GNSO policy from 2007 does not match up with what was put into the applicant guidebook due to a number of other processes through GAC advice, through other comment periods that were applied in the creation of the applicant guidebook, so what we are actually doing at the moment within the Work Track is going through each of those, showing clearly the differences in treatment from what was originally specified as principles of the 2007 policy verses the resultant applicant guidebook.

Now that's an interesting point because at the moment if we've looking at trying to make sure that policy drives our activities going forward, we do already have a piece of work within the Work Track Five which needs to address that gap and see whether we need to recommend going forward with what was contained within the applicant guidebook or revert to the 2007

policy or something in between or something completely different.

HOLLY RAICHE: You're treating the 2007 as actual policy and you're treating the subsequent guidebook as a deviation policy, something along those lines?

MARTIN SUTTON: The Work Track Five is looking at what those differences are and we need make sure that when complete the work that there's something embedded in the policy that reflect future application rounds. We recognize that there's a difference between the policy results of 2007 and what was set out in the applicant guidebook.

That's our first mission is to make sure that everybody is aware of what that difference is and we are discussing whether there's benefits in the way it was finally treated in which case we could perhaps recommend some of these are carried forward as policy, as what was put into the applicant guidebook or where we think there should be some changes made. Whether that reverts back to a 2007 policy or something completely different, that is the whole point of the Work Track Five to assess that and consider any recommendations.

ALAN GREENBERG: One can debate whether some of the things that were put in the applicant guidebook were a change in policy or were implantation but at this point our intent is to decide how the next process will work regardless of why the changes may have been made or if it was a sin or proper work. The history to some extent of how we got here doesn't matter but now we need something definitive going forward. We have a cue of Tijani I believe and then Christopher.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. This issue of geographic names is today -- by the way it wasn't a very big issue for the past round and now it is a very big issue because there is a very big conflict for .Amazon and also for .Patagonia, I don't know if you know about it.

Now there is a problem and the problem is essentially between two interests, the political interest, governments and the commission interest. Those two parties tried to make us go to the top and lobby for their interest. We don't have as At-Large because we are defending the interest of end users, we don't have to go this trouble.

We have to always look to the interest of the community, to end users and I think the community applications should have a

priority for the geographic names because we need people to have the possibility to speak, to express their point of view so the community when they have the TLD they can express their point of view through this TLD and they can make use of it also to have an identity on the net. I think one of the best ways to address this issue is to prioritize the community applications. Thank you.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Just to raise a point for both the last two remarks, what we didn't have before 2012 round was a vast amount of experience in this. What we do have now is some expectations of what may occur in the future and the opportunity to make any corrective action that might make it easier or at least understandable for some as to what risks they may be taking to apply for certain terms.

The predictability element is something that we need to try and help address, we may not solve everything and I doubt we ever will but at least we can have an opportunity to improve based on lessons learnt from the last round and the experiences that we've seen over the last few years. There's somebody next to you to speak in the cue.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think Jeff wanted to comment right now in response.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Three points I just wrote down on the last comments. I want to clarify because I think often we are thinking now about the two situations you mention the Amazon Patagonia and you had put that as some commercial interests against the political interest. I think it's very careful we stay away from the term commercial interests because at the end of the day it could be a nonprofit organization that applies for a name that shares coincidentally the name of a villages, a river, a town, a mountain, a statue, whatever it is of cultural significance somewhere else in the world. It's dangerous to portray this issue as just commercial verses political.

The second thing on that, there also is and it's not just about this geographic issue, it rears its head in other issues as well but there seems to be a mentality of people when they think about top level domains, to think about the one model of making domain name registrations available to third parties and somehow distributing it, whether it's selling it, giving it away.

I think that's a very narrow view of potential uses of the DNS, there are other uses and whether it's a brand top level domain that uses it internally to benefit consumers or whether it's just used in some other innovative way. We need to think beyond the current .com old models and think ahead as to how the DNS can

be used. I would urge that when we're talking about this debate, that we need to just think about potential uses and not set a rule that limits the flexibility to innovate.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're running out of time, so I'd like to limit questions and answers right now. Can we start using the timer, we'll start with two minutes and reduce. We are about 20 minutes into this session of a 20-minute session. At this point we're taking time away from the other sessions. We have Christopher and then myself.

CHRISTOPHER MONDINI: I think we should be close the book on the 2007 stuff, it was not a consensus, it had to be changed before it could be implemented and I think we're wasting a lot of time on the claiming that it was a policy. I think that provokes a lot of people into feeling that GNSO is trying to grasp onto something that they never had.

I'd also ask the question, what exactly does the PDP mean when it discusses freedom of speech? For me the freedom of speech that we're talking about is very similar to the freedom of speech that Tijani was just referring to, it's the freedom of speech of the registrant, not the registry.

ALAN GREENBERG: I just want to recount something. At the end of Abu Dhabi, the ALAC holds -- end of every annual general meeting the ALAC hold a developmental session for the new ALAC to get people working together and one of the things we did this time is we held a sample policy discussion, just to go through the mechanics of how can we come to decisions and how can we evolve and ALAC position on something.

The sample topic we took was GEO Names as TLD's and I was somewhat surprised that we did come to consensus, there was one or two people who disagreed but we came to consensus and the consensus was we didn't care what the outcome was but it shouldn't end up with absolute winners and losers.

We need to come to some level of compromise, where no one maybe perfectly happy but somehow, we can go forward without losers because either the GAC losing or all commercial interests losing and forgive me for using the word commercial, was not a way that we wanted to go forward. I just thought I relate that.

MARTIN SUTTON: Let's hope that it similarly happens in the Work Track that way.

ALAN GREENBERG: We just say what we wanted, we didn't have to figure out how to make it work. We have the last speaker, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. First of all, I want to support what my colleague, Christopher, said, I agree with him. I want to take the opportunity because it's the first time I am able to say that I am very, very surprised that we consider that guidebook is a bible and then we just need to change a few things if we find an agreement.

We will never find an agreement to change things because it was done by people who wanted one way and the things will not evolve and I think we are spending time for unfortunately we are losing our time and that's a pity.

We need to have a new policy for some of the issue and not to take into account what was a policy at that time. I just want to remind you that it was not the first round of TLD, people are discovering questions that we are talking about GEO Name, it was already a discussion and the .info and therefore if we want to learn, we can learn. We will learn after the next round and we will learn and learn but don't forget to learn from what's past round, so 2000, 2004 was very useful or could have been very useful. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Back to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very Alan. I'm just desperately trying to work out which is our next topic because it's not very easy for me to see if it's up there on the agenda. Let's just click over to the next slide, one more slide. Work Track Three, Karen, Robin which one of you are going to lead off on this topic? Who's going to take it, go for it Robin, over to you.

ROBIN GROSS: I'm the co-lead of Work Track Three. Some of the issues that we're working on, concerns about the community priority evaluation, also known as the CPE, particularly the results. The strictness of the criteria and the way they were interpreted by the evaluators there was some conflicting decisions so we need to tighten that up a little bit. Concerns about CPE process and the level of transparency, note the ICANN Board resolved in 2016 that ICANN undertake an independent review of the CPE process.

What's the current status? The working team has considered a number of available resources, such as the Council of Europe Report, the data on outcomes of the CPE in 2012, GAC advice and we've sought input from the community leaders and the applicant support working group and developed a set of draft recommendations and questions for community input to include in the initial report that is about to go out.

What are some of our preliminary recommendations and implementation guidance? We need to increase the transparency and the predictability in the application process. We need to have the elevations done in a shorter period of time, the application evaluations done in a shorter period of time. The procedures need to be developed before the process opens, can't have it changing in mid-stream so to speak. We need to have more opportunity for dialog and clarifying questions with the applicants and the CPE process.

Other fixes would be less restrictive word counts for the communities to engage in clarifying and providing information on their applications.

Now, we've got some things that we want to get input back from the community on some of our questions that are still sort of hanging over us. Really one of the most important issues that we're grappling with right now and would really like to get some feedback on is how to define community for the purposes of the community based gTLD applications.

There seems to be a consensus that we need to have a definition for what a community is but what we don't really have consensus for is what that definition should be. We've got a lot of different ideas. Some people have suggested we need to have different types of communities that have different types of rights

and privileges associated as opposed to this one size fits all process.

Let me ask this group, At-Large, how would you define a community for these purposes? What are the attributes that we should be looking at and considering? Again, we need to think about, what is the overall goal of this community process? What is the public interest objectives that we're trying achieve by creating this concept of community priority? What do you guys think? If we could get some feedback on how to define community for these purposes, it would be really helpful.

TIJANI BEN JAMAA:

Thank you. You are absolutely right to say that there is no consensus about definition of the community. Exactly like the impossibility to have the common definition of the public interest. We are little bit stuck but I think that we have to do something so that we're not stay there.

Similar kind of communities, yes, we can have but I can tell you that a number of registry can make an application as a community and they are a community. Should they be treated exactly like if for example the Amharic language community asking for a TLD? No, so the definition of a community I think it is a little bit known but what kind of community we will give priority or we give advantage. Thank you.

ROBIN GROSS: Thank you. Did anyone else want to weigh in on this? Yes, please.

CHERYL LANGDON ORR: You'll need your ears, Robin, unless you're very good at Spanish.

ALBERTO SOTO: In my opinion defining what a community is -- sorry. I think that it's relatively easy to find a definition of community if we look it up in a dictionary. The issue if we're going to work with different types of communities we will have different types of solution for each of those communities, each of which will shrink the problem at the time of defining but will enlarge the problems in terms the treatment to be given to each community and that might spark conflicts because the treatments will be different.

I think it will increase complexity if we split into different communities at the time of resolution and bring about problems. A community simply a group of people with the same interests, it could be religious, educational, whatever. Thank you.

ROBIN GROSS: Thank you very much. One of things that we've talked about is as you mentioned, having these different types of communities

and the reason for this was because there was this assumption that different communities have different needs that maybe a community that geared towards brands would have a different set of needs than a community that's geared more towards religious or nonprofit interests for example and so the thought is maybe to try to tailor the needs of the community to the types of assistance that's provided to them in the process.

I think that's sort of where we were trying to get at with the thought of, well maybe what we want to do is have different types of communities and that was something that came from the GAC, our meeting with the GAC in the last ICANN meeting with some suggestions that maybe if we try to think about it in this way things might fall into place a little bit easier if we have different buckets as opposed to trying to put everything into one bucket and then deciding everyone gets the same assistance for that. That's just sort of the thought there.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We have a cue at this point of Jonathan, Olivier and Eduardo.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

From the Innovators Network Foundation and I'm also the chair of the CCT Review but I'm speaking in my personal capacity on this question of community TLD's. Having spent the last couple

of years looking at this, I think that it defies definition and that what we found is that the current model pushes everyone to a specific business model, which is an open TLD and trying to just sell as many second level domains as you possibly can and so that has an impact on the number of different alternative models.

As Jeff brought up earlier, whether it's community driven or something else where I'm just trying to make a creative use of the TLD, I'm economically incented to do one specific model. I think changing that economic incentive around is the answer more so then trying to come up with all these individuals carve outs that defy definition.

In other words, if we find a lower barrier to entry, a lower barrier to maintenance, lower minimums, etcetera that allow people to really experiment with the DNS, I think we'll solve the problems of community better than trying to define it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Actually, I have a question as to whether Work Track Three has consider the definitions used by the economist intelligence unit, as to what a community is in their appraisal back for the previous round? Whether it has looked at the definition of community as the .health objection was refused by the examiners at the time because .health was not a community or

the health community was not a community and it was community objection that we had filed, did you looking into this?

ROBIN GROSS:

I don't think we looked at economist definition. If you've got that handy I would certainly welcome it because this again, is something that we're really grackling with, so if you've got some material for us to chew on that would be really helpful. I don't think we had anything that was specific on .health either.

We have invited a number of community applicants who went through the process and either had good experience or bad experience to come talk us and relate their experience but I don't believe the .health folks came for that. Karen, did you want to clarify that?

KAREN DAY:

If I heard you correctly, the definition that you're referring to was the EIT?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: The Economist Intelligent Unit, EIU. Didn't come up with a definition but they determined through some unknown process that for example .gay was not a community, which was a rather

interesting thought, since I've always heard of the gay community but for their things it wasn't.

KAREN DAY:

We did talk about that definition and we called it very affectionately our straw bunny, that our former esteemed colleague Avri Doria helped -- she's formally of the PDP, was instrumental in crafting definition to try and fill in some of those gaps that we felt were evident by that but quite honestly we did not get a lot of uptake and participation in specific ways of improvement and that's where we are now and that's what our questions to the community are going to be, are based around.

How can we write this, this time to alleviate that again but yes, we have talked about that but as far as anybody giving us a specific proposal, something that we can really meld with, we're not quite there yet?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

At the moment the transcript record says man, woman, woman, man, man, woman, because you're not saying who you are when you start your interventions. Housekeeping please. State who you are when start speaking.

ALAN GREENBERG: I must make one comment to Olivier, the EIU's methodology if not definition has been reviled by almost everyone, I'm not sure we want to use that as our model.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I would have said as a model we should not peruse that is why but sometimes it's better to see what you don't like to choose something that you like on the menu. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Just follow up on the --

ALAN GREENBERG: And it's Jeff Neuman speaking.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes, that's me.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: For the record.

JEFF NEUMAN: For the record or man, I like that actually.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Probably feeling like a woman.

JEFF NEUMAN: That's not so great. I mean it's great but not for me. It's really great...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: On the record.

JEFF NEUMAN: For the record, it's fantastic, for my wife it's awesome. My point, sorry was on the .health objection, I'm just trying to figure out, we did hear about different issues for Work Track Three on the .health objection, mostly related to the interaction between the independent objector and also in relation to the At-Large objection. I'm not sure the point your making on the definition of community, if we have a second, just clarify what the connection was.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And so, the objection was made by the At-Large Community. It was a community objection for .health and that was rejected because the At-Large was not seen as being a community that was related to .health, etcetera, etcetera.

JEFF NEUMAN: Understood, but did you have a view that it was wrong, it was right?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I have never gotten any views about anything.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have views but I don't think this the time to discuss.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Obvious we were upset because a lot of work went to this but obvious at the end of the day these are little things which looked like loop holes or something that could be fixed somehow but I think the EIU was the thing that was probably significant and that we felt as the community, the ALAC actually did write a statement about this and complained about the treatment of the applications by the EIU and in fact even before the EUI progressed forward, there was a questions being put as to what knowledge does the EIU have about communities, especially in our context to be able to make those judgement calls.

Maybe this is one thing that we need to look at and I'm not quite sure whether you do have the scoring method in that the EIU used to choose where the community was or not but perhaps

that's one thing that you can try and find and quietly put to the side and say, that's not what we're going to use.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

You were asking ideas on how define community and hear what Jonathan said about business. Anybody that applies for a new gTLD has a business in mind, I don't think they are going to give it away, knowing that this definition of community I will say that anybody that has a non for profit organization should be the community because it's not for business, it's for some kind of charity and if you define community that then that's it but then you have to say, non for profit has the same condemnation around the world, maybe not. You can have a community Tanzania that wants a new TLD, they will incorporate a non-for profit, you have to balance these things, that's an idea to consider.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just to note, the concept of not for profit varies around the world, not everyone has that concept. John,

JOHN LAPRISE:

Rather than come up with a definition of community from scratch, I ask the internet and Google comes up a couple of definitions that I posted in the chat log but they're incredibly

broad. A feeling of fellowship with others, shared common attitudes, interests and goal, so if we start with the super broad, who are we trying to exclude?

Take the broadest definition and start chopping or start chipping away at the definition, to exclude those groups that we feel should not have access to this. Maybe it's a process of reduction rather than addition. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll go on this topic for about another five minutes, so we have a little bit more time, if there's anyone. Kaili.

KAILI KAN: Thank you, Alan. I just want to say one thing. As far as I know the human rights commission of the United Nations so far still has not been able to define exactly what are humans, so if that's the case well don't worry about the definitions, just keep on working on it and that's it. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Not on the human rights issue but, one thing we also need to think about especially with the statement if you're not for profit then maybe you're representing the community, there also has be a strong nexus between the community and the string.

Just because someone's a nonprofit, let's say in the United States lawyers are members of the American Bar Association, they maybe a community for the terms ABA but are they a community for the term law? Those are the types of things, it's not just are you a community but it's are you the community and is there a strong enough nexus between you as the not for profit let's say and the string itself.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I put myself in the queue. One of the issues that I think the working group has to tackle is how widespread that community has to be. I could make a case that I could put together of genealogists in Montreal and I'm pretty sure we could make a strong case that we are represented of all the genealogists in that area but does that give us a big enough community to use the genealogist as a top-level domain when there's millions of them around the world that we don't represent. Is it enough if I have all the Canadian genealogist's, all the North American ones, all the English-speaking ones?

I think we're going to have to give guidance to whoever has to make these judgments of just how wide a community do you have to be before you can get the name and it's something that was clearly not well specified last time and varying definitions were used for different applications and that's something we

can't for in the future of having varying definitions being used in different cases. At least in my mind. We have Christopher and I will close the cue at that point.

CHRISTOPHER MONDINI: Just a gloss on what you've just said. We have had historically exactly that problem with the question with .edu, and I know from experience that there was a time when I think it was Becky Burr rang me up and said, what do the Europeans think about the expansion of .edu? And I consulted the internet community and the European Union and everybody said but we've got .ac and all our ccTLDs so we don't want .edu that was one solution.

ALAN GREENBERG: Although my university in Canada had a .edu we never used it but we had it, we still may have it for all I know. I don't see any other hands in terms of people from working group want make any closing statement or something like that?

JAVIER RUA JOVET: What you just said in terms size also consider that the ability of a person to represent that community, maybe there should some sort of a norm to credit that you can speak for a bunch of people.

ROBIN GROSS: I would actually like to piggyback on something both of you guys have just said inherent in the awarding of a community TLD is also allowing that registry to decide essentially who to exclude from that TLD and so I think we have to have that in our minds when we look at this because we are allowing this group of people to decide who doesn't get to be included in the community and that's really important.

ALAN GREENBERG: Back to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Alan. If we progress our slide again we will get to our next little spot which if memory serves is indeed Applicant Support, over to Track One.

SARA BOCKEY: I believe we discussed this previously in Abu Dhabi as we all know one of the issues with Applicant Support Program was its lack of use during the 2012 round, only three applicants applied and I think one met the criteria and so we had been going through and gathering information from ALAC and the community and the GAC and we actually did get a lot of really good feedback during the last meeting which was very helpful.

I guess we still have a few questions we have regarding -- I don't know I need to go through the current stats. I think we have a pretty good idea of where we are. Most of this is going to be like implementation recommendations, ways to improve it because there just wasn't enough outreach primarily during the last one.

A lot of our recommendations are going to be regarding the promotional efforts, how to better engage ALAC and GAC member to raise awareness. Finding suitable partners in the relevant global areas, implement training programs. Also looking at utilizing partnerships for that outreach.

Definitely looking at sport beyond the reduction of application fees, understanding that it isn't always just about finances, that there are other aspects of the program where we can help the community to be more successful in an applicant support program.

Better understanding the obstacles that there might be such as technical support, evaluating the total cost of what the applicant program -- understanding the total cost of applying for the gTLD and putting that business together and attorney fees and all of that. That's what's outlined here in these bullets, some of the information that we've received back from everyone.

Then we still had some questions that we wanted to pose to the community and as you can see, feedback that we would like is

better understanding the metrics of how we're going to measure a successful program, what are you going to base that one? Is it the number of applications? Considerations verses actual applications applied for? Are we going to be looking at business plans and financial sustainability?

Do we want to have an evaluation criteria? If there's more applicants than funds? How do we want to determine who gets that funding? Did we previously provide the right types of tools? What we maybe need to consider moving forward would be good tools for our applicants to have? How to best provide locally available consultants and how do we find that resource? How to improve the learning curve?

We've talked about doing possibly mentorships, is there some other way that we could provide assistance outside of that? Do we want to keep the potential penalization to applicants who may try to game the system or do we think that trying to block people from gaming the system becomes more of a barrier then it's really worth to the other applicants? Stream contention, how are we going to resolve those? Should there be special considerations for the applicant support program and just dealing with that sort of topic? Those are some areas where we still could stand to have some feedback, if you all have any ideas we'd love to hear them.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have me, Tijani, Jeff and Holly at this point and Christopher and John. Two things that seem to be missing from this, one I know we've talked about and that is if they don't meet the criteria for applicant support should they stay in the race or be eliminated all together? I don't think that's there but maybe I missed it.

SARA BOCKEY: I don't know that it's necessary up there but that is in our recommendations as far -- if they fail to meet the criteria for the applicant support, allowing them to go over the regular application process...

ALAN GREENBERG: I just wanted to highlight that because that was one of the considerations. The one thing I don't see on the list is where's the money going to come from? Last time the money came from the ICANN Board, not out of the funding from the applications but essentially a donation, I can't see that happening again and you talked about what happens if we have more applicants than funds but there other question is, how much funds are we going to have and where's it coming from and is it funded out of the overall gTLD program or from somewhere else?

I think that's a rather critical one because we can decide on everything else and if we don't have money it's not going to get anywhere. Next in the queue is Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I would like to complete the information you gave saying that there were only three applications and only one met the criteria. I want to tell you that this one was dropped by the community evaluation panel, so we have zero experience of support the applicant and this is problem because if we had experience we can say, ah there is also a problem of sustainability but we don't have this experience.

I think that if we had so few applications it was because several things, one of them, what Alan said about the ability to apply otherwise if they are not accepted as supported applicant but I think the most important element was the very tough criteria we put to define what is supported applicant and we put those very bad criteria.

I was from the working group who did that because we are always told it should be gamed, the system will be gamed. I think this time we have to look at another way and I don't know if the criteria will be defined by this group, by the Work Team One or it will be defined elsewhere. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any response? Not necessary, just asking. Okay, next we in the Jeff, Holly, Christopher, John Laprise and Johnathan Zuck.

JEFF NEUMAN: I may partially respond to that as well. I think what we found as a group, which Johnathan's actually in the cue as well so he may repeat some of this because this is in essence going to be referred back to us for help from the CCT Review Team anyway, we're getting nearly universal agreement that nobody liked the result, they didn't think the result was good. We're getting universal agreement that we need to do better. We're getting universal agreement that outreach was not as good as it should have been.

We're getting also a number as Tijani had said the criteria might have been too harsh? But what we're not getting is the specifics, which criteria in particle were too harsh? What are the elements we can fix? What are the methods of outreach to achieve success? That is the kind of thing -- our group has been very good at pointing out some of the things that have gone wrong but we're not getting great information yet is how we improve that, what are your suggestions?

If you can think about that, especially once the initial report comes, so if we don't have it prior to the initial report, which should be out in April and it will be out for a couple months, it's going to be vital for that response to the initial report. Please provide specific's because that's what we're looking for. We all know their problems, we're just trying to figure out how to fix it. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That sounded like an advisement. If you're interested in this thing, maybe join the working group. Each Working Track advertises ahead of the meeting what they're going to be discussing. We can make sure you're notified if it's a subject of your area, your interest and that goes for all the working groups. Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just a question, does the actual availability if infrastructure to support internet exchanges and so forth have anything to do with that?

JEFF NEUMAN:

Do you mean -- what we have explored is access to technical service providers of registration services. It's a little bit different then internet exchanges. There were some volunteers of

registration service providers prior to the last round that said, “Yes, we would be interested in supporting anyone that wanted to come forward.”

There’s no information as to what they would have offered and I’m not sure anyone was really taken up on that offer but again, we need figure out why? Why is that the case and how can make it much more appealing for groups to take them up on that offer of assistance?

HOLLY RAICHE:

I think I was referring to just really, I do mean basic infrastructure and is that infrastructure that will support the industry from bottom up? Is that there? Look, we’ve got horrible broadband in Australia so maybe that’s not the thing to talk about.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

If I may. Holly where the registry is, is where that’s important and that’s what Jeff was saying. There was register service providers who offered their services to supported applicants but of course we didn’t get supported applicants to test that model out.

ALAN GREENBERG: But to be honest, I've done work in parts of the world where there is abominable internet access in general but the banks in that country still have good internet access and provide services over it and so do the telephone companies and things.

In most places, I'm not saying you necessarily want to put the registry there but, in most places,, there is good internet access to those who are willing to be in the right place and spend enough money. Next, we have Christopher.

CHRISTOPHER MONDINI: I just wanted to press your own question a step further and ask, what is there in the budget for next year for this purpose? I think it should be budgeted and if it's not been budgeted now, when will it be budgeted? On the last question I agree that the infrastructure is much better than if was 10 years ago and some of the ccTLDs, perhaps not all of them, some of the ccTLDs do provide the basic technical capability.

ALAN GREENBERG: My recollection is that the best forecast we have is 2022 for the next round, 2020? Whatever the year is, it's not this fiscal year's budget.

JEFF NEUMAN:

But that raises a very good question, which is this is the budget the time to talk about the budget and I'm sure you have or may have already had a meeting to talk about the budget with ICANN Staff and what is critical if you look at the 2012 round budgeting process started for that 2007.

With the caveat that they expected it launch in 2009, the point is that if you expect a round to start in two or three years, now is the time you start budgeting and at this point, there is a round that's expected in two or three years and therefore there should be budget for it and there's not and there's an explicit mention in the budget for fiscal year 19 that says, "We aren't specifically not allocating any funds for the implementation of subsequent procedures."

Which is an interesting choice, they could have just said nothing but they actually wanted to point out that we are putting zero money towards it. They're putting more to help this group, the policy group finish its work, like all other PDP's but nothing on implementation. I personally think that's a problem, I've made that comment.

The registries and registrars, council and others, if you think that's a problem, which if you want to develop an affective outreach and application support program it should be a problem, then you should make your voices heard. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will just point out that the money for applicant support isn't needed until the round launches. It will have to be in the five strategic plan and operational plan.

JEFF NEUMAN: Well, let me point out, you need people and resources to develop the program to have a place to give money to. If you don't start developing the program, meaning you're going to have these resources in place, these people devoted to writing the rules, these people devoted to ...

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Jeff. We're closing the cue, we have another four minutes on this particular one. We have Christopher who spoke and now we have John Laprise. We have Johnathan Zuck and Sebastien and the cue is closed.

JOHN LAPRISE: I just want to make comment and this is definitely out of scope for the Work Track One but it seems apparent to me that for all the work we're doing to help people file applications, one of the things I hope being considered elsewhere is simplification of the

whole process. If the process were easier, we would have to provide less support to get new folks to apply. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And a one-minute timer for the rest of the interventions. I missed Tijani or he was not put in the cue. We have Johnathan Zuck.

JOHNATHAN ZUCK: Two things, one is a question. Aubrey keeps mentioning to me that there was some outreach plan that existed and then was disposed and replaced by this one that was sucky and that she thought the first one was great but was never able to produce it for us, is that something that you guys have come up with, this mystical first outreach plan?

My second question is the other thing that came up as we were trying to review this was that there was a mentoring program where people could sign up to be mentors and sign up to be mentored and people signed up to do both of those things but there's literally no record of anyone actually reaching out to anyone after signing up to be those things, so I don't if that's part of the plan going forward but it could be to help navigate some of the complexity because some of the folks that were doing so many of them were happy to lend services to others.

I'll go back to the very beginning, at the end of your presentation you said, what are the goals and I think you have to start there, what is the objective and build a plan around that rather than building a plan and then decide later what the metrics are for its success. We need to really figure out what the goals are and if more applicants are the goal, we need to justify that I think.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Jonathan, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Alan spoke about the funds that we have to get for the support of applicants. We may get money support but we can also don't take fees or take very few fees for those applicants. I want to remind everyone that for the 2012 round we were told that the applicant fees were calculated on the cost recovery and it was calculated assuming that they will receive 500 applications, they received 2000.

I don't think that it is a problem for ICANN if we cannot take fees for those people who we want to support. Thank you. Last point, you spoke about specifics, you are right and I thought that this issue was with Robin with three, since it is with the group one I will join this group. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Where the money comes from is a conscious decision and it could come from the fees of other applicants, that's a decision. We have the last speaker Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: A few words. When Jeff talked about the budget, how many staff was before the last round and how many staff there is today? I don't think we need to increase budget to be able to do the work for the next round, we have already the staff for that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Clearly a management decision. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think Jeff does need to respond to that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll just point out, this whole program not just applicant support, is going to have to be designed and implemented, it's a much larger question than applicant support.

JEFF NEUMAN: It's not a question of -- I don't think we need to add staff but if you look at the plan, it tells you that it's reallocated staff to different departments and what you need in the budget is a

recognition that the staff is allocated back to working on the new TLD's as opposed to, you need additional people.

ALAN GREENBERG: If we have any time at the end, we'll come back to this topic, I know there's some additional interest. Cheryl, topic four.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Alan. If move forward two slides and in a perfect world we're going to have Christa's voice coming in from above. Christa, are you there?

CHRISTA TAYLOR: I am, can you hear me?

CHERYL LANGON-ORR: We can, the system works and it's over to you. We have your first slide of three on the screen.

CHRISTA TAYLOR: Great, thank you. Talking about application fees, there was a little bit of background is that so far we've discussed to date that it should still be revenue neutral, just like it was in 2012 round and because it was new it was difficult to predict the cost and also the number of applications. A couple of the questions are, is

it costing methodology still appropriate going forward? If we go from rounds to say continues rounds, how would we invest in the systems and other multi round assets and how would we allocate those costs in terms of application fees?

Just a little bit of background, the working group has actually gone a lot of discussions in terms of the different kind of business models and what would happen to any excess or what should also happen to it? That kind of ties into the prior discussion and in term of how you would feed some of the seed money in applicant support.

Additionally, the Work Track has discussed the application piece including the costing methods and some of the aspects that have come forward are a purposed cost floor and a cost floor is what is ultimate lowest price that we'd be willing to accept for an application? Based on the premise that a new gTLD is a valuable piece of the internet and to avoid any other issues that we don't want to see occurring.

The cost floor method has come forward on that and then along with some factors that should be taken into calculating a fee. With the cost floor it was if charged too much then how do we refund that excess fee and how do we also do it in terms the actual cost and the cost floor? I know that sounds a little confusing but I'm hoping it makes a little bit more sense. I'll stop

here and see if there's any questions just to see if I've explained that well enough.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have Jonathan. No, no questions. I have a question. There has been some discussion in the group that maybe we should use 185,000 with the logic that if I paid 185,000 last time, they should have to pay as much, it's a valuable part of the internet. Then we have an interesting question, it's no longer necessarily cost recovery and perhaps this is the source of funds that ICANN needs to address its budget problem.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I actually find that rather appealing, just me perhaps.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's not just you. Anyone else? We could go back to applicant support if there's no other interest in this topic.

CHRISTA TAYLOR: One aspect to consider is that part of process of setting the application fee is that there's a costing method that everything goes through in order to determine the 185,000. I don't know if we can necessarily say that because last time it turned out to be 185,000 actually went to the costing process, that we would still

get that same 185,000 if we were to repeat it again today or are we not doing the cost neutral methodology and just saying it's 185,000? I think there's a little bit of confusing on that, any feedback would be appreciated.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly, from my point of view, I wouldn't object to setting at a 185 or higher if indeed that's what the cost is. I could probably find interesting uses for the money, that's my position. We have Christopher. I'll not, when I said we can go back to the other topic, I neglected the fact that we have two more slides after this and Christa wasn't actually finished.

CHRISTOPHER MONDINI: I just wanted to say that we should not lose sight of that many of the lateral and multi-lateral development agencies have priorities for information technology and it's quite conceivable that a well-prepared project in an underserved region would be liable and we should promote that with agencies concerned.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have Jeff next.

JEFF NUEMAN: Sorry, I'm going back to Alan, something you said. You can't have something be revenue neutral and say that it's going to be \$185,000 because we know by definition there's 80 million dollars at least now still leftover and as much ICANN may want to that 80 million dollars we know there's going to be a surplus at some point of a lot of money.

It's either you apply strict revenue neutral model or you do a revenue neutral model unless it falls below a certain price, at which case you setup a floor because you want to discourage speculation but you can't say both. You can't say it's revenue neutral and 185,000.

ALAN GREENBERG: You won't find me advocating it should be revenue neutral, I agree completely. I may differ with a lot of other people. Christa, why don't you go ahead with your other slides.

CHRISTA TAYLOR: Going to the next slide, some discussions had been around what to do with the access fees? The current ideas are support the general outreach, support the new gTLD program further, support the applicant support program and then also as discussed early, top up any short fall in the segregated contingency fund.

Those same questions that go back to how that would occur but the overall thinking of the working group and this ties back into the actual application fee verses the revenue neutral aspect of it, is that anything above the cost floor would be returned back to the applicants. Only if the amount is different between the cost floor and the actual cost, would that excess fees be allocated among these categories. I hope I've explained that well enough and I would of course appreciate feedback on that as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Krista, question. I think what you just said was, there would be a cost floor for the application but the actual cost of the gTLD when all the dust settles might be lower than that, if indeed there is excess, I think that's what you're saying.

CHRISTA TAYLOR: Exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Comments or go onto the third slide and take everything at once? We have one question from John Laprise.

JOHN LAPRISE: With respect to the question, I would say I'm disinclined to issue refunds, however we might consider and I don't how feasible this

but we talked earlier about the issue of communities and then giving support to specific communities and creating a separate system for perhaps refunding to those communities that we deem for special treatments.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're suggesting that we might want to have differential pricing, depending on the category?

JOHN LAPRISE: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We have no other in the queue. Christa, back to you.

CHRISTA TAYLOR: Okay, going to another question is the other aspect of when there is a costing process and it's complete and if there are different application fee amounts that are significantly different between the different applications, should we consider a different application fee by the type of application?

For instance, if brand application cost significantly less than say a community application, due to the amount of resources it takes and that a number is significantly different, should we entertain the idea of having different application fees? I go to a

couple more questions. I guess the last one would be consideration or implications if we move to continuous rounds verse the current rounds?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record we haven't covered that here. At this point we're talking about a round, possibly even another round but maybe moving to simply continuous applications and not having explicit rounds or something in between that, that's the reference in the last one. We have Tijani and then I'd like to go back to Christa, we're down to about seven minutes. Tijani and then back to Christa for the rest of the slides.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I agree with you Christa about having different fees for different application and I think this is the wise way to do it and we spoke about that before, especially for the support for the applicants and also for the communities. The last point about one round or several rounds, I think that we have to get one round and stop it at a certain time. If you put up -- why there is a different point of view between the community elements regarding opening a new round now. It is because we want to learn from the round and if we let it open we will not learn. We will have perhaps a catastrophe.

ALAN GREENBERG: Whether it's one round or multiple rounds continuous is now the subject of today's discussion but do join that working group because it's an interesting discussion because of string contention. If you take applicant as it comes, you never have any string contention and it's first come first serve, that's the issue there but it's not today's topic. Christa, back to you.

CHRISTA TAYLOR: I don't have anything else, just other than hopefully some additional feedback on the costing floor and how to use the excess and any other ideas that anyone can provide.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're slide says two of three, so I'm assuming there's a third.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's progress the slide and see what it says, it could be nothing, it could be general questions. I think that's false advertising, ladies and gentleman. I for one am disappointed bitterly that we don't have another slide for Christa to talk to.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any last questions before we wrap? Alright then, I'll turn it back to Cheryl then I have something to say.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Alan. I'll also hand it over to Jeff before I give back to you. I wanted to thank all of the Work Track Leads for the PDP here, that they've come literally at the work, can only be described as a relatively long day on this subject and Christa, who's finalizing her thesis, thank you, you are an example of the ridiculous amount of pressure and time we take out of volunteer's lives, I'm just so pleased that you could even join us today.

I really want to give you all of our thanks for doing but it is a huge task to run these Work Tracks and what you've all done today, is given them fresh food for thought and I think I can say on behalf of the Work Track Leads, that we'd really appreciate this interaction with the ALAC and At-Large, so thank you for setting this up and picking such cheeky and exciting little topics. Jeff, what would you like to say?

JEFF NEUMAN: I'll make this short. Thank you for inviting. I think this is the second time in a row now that you've invited us to come and speak with you and this have been very valuable for us. We hope that you continue to invited and that we can exchange ideas like this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Or you can finish the PDP quickly and we won't have a change to invite you. Some of you may be familiar, any of you familiar with alcoholics anonymous? Alcoholics anonymous is a treatment group for alcoholics and the process is when someone goes into one of these meetings they start off with a statement that's roughly equivalent to, "My name is Alan Greenberg and I'm an alcoholic." It's admitting it. My name is Alan Greenberg and I'm a work group masochist.

Masochist is someone who does nasty thing to themselves, I'm a member of main PDP and all of the working groups and I actually try to attend most of the meetings when they're not held at three in the morning and occasionally some of those. These working groups with the exception of Work Track Five, which is dedicated to one subject, all of the other Work Tracks have a whole bunch of subjects that they're working on. Some of them are really intriguing like some of the ones we talked about here, some of them are, from my perspective boring as hell. I wouldn't be talking about any particular one.

The Work Track Leaders, some of whom have very strong opinions on some of the subjects that they're working on are doing an unbelievable job from what I'm watching. They are dedicated, they are attacking all the subjects, even the boring

ones and are uniformly, even when they have strong personal positions are running a really clean show and I would like to take my hat off, if I was wearing a hat, the amount of work that's being done and how well it's been done is just amazing and I thank you all.

The same of course goes for the Work Group Co-chairs but they get all the glory, so we don't need to thank them a lot. Thank you all. You have my respect. That is the end of this session. It is the end of our day for At-Large and it's been a long. I would like to thank everyone for participation.

There's been really good turnout throughout the day, except for when I wasn't here and I'm not sure how well it was but I guess it was pretty good. It was better when I wasn't here, I can do that again. I'd like to thank our technical crew because everything has worked part marvelously, and of course our interpreters who are doing again a yeoman job, even if we don't announce who we are each time. Thank you all. We'll see most of you tomorrow.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]