

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO New gTLDs Subsequent Rounds Discussion Group
Monday 16 March 2015 at 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO New gTLDs Subsequent Rounds Discussion Group call on the Monday 16 March 2015 at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-16mar15-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#mar>

Attendees:

Bret Fausett - RySG
Stephanie Duchesneau - RySG
Jeff Neuman-RySG
Tijani Ben Jemaa - ALAC
Dietmer Lenden – RySG
Christa Taylor – Individual
Rubens Kuhl- RySG
Katim S. Touray – Individual
Lucie Loos – Individual
Avri Doria – NCSG
Philip Sheppard – BRG
Stuart Fuller – RrSG
Jonathan Frost – RySG
Sonigitu Ekpe – NCUC
Donna Austin – RrSG
Jon Nevett – RySG
Sam Lanfranco – NPOC
Arnaud Wittersheim – RrSG
Kristina Rosette – RySG
Evan Leibovitch – ALAC
Tom Lowenhaupt – ALAC
Kiran Malancharuvil – IPC
Christopher Niemi- no soi
Cecilia Smith – no soi

Apologies:

Alan Greenberg - ALAC
Steven Coates – BC (no SOI)
Susan Payne – IPC
Phil Buckingham -

ICANN staff:

Mary Wong
Marika Konings
Steve Chan
Lars Hoffmann
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Good morning, good afternoon. This call is now being recorded. Please go ahead.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Rounds Discussion Group held on the 16th of March, 2015.

On the call today we have Tijani Ben Jemaa, Katim S. Touray, Dietmer Lenden, Cecelia Smith, Lucie Loos, Avri Doria, Jon Nevett, Philip Sheppard, Stuart Fuller, Jonathan Frost, Christopher Niemi, Sonigitu Ekpe , Bret Fausett, Jeff Neuman, Rubens Kuhl, Donna Austin, Sam Lanfranco and Stephanie Duchesneau. I show apologies from Alan Greenberg, Phil Buckingham, Steve Coates and Susan Payne.

From staff we have Steve Chan, Lars Hoffman, and myself, Terri Agnew as well as Marika Konings. I would also like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, Bret.

Bret Fausett: Thank you, Terri. Well welcome, everybody. Since our last call when we had Jeff Neuman and Liz Williams step forward to be co-chairs, I'm very pleased to say that that has worked very well. We've had two calls in between our last

and this one among the three of us with staff. And I think we have some, you know, some work plans to share with the group.

I'm in a noisy place so I'm going to let Jeff talk us through the agenda and talk about some of the agenda items. And I'll pass it to you, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Sure. Can you guys hear me?

Man: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Can everyone hear me? Yeah, okay great. Yeah, so what we did is, you know, we had told everyone on the call we'd asked everyone to provide some input into the matrix that was sent around along with the executive summary that was sent around and I had submitted some comments to it.

But today what we'll do is we'll talk through the - as you see on the agenda - the ICANN board resolution, some of the - any questions on the GDD staff input - they provided a paper - and then updates to the executive summary, which was sent around.

And then what we'll do is we'll talk a little bit about how Liz, Bret and I and Steve kind of envisioned the next steps and then to obviously confirm the next meeting. We think there's a lot of work ahead of us but the good news is we think that we have a path to hopefully get this on the GNSO Council agenda to request an issue report, I'll knock on wood here, hopefully by the May timeframe so that we can have some more substantive discussions when we get to Argentina.

So with that, Steve, you're on, right, as well?

Steve Chan: Hey, Jeff, yeah this is Steve. I'm on the call.

Jeff Neuman: Okay great. So what we have up there now is Annex A to the board resolution. And I don't know if we need to go through this. I think hopefully everyone has kind of seen it. But we just wanted to ask - because we had it on the agenda for two weeks ago - if anyone had any questions on this.

I believe that in looking through this that each of these are contained in some way on the - or in the matrix that was sent around with the issues. And they all kind of - I think the questions that we had come up with over the last, what, since September, I think all reflect a lot of the materials that are in here. But I'm not sure if anybody found some things in this annex that weren't covered. Does anybody have any comments to that? Steve, do you have anything you want to add?

Steve Chan: Not much to add but, yeah, this is Steve. I would agree with that assessment. So in most ways the annex does reflect just about every one of these topics that are covered in the Annex A. And so there was a couple of things that the discussion group did not highlight but those are captured within the matrix that was circulated...

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Steve Chan: And those were the - you know, picked up as new items potentially so things like name collision is there or there's other things that might warrant a separate effort like the RPM review. So those are noted in the matrix. So I think in general they sync up pretty well which, you know, is really a good thing.

But I think it's a good thing for us to reflect on just other party's thoughts to make sure that we make what we capture as wholesome as possible and, you know, whatever we pass to the GNSO Council eventually the better we make it and the more well that it's scoped the better shape that we are so I think it warrants, you know, at least discussing this and, you know, if no one

has any thoughts on this then that's fine but at least we should try to discuss it.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, Tijani, I hope I'm pronouncing that right, I apologize if I'm not. You have your hand up?

Terri Agnew: And, Tijani, we're unable to hear you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, yes. You hear me now?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, great.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay thank you. So Tijani speaking. The Number 7 of the - Annex A speaks about fee reduction for countries or less developed countries. It wasn't what we put in our (unintelligible). It could be (unintelligible) but now that we have already around that 1500 application that (unintelligible) future the most important strings are already taken. And the people from those developed - or let's say underserved regions didn't step, they are not in the loop now. And we need to make them participate in the program.

So we need some more (unintelligible) consideration. We propose already that we make new gTLD round and if not (unintelligible) round (unintelligible) those regions and also for the communities, for the (unintelligible) communities which is not - which is not mentioned here for the communities, nothing is mentioned for the communities.

So I propose that - I would like to see comments on this question and try to make the applicant support program that (unintelligible) like this in a different way, not only fee reduction and something like this. And don't (unintelligible) it to the list - to the most least - or to the least developed countries. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Tijani. And I agree with your points and I think they're really important. What we're looking at now is just the board resolution. But I do

hope that the matrix that we developed as a group does cover that in more detail.

We can't really change the annex to what the board had decided in November but we certainly can make sure that the list of issues that are in the matrix covers the subjects that you want to cover especially with respect to serving the - those countries and also to making sure that we address the subject of communities. So I think that's really important.

And, you know, this again what we're reviewing here is the board resolution that was already passed just to make sure that we've gotten all of these items. But I certainly agree with you that we should - when we put the matrix up on the screen we should make sure that it's all covered.

Does anybody else have any comments? Steve, are we able to scroll through this document on our own or do we have to have you guys do it at this point? Because I'm not able to go through.

Steve Chan: It should be unsynced. This is Steve. If you're not, let me know, I can try to make sure it's not synced.

Jeff Neuman: Oh, there we go. Cool.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, all right. Thanks, Steve. Okay does anyone else have any other comments or questions on the board resolution? All right Rubens has a comment. I think there's one point for limits rounds, whether they are limited to communities, developing countries, brands, etcetera. Okay well let's make sure that we cover the - make sure that they're covered in the matrix.

And again, I just want to clarify that our role here is really to make sure that we have the issues laid out and not necessarily the solutions to them

because that'll come with the actual PDP on it. But make sure we have all the questions here.

And hopefully the questions are presented - that's another thing I'd like everyone to look at is that the questions are presented in an objective way without any kind of presupposing any outcomes, that's really important in scoping the issues that we don't want to make it seem like we're leaning in any way one way or the other even if all of us agree that there's one way to go on this, we really - our role here is to scope out the issues.

Okay - any other comments? Okay do you want to - Steve, can you put up the executive summary with my comments in there?

Steve Chan: This is Steve. I was actually thinking we would throw up the GDD input document just for - if there's any discussion on that document as well.

Jeff Neuman: Sure. Sure. Looks great, sorry. I went out of order, thank you.

Steve Chan: No problem.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so while this is coming up in - I think it was January, Steve, correct me if I'm wrong, staff released this input paper on issues that they saw that we could all look into or that eventually a PDP would look or multiple PDPs would look into to help us kind of - from their point of view.

And so this document - I don't know, Steve, if you want to kind of go through high level what this document is and what it was intended to do. I actually found it incredibly helpful in reading through it to lay out every staff view of these issues and what the issues are.

Steve Chan: Sure. Thanks. This is Steve. Yeah, this is the staff input from the GDD staff. And the way that they organized their input to our discussion group is they followed our high level categories that were presented within the mind map.

And so what they're trying to do is reflect on the issues that we identified from their operational perspective. And they were trying to give us questions to think about and that's the way it's presented is things that we might want to consider just to help us scope the issues that we've identified.

And, you know, I'm not going to read them through the paper but, you know, that's really what it is, is just to give us things for further reflect on and to help our very important exercise of establishing the scope of what we want to put forth into the GNSO Council. So that's just my little blurb about it. And I see Philip Sheppard has his hand up so please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, Phil.

Philip Sheppard: Hi, can you hear me?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. Yeah.

Philip Sheppard: Hello, are you hearing me? Okay, Steve, I'm just a little surprised on Section 4 about different tracks. Now you're making (unintelligible) was being made a more general point about some of the challenges of different tracks. And yet there is no mention of the consumer work that staff did on the creation of Specification 13 proved that actually in effect a diversion, perhaps, rather than the second track, different track, was indeed possible. The definition of the category was possible.

(Unintelligible) way that you would opt in or be able to be removed from that category was also possible as all that was included in the Specification 13. So I think it's a bit of an omission that is not mentioned as a work that staff has done and something that I think will be extraordinarily useful for the future.

Jeff Neuman: So thanks, Philip. Steve, do you want to address that or...

Steve Chan: Yeah, just...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Yeah.

Steve Chan: Just a real quick comment. And this is Steve for the transcript. The staff input paper was, you know, really a GDD effort so - and, you know, they consulted me to some degree but it was mostly their independent effort, so that's the first point.

The second is that, you know, if you want me to pass these comments over then I'm more than happy to do so. And if we want to have more substantive discussion about their input document we could actually have them on one of our calls to be able to address questions directly, if that's something the group would like to undertake. That's it, thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Philip Sheppard: Okay, Steve, thanks. It's Philip here again. Yes, please to your point about relaying information to them. I think certainly the idea of having them on another call would be helpful. And perhaps in the meantime we might also write to them on that point - we being the (unintelligible), not you.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah and again I think - Philip, I think one of - and I certainly agree with you that, you know, we've sort of proven the concept that you can differentiate between certain types of applications. But I think, again, I think the staff paper and what our exercise here is to just ask the questions and then let the PDP process or whatever processes we choose to - or the Council chooses to go forward with answer them as well. But I think your comments is excellent.

And I think, you know, we certainly accounted for the fact that we can differentiate between different types of applications whether they be the brands or even in fact - and this may be controversial - but even the fact that, you know, some groups consider certain strings to be more sensitive than others. So I certainly think that's possible and it's a good comment.

Philip, did you want to add anything else or that's...

Philip Sheppard: No that's fine, thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Okay and again I think one of the things that we should do - and we're ultimately building up to showing the matrix again - is to make sure that these items - we feel like these items are all represented in that matrix because we're going to help - what you'll see is we're going to try to use that matrix to help draft or guide the Council into recommending how we believe as a group a PDP or multiple PDPs may be structured in the future.

So with that, Steve, if there's no other comments, you want to put up the executive summary?

Steve Chan: Sure. Sorry, Jeff, one second, I've got to upload your updated version.

Jeff Neuman: Sure.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Chan: ...I'll have to convert it real quick. If you want to keep talking about it go ahead and I'll do my best to get it quickly.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, sure. Thanks, Steve. So the executive summary what Steve has - and staff have tried to do is to kind of show us what an executive summary of an issue report ultimately would be if in fact the GNSO requests an issue report.

So just as a reminder, the GNSO Council has to actually request an issue report on a subject.

What they've requested so far is a group, which we are, to kind of come up with the issues and to help recommend to the Council a way forward with one or multiple PDPs or other processes that may be used to address subsequent rounds as new gTLDs.

So Steve and ICANN staff did a shot at drafting the executive summary. That's been sent around - that was sent around a few weeks ago to the entire group. And then I sent around I guess probably about a week and a half ago or so I sent around my comments which, again, are just my personal comments to the executive summary.

I feel - I felt that there were some things that were sort of left out and a little bit of revisionist history there in the executive summary and I wanted to make it clear that a lot of us believe that there were a number of policy - even though the guidebook came into existence with the goal of implementing the policies that came out of the 2007, 2008 GNSO recommendations, in reality a lot of us believe that there were many policies that were subsequently decided.

So the changes you'll see that I made - and again this is just out for comment, this is just my own personal - people could agree or disagree - the changes I've put in there really reflect that there were a number of policies that were decided after the fact and, you know, kind of I think more accurately portrays what actually happened. So with that said, Philip, is that a new hand? I can't...

Man: Hello, - hello (Katim) here.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, go on.

(Katim): Yeah, (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: I'm sorry?

(Katim): I say is that - is that me, (Katim)? Should I go ahead and say what I want to say?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, if you - do you have anything...

((Crosstalk))

(Katim): Yes I do. And thank you very much. I must preface my comments by apologizing from speaking a little bit out of topic because I was offline, my call was dropped for a couple of minutes there. I just wanted to mention that I noticed that in hindsight there might be - or might have been a slight variance with (unintelligible) of the GNSO policy in the applicant support program for these developing countries.

There was a (unintelligible) actual implementation of the applicant support program because as you recall we have only three applications for support and they're mainly from developing countries which actually means it's a different and a larger subset than least developed countries or, you know, least developed countries.

So I'd like to suggest that moving forward that this policy issue be clarified as to whether the applicant support program is meant for developing countries in general or technically for least developed countries because I think there's a world of a difference between two groups of countries and we need to make appropriate adjustments in the implementation moving forward (unintelligible) support for these different types of countries.

And also just reiterate especially in light of the fact that the (unintelligible) incredibly high fees for contended applications or contended strings that are

in contention. But we need to make appropriate elements to ensure that the (unintelligible) previous applicant (unintelligible) from developing countries would not be basically priced out of auctions in the future, we need to have them protected moving forward from their previous applications.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thank you for those comments. Again, what we're trying to do here is to lay out the questions and lay out the issues so that ultimately when the PDP or if - I should say if the PDP is commenced that we have all the issues out on the table so the thoughts you have on the applicant support program and on contention resolution, especially for those in the developing countries, that they - those issues are addressed.

So, I mean, I think those are very valid comments. And I think if you could read these documents and make sure that the issues - not necessarily the solutions but the issues are covered I think then that will make some great conversations which we certainly look forward to you and others participating in as we get further into hopefully a PDP that's commenced in the near future. Does that make sense?

(Katim): Okay sure, thank you. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Great, thank you. So this - getting back to the executive summary - and I see that Jon and others agree - just hopefully again this is just an executive summary. If anyone's got any comments, other than mine, what our goal is - and I'll repeat this a couple times during the call - is our goal is to have comments to these documents that have been submitted by the end of March - that would be March 31. I think there's 31 days in March.

Again, this is just a listing or a scoping of the issues. This is not substantive PDP work. The reason we'd like comments in by the 31st is so that we could try to put together a document to present to Council. There will be many more, I'll say, bites at the apple, if you will. There will be, you know, once these groups are - or PDPs are created, the issue report is drafted, there'll be

plenty of time to add additional issues. But we've been kind of going through this exercise for the past - well since September. And I think at this point it's good to put a - kind of try to put a stake in the ground to get something to the Council.

So what we'd really like to do is to get these questions out. And, Steve, if you could start putting the matrix up on the - on the screen while this is going on. What we'd really like to do is - in the next couple weeks - if you could kind of socialize these questions with your groups whether it's the, you know, a constituency, stakeholder group and advisory committees, just to kind of socialize these to see if at first glance we've covered most of the issues or hopefully all the issues, that would be fantastic.

Again, I'll go over that again as we go through the call. But we'd really like to have all these comments - or questions, I should say, by the end of March so March 31.

So the matrix is up on the screen. I'm going to try to make this larger so I can read it. All right, guys. There we go. Everyone can make it larger for themselves by using the zoom control at the bottom.

So what this is is, this is a matrix that Steve and ICANN staff have drafted in order to take the issues that were in the mind map that we had done over the past few months and kind of mapped them to the initial GNSO or I should say the final GNSO policies that were approved eventually by the board in 2008.

So if everyone remembers there were principles, there were Principles A-G, recommendations 1 through - I'm trying to remember what number - and then there were implementation recommendations as well or implementation guidelines.

And what Steve had done is basically added a column that says policy - is the policy and implementation satisfactory? And I divided - to the red most of the

things in red are things that I've added especially if it's highlighted. So if it's in a highlighted box it's what I added. Again, it's my own personal comments, it's not - it's not authoritative or anything; anyone can make comments or changes, it's just my recommendations.

And so what I did is I added a second column to it. Instead of keeping policy and implementation satisfactory in one column, I put, "Is the policy satisfactory?" in one column. And then, "Was the implementation of the policy satisfactory?" in the second column.

The reason I did that is because I think in looking through - at least when I did a review I looked through the policies and it seemed like policies that were sound and policies that I think were the right policies from the GNSO perspective but maybe in some cases weren't implemented right or weren't implemented in - or could be implemented better; I shouldn't say "right" that's not really - there's no black and white here.

But, again, so what I did is I separated the two columns out in this. Ultimately the goal of this matrix will be to try to group issues together in order to come up with a way that the PDPs can be organized. And after we go through this matrix I'll give you what my proposal is on how we can organize each of these into what I believe is five working groups moving forward.

But I - but everyone really should take a look at this Issues chart that's mapped to the initial principles and make sure that everything is covered and submit comments, again, by March 31. So with that, Philip, do you have a comment?

Philip Sheppard: Thanks, Jeff. My comment applies to the second part of that Excel sheet, potential new policy work. Shall I carry on with that or did you want to come to that later?

Jeff Neuman: We can - it seems like you're the only one in the queue so why don't you give your comments?

Philip Sheppard: Okay. All right it's just on that second page it's Item 3, should different application tracks be considered creating new policy work? And then under Notable Issues there, there's some very good questions being asked that the group has come up with.

But there were a couple that seemed to be slightly separate to that one of which should limit on the (unintelligible) applications by one application group be considered? And the second issue, the application fee amounts be made variable.

Now those struck me as being indeed interesting questions but they are separate to the concept of applications tracks and maybe - and maybe that should be a separate main - a policy point because some of those open up much wider questions and it could actually make the consideration of that question more complex than it needs to be.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks Philip. And Steve, do you have - you can separate those? I think that's a valid - a great comment. And I think they - I agree with Philip, they are really two separate issues. Can we make sure we break those out? All right I'm assuming that the answer is yes.

So the - and just for everyone else that's on the call, the matrix that's up here now is only the first tab. Philip was actually referring to the second tab which actually is not up here yet.

So when you review this matrix in an Excel spreadsheet please make sure you review both tabs because I think the initial tab is what I described before is mapping to the existing principles, policies, recommendations. But the second tab were things that weren't necessarily foreseen by the GNSO

policies at the time; that came up afterwards. So please make sure you review both of those.

Let me just go back to the chat here. Let's see, Mary says, "Some of the questions you're asking led in part to the GNSO Council chartering the Policy and Implementation Work Group for whose initial reports - ah, public service announcement.

Comment period closes tomorrow and should that working group's recommendations be adopted, including a set of working principles and a few additional processes for the GNSO, as a whole to - oops, it just got moved here - as a whole to provide input into the implementation work. Hopefully they will also (unintelligible) this group and the potential eventual PDP that results. And Avri agrees with that point.

So I'm definitely looking forward to seeing the final - well all of our comments hopefully are in - or should be in but then seeing the final output of that group.

So again, just what I did here is on this chart is put in my own personal kind of feelings on some of these issues and tried to clarify some other issues. Please, everyone, read this. We're looking for comments on this matrix by the 31st of March.

Does anybody else have any questions on this matrix? I know we had asked for comments the last time but now we really kind of want to move this forward so to the extent we need comments in by the 31st that would be great. I'll pause to see if there's any questions on this because we're moving fairly rapidly through this.

All right so Jon asks if we can recirculate these documents to the group with my comments in there. Okay, Bret.

Bret Fausett: I think - as everyone takes this back to their constituencies, you know, this is not the kind of thing that I think we're asking anybody to spend hours on. I think it's the kind of thing that someone can read in 15 minutes and sort of identify, you know, really very quickly whether the issues are fully covered or whether they're properly raised.

So that may be helpful when you're circulating this to - when you're taking this back to your - the groups from which you come, you know, let them know that we're not expecting any really heavy lifting here. This is something that, I think, people who are familiar to read through quite quickly. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks Bret. And I second that. Really it's, again, there's going to be many bites at the apple, if you will. There's going to be many opportunities over the next months and years as this PDP progresses to raise additional questions that we might not have thought of but really this is hopefully going to help us frame the issue report. And, Steve, you have a comment?

Steve Chan: Sure I do. Thanks, Jeff. This is Steve. It's just a quick comment about - so I like the separation that you made in the document to - especially call out policy satisfaction versus implementation satisfaction. And so my comment is that the level of guidance in some of those policy recommendations is - I think you could probably agree is relatively high level.

And so you have some situations where staff - their implementation might take (unintelligible) as you guys might - or it might be construed as creating new policy.

And so I guess what I would say is that where you see those cases it may be a good idea to consider possibly codifying their implementation into a policy or if you disagree with how the policy was implemented then I think it might warrant actually providing additional policy guidance so that in a subsequent roll out of the next round perhaps they can be guided to develop an

implementation that is more in line with what the community envisions.

Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Steve. And I think that's important. I think you're absolutely right, when you read through some of these policies, right, so like, I mean, look at the policy Principle A, just the first one that's on there, it says "New generic top level domains must be introduced in an orderly, timely and predictable way." I think we would all most likely agree that that's a policy that's probably worth keeping assuming you want new gTLDs.

But assuming that moves forward, then I think that's a policy we would all probably agree with. And then the question is was implementation done in a way that achieved that principle? And I think that's where you'll find the issues.

And I agree with you that to the extent the policy can be clarified that's obviously worth that - will need to be done in a - in one or more PDPs, however the GNSO chooses to structure it.

But, yeah, I agree that a lot of those policies were extremely high level and in hindsight certainly could use some more guidance or even just, you know, the way that the GNSO had envisioned a certain policy may have been envisioned subsequently by the staff or by others in a very different way so clarifications are extremely important to the policy, I believe, moving forward.

Any other questions on the matrix? And again I just want to point out that the comments that are highlighted and in red are my own comments, they're not staff's comments, they're not necessarily my company's comments, they're just my comments. So don't take this as kind of a staff position. Everything in here is pretty fluid so I just want to point that out that these are just comments I had going through. And most of them should be highlighted in yellow when you get the matrix.

The matrix was sent to the list about two and a half weeks ago. So it was on the list so I could promise you that because I remember checking with a couple people to make sure it got on there. So hopefully we'll resend it but it was definitely on the list but there's a lot going on in the community so I know it's not always easy to keep up with everything.

So, Steve, I think what I'm going to do now is just talk about - so what I did also is I was asked to do this by Bret and by Liz and by ICANN staff is to go through and try to think if there was any kind of logical grouping of these issues so that when we recommend something to the - when we recommend to the GNSO Council to initiate a PDP - well first to request the issue report then to initiate a PDP - one or more PDPs - if there's some kind of logical way to group all of these issues and I came up with - and I'll send this around to the list - but I came up with sort of five groupings that I thought could be used to group these issues together and if we were to do it again.

It's completely my own recommendations but I will send this - although actually, Steve, since you have it you might just want to send this out to the group as well with the matrix. So I grouped them into five areas just as kind of - again, just a suggestion.

And the five areas I had were - just trying to find it here. Sorry, do you have the definitions of those five groups too, Steve? Otherwise I got to find it in my email which I think I...

Steve Chan: This is Steve. I do have them in front of me if you want me to read them out.

Jeff Neuman: Oh wait, I actually found it. Okay so what I had done is five groups and in no order of any importance at all whatsoever. And I managed to basically get them into five groups. One - Group 1 would be the overall process and support and outreach. Group 2 I put all kind of legal - what I thought of as legal and regulatory issues in Group 2.

Group 3 I put objections, contention sets and dispute resolutions into that group. Group 4, which admittedly is probably at this point the lightest in terms of the number of issues that are on there what I think is pretty deep in terms of work that needs to be done which is internationalized domain names. And probably could put in there too universal acceptance in Group 4. And Group 5 I have technical and operations.

So as you go through this latest matrix you'll see them - oh, I'm hearing a busy signal. Is everyone still on?

Man: Yeah.

Terri Agnew: This is Terri from staff.

Jeff Neuman: Okay cool.

Terri Agnew: We'll isolate the line.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thank you. So I just again - what I wanted to do my goal was to try to come up with a way to make these issues manageable in a PDP or multiple PDPs going forward. So I tried to group them all into these five groups, again, overall process support and outreach; Group 2, legal regulatory; 3, contention sets, objections, dispute resolution; 4, internationalized domain names and universal acceptance; and, 5, technical and operations.

There may be a better way, there may be other ways to organize these issues. But this was my kind of first cut at how we could move forward on these subjects. So if you could please look at that as well. Maybe in addition what you'll see in - you'll see individual issues broken out, if you think the issues are in the wrong category, even if you agree with these categories, let us know, again hopefully by March 31 to see whether we got this right.

Anybody have any questions? Steve.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Jeff. This is Steve. Just to follow up on Jeff's description, I think where this would be really useful, these groupings, is in developing the draft charter that may be used for the future issue report. So I think this is a great lead-in to be able to develop a, you know, a really well scoped charter as well. And I think, you know, then hopefully that goes on to be used in PDP as well. But in the near term that's kind of where I see these groupings being really useful. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Steve. Okay (Cecilia) had a comment - or a question. "How do we provide comments." (Cecilia), if you could just use the list to provide the - to provide your comments. Steve and ICANN staff is keeping track of all the comments that are received.

And actually if you could get some of these comments in before the 30th - I know I said the 31st is when it's due - but if you can get some comments in by the 30th then we can - if we continue on our current schedule and have a call two weeks from today that would be the 30th. So perhaps if we could get some comments in prior to then we can discuss those on the call on the 30th, again just to try to help us out. But comments we set a date really due the 31st.

Any other questions? Comments? We have a pretty silent group today. I feel like I'm doing all the talking here. Okay so again just to kind of reiterate the - we'd like comments on each of these documents by the 31st. Our proposal is to have the next call in line with the every two weeks on Monday, March 30 at the same - Steve, I'm seeing the same time, I can't remember Daylight Savings where - we're going to set it at UTC same time, Steve?

Steve Chan: This is Steve. And I actually am not entirely sure. I'll double check. Actually Terri is just pinging me and she's telling me that it will be 1400 UTC.

Jeff Neuman: Okay 1400 UTC. We'll send a reminder out on the list as well. And if you have any comments or questions feel free to please send them to the group. The chairs, Liz, myself and Bret, are meeting every week - every Friday to try to collate - or the comments that are coming in and trying to figure out how we can make this efficient and move this forward so any comments you have we'd really appreciate.

Any last final questions or comments? Steve? Bret, anything you want to add? Okay hearing none thank you everyone and look forward to getting all of your comments.

Avri Doria: Thanks, bye.

Terri Agnew: And once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines. And, (Francesca), you can stop the recordings.

END