ICANN

Transcription ICANN Johannesburg

GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG

Tuesday, 27 June 2017 at 10:30 SAST

Note: 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 recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar

page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Avri Doria: It is now 10:30 so I am going to start, as I promised. One thing I wanted to mention, and this is for all us presenters and for others who are using acronyms, we did have a request on what an acronym meant so I would like to recommend that, at least on the first use of an acronym, and possibly even the first and second, also include its spelling out for those that aren't as familiar as everyone else with the acronyms.

So I'd like to ask everybody that's by the door, please come in. And for Work Track 2 I'd like to introduce Mike. Yes, I knew your name, I think.

Michael Flemming: So ladies and gentlemen, thank you for coming back to us right after the break. My name is Michael Flemming. I will be going over the Work Track 2 topics. Actually we're probably going - only going - just sticking with one topic. Are we in sync on the slides or…? No? Okay.

So, okay. So we do have two topics planned but we're going to stick to one, just for concerns of time. We're going to be discussing closed generic. So very quickly, a closed generic is referred to in the community as a TLD string that is a generic term that is more or less operated exclusively for the registry operator for their own benefit. Currently there's nothing in policy or the

applicant guidebook that addresses closed generics, but the idea of exclusive use is talked about within the exemption to the code of conduct under specification 13 of the registry agreement.

So far we've looked at the pros and cons of closed generics. We've had a lot of discussion in regards to these points. Most of what we've been trying to do is see if there is actual evidence of the alleged harm that was proposed originally in the idea of closed generics. You can see the points of the arguments for closed generics and the arguments against closed generics on the second slide. I'm not going to go over them individually.

Could we go to next slide, please? Thank you.

So far up until now we've had a lot of debate but there has been no clear consensus on where we're headed. However, we have been able to agree on a consistent amount of principles such as in this debate there is basically - sorry, we've seen a lot of observations and so far we've seen that when individuals pursue the public interest and the idea of closed generics, a lot of times they're talking about maximizing benefits or minimizing harms for different parties.

For example, when talking about the consumer, it's either in the idea of the applicant, the registrant or the end user. Working track members have agreed that there should be important - that it's very important to set certain goals and that we should be very specific when addressing policy.

Some points of discussion -- next slide, please -- once again we do have no clear consensus for how to move forward on this topic. However, the idea that we need to have those set goals and at least have that understanding of what goals we need to set when moving forward with the closed generics, is something we have reached consensus on.

Potentially we could look at several possible paths forward in regard to this, such as not allowing closed generics at all, allowing closed generics with limitations in regards to the use of the TLD and compliance requirements to adhere to, or imposing criteria that an applicant registry operator must fulfill in order to operate a closed generic.

So I'd kind of like to open this up to individuals to comment on specifically looking at seeing if there is evidence of alleged harms or if they have ideas for how we can move forward with possibly allowing closed generics or whether or not we should not allow them period.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Yes, Jeff wanted to make a comment.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. Just to kind of add to what Michael was saying, we've certainly heard people that are strongly against and strong - and those that are strongly in favor, which is why we're kind of deadlocked at this point. What would be great is if those that are strongly against would see if there were any potential exceptions, or those that are strongly in favor would comment on anything that could address potential harms, see if there's any middle ground. There may not be but we're trying to see if we can get to some other solution. So, now that's all. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Jeff. Jim, please.

Jim Prendergast: Thank you very much. Jim Prendergast. I think we could all agree that the process by which this issue was resolved in the previous round was messy and not ideal. Applicants weren't given this information prior to application. And as I result I believe some actually withdrew their applications knowing that they couldn't operate and apply for a TLD as a quote, unquote, closed generic. How do you justify moving forward in the next round by allowing closed generics when you've already had people who essentially were forced to withdraw from the program because of a previous prohibition on them? I

don't know, that seems to be blow fairness out of the water, but maybe some folks have some ideas to respond.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Okay, I don't see anyone else in the Adobe list. Oh, was Jordyn before Kathy? Was that what you were saying? Oh, Jordyn, please. Oh, you weren't?

Jeff Neuman: There's people over here.

Avri Doria: Yes, it's really helpful when people use the - okay.

Michael Flemming: Raise your hands in the Adobe room.

Avri Doria: Yes, please. That does help. Okay so Kathy you're saying that they were before you? And was Volker first or were you first?

Jeff Neuman: Volker and then (Dirk).

Avri Doria: Okay Volker and then (Dirk) and then Kathy.

Volker Greimann: Let me say first that I'm not a big fan of closed generics, and looking at some of the originally applied for closed generics that have since opened up, some of them have become moderate to large successes. If we look at the .blog or .cloud, they were originally conceived as closed generics and the operators have contended that opening them up could be beneficial and led to larger registration numbers.

I think having closed generics has an inherent danger of an operator being able to dominate the industry that he's in at the detriment to all other competitors because of the superior name that dominates a topic and industry or whatever. So we should be very careful in allowing them. Nothing - in the first round we made the right decision of not allowing them without at least adding some safeguards.

Avri Doria: Thank you. (Dirk), please?

(Dirk):   Yes. (Dirk) (unintelligible) in my personal capacity. In fact five years after the application window we don't have any experience with closed generics like (oslo.food) and others, as Volker mentioned. So we cannot really say if they create harm or do good things. That's one point. The other point is I forget this. The second later.

Avri Doria: So I have Kathy, then I go back to the list and I have Jordan and Steve. So Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. When it comes to closed generics, we've actually got a lot of information on this. We heard huge objections from the public. Probably more comments than ICANN's ever received in a public comment period to date were heard when the world found out that kind of Amazon wanted .com - sorry, .book all to itself. And, you know, booksellers around the world wrote to us.

                 And we also heard from the GAC. I'm looking at the GAC early warnings. We heard - we saw over a dozen objections just from Australia. So for one, Australia said, this was for .beauty, which the applicant was L'Oreal, and Australian GAC said L'Oreal is seeking exclusive access to a common generic string, .beauty, that relates to a broad market sector. So we heard oppositions to closed generics from the public, from the GAC, and also from different communities. So.

                 You know, and in terms of harms there were actually community objections filed against closed generics and there were harms - Michael, there were harms that were shown because otherwise you couldn't get a finding, and there were findings and community objections that included harms that were shown if the entire industry sector didn't have access, didn't have equal

access to what one competitor -- because the registry was also a competitor in some of these cases.

So I'm sitting in Michele's chair and he asked me also to channel his objections, his ongoing objections to closed generics and the success of .blog and .cloud when they were opened up and they really become -- and these are, you know, this is what he said to me -- that they really become kind of, you know, very successful as open generics in terms of being places that the industry goes as a whole. Thank you. Oh, and that was Kathy Kleiman.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Yes, and please do be sure to give your name at the beginning. Okay, I have Jordyn next.

Jordyn Buchanan: Thanks. I - it's Jordyn Buchanan from Google. I actually didn't intend to talk too much to the virtues of closed generics but with the comments so far maybe I'll take a moment to do so just so that the conversation's not so one sided. I'll make two quick points and then I actually want to get a third one that was what my original point was.

But first of all like the notion that a TLD somehow gives you a huge competitive advantage is I think absurd. Like, we know that SLDs are allocated on an exclusive basis to potential competitors. If we thought that a domain name could magically make you succeed in business then Barnes & Noble would have destroyed Amazon a long time because that have book.com, and in fact the opposite has happened. You succeed in business by having a good product and selling it to people, not by having a clever domain name. And that's equally true at the top level as well as at the second level.

I think the second point is, to channel what (Dirk) said, is we don't really know, right? Like it's true that blog and cloud were opened up and, you know, they're looking good. We don't know what would have happened if they were closed. There could be thriving ecosystems there but we didn't allow that

experiment to happen, and so it's not actually possible to make a comparison of what a closed TLD would look like and whether they would be more successful.

So I don't think it's reasonable to look at the cases where things have been opened up and say that looked very well, therefore we should keep doing that without necessarily understanding what the opposite case would have looked like.

But the overall point I would make is I actually don't think, even to the extent that you sort of think that you want to ban these things, it doesn't seem to be working very well, like there's a kind of policy against it, but it doesn't really - like, if you look at .food, as (Dirk) mentioned, you know, that is a closed TLD for a network, a television network about food. Now the trademark is for a television - it's for television, not for food, right, and so therefore they were allowed that. They were allowed to close the TLD on that basis.

I think there will be always ways to sort of work around any restriction that's put in place here as long as you allow closed TLDs at all, right, which we probably will because we probably want companies that have generic names like .apple or something like that to continue to be able to close their TLDs. And to the extent that's allowed, there's going to be a way people figure out how to close the TLDs off.

So rather than, you know, trying to fight against this, let's just, you know, let people use TLDs as they want and, you know, let's see how it develops as opposed to, you know, imagining some mythical scenario in which having a TLD is going to somehow give you a competitive advantage, which you just never see in the domain name space ever.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I have Steve and then I have (Emily) with a remote at the moment. So, please, Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Avri. Steve DelBianco with the Business Constituency. We were among the groups that was quite concerned with one aspect of what we all call closed generic, and that was the notion of a competitor of an industry obtaining exclusive rights to control a TLD that was a generic phrase that to a business-focused consumer would have implied that that TLD was available to all competitors in the industry. So the notion that it was closed exclusively to a single competitor gave rise to the BC's concern.

So having said that, our concern survives but I believe the BC's current position was pretty clear from our comments. We don't think that in subsequent rounds we need to close and prohibit some notion of closed generic. Instead if we maintain the objection procedures such as string confusion, legal rights community, and public interests, there's an opportunity then to object to exclusive control if in fact we can force an applicant to declare their intention for open or closed, we have an opportunity to make objections precisely of the type that the BC has articulated in the past. Consumer confusion and competition concerns would arise from a closed generic being run by a competitor.

So we do not favor a blanket prohibition so long as those objection procedures are available. And if we do it that way, there isn't even any need to define the term closed or open generic. The need for that term go away if you simply allow applications to express whether they'll be closed or open, and if it's a term that could confuse consumers in a given market or industry, the objection procedure would be an opportunity to raise those concerns. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. I've got Emily with a remote, then I have Jeff and Kristina.

Emily: These are two questions from remote participants. First from Anne Aikman-Scalese of the IPC. "Standing GAC advice is that closed generics should be operated in the public interest. Should we really be talking about the public interest rather than closed generics or no closed generics?" End question.

And the second one from (Paul Foody). "Could you please clarify does generics refer to every TLD or just TLDs using generic terms, i.e. book, et cetera versus .microsoft, .google?" And noting there are some responses in the chat to that.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Jeff, it's yours and you may also want to answer the questions again.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. I think a number of people did a good job in the chat to answer (Paul)'s questions so - of what generic refers to. Basically it refers to what others refer as dictionary words or something used to describe a category of goods or services as opposed to being a brand. And so there's been some actually good back and forth on the chat, if people are in Adobe.

So I want to thank Steve for actually his comments because I think that was - I think it's a good suggestion and a way forward whereby it's not exclusively a prohibition but more towards addressing concerns and also provides an interesting path forward to not having to go down the roads as defining these terms but more defining the harms and then having like a basis he said for an objection or something like that. So I wrote that down with a lot of interest and I think that's a good path to follow in addressing the harms.

I also want to say that there's been some questions back and forth of why are we even addressing this and this is subject to GAC advice, it's a settled matter, things like that. And I just want to point out and remind everyone here that this was a board determination on its own. It did have some public comment but it was not a GNSO policy.

In addition, the board specifically asked the GNSO to formally address this in policy. So while appreciate the comments that are raised of this is settled, why are we even addressing it, I hope now because the board specifically

asked us to address it, hopefully we won't get those comments again. Thanks.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. And I'd also like to point out one other thing. With the way this particular PDP is being run where everything is reviewable, the notion that anything is settled is difficult to define because everything can be reviewed and also advice, even advice of a group such as the GAC, is never the final word on any of the issues. So I just want to say that the issue is indeed still discussable. Kristina, then I've got (Dirk) with his hand raised. Thank you.

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, Amazon. Given that our company's name has been brought up, I really felt that it was necessary to address the issue. First, I think it's important to note that at the time that the applicant guidebook was published and at the time that the application window was opened and closed, closed generics were not prohibited.

Part of the reason that Amazon submitted its applications for TLDs and identified a potential model, that has later been called closed generic, was to provide an opportunity for innovation. We heard a lot from ICANN about the gTLD program as being intended to foster and create innovation. And quite frankly we haven't seen much of that.

One of the advantages of having what is referred to as a closed generic is that the registry operator has an opportunity to innovate and gradually open the TLD. Because, as we all know, once you've allocated a domain name, unless you've got something in your registration policy or your acceptable use policy, that gives you the right to cancel the registration. You can't later restrict it to no matter how valid the innovation is, no matter how important it is.

And so what I really would like folks to do is let's look at the harm that we're actually trying to address here by saying that closed generics should not be permitted, and if the concern - if the harm can actually be identified and it

would be possible to put limitations on how the TLD could be used in a way or the criteria that once triggered would implicate the ability of the registry operator to continue to operate the TLD in that way, that's fine, but let's not kid ourselves. We haven't seen any innovation yet and unless we start thinking about this whole process a little bit more creatively, we're not going to.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I have (Dirk) next.

(Dirk): Yes, and the other topic really concerns cases like .food, where companies come up with a generic word, which is the brand then, and they could apply both as brand and as a closed generic based on the generic term, not like L'Oreal which just came up with .beauty which isn't protected as a trademark, and that makes it even more difficult to distinct between the closed - the generics and the generics of trademarks and used for that application, and there might come a number of more of applications in this kind of sort.

Avri Doria: Thank you, (Dirk). I have Kathy, then Michele, then Greg Shatan. And that probably is where I'm initially drawing the line under this one, given the amount of time. So, Kathy, please.

Kathy Kleiman: Kathy Kleiman. We're not saying it's a settled issue, what we're saying is that you've heard more on this topic than almost any other topic from the public, from the (unintelligible), from the GAC. This is a well heard topic with a lot of concerns about closed generics. I did want to read, since everyone's saying there's no harm that's been shown, I did want to read from the International Chamber of Commerce decision on .mobile, which has to do with a competitor - and this is how I might revise Steve DelBianco's proposal since it's a competitor who's coming in in the field as the registry, maybe not.

If it wasn't a competitor I could see perhaps some, you know, some value to your proposal but where it a competitor, think about this. And here I quote. "The establishment of unrestricted exclusive rights to a gTLD that is strongly

associated with a certain community or communities, particularly where those communities are or are likely to be active in the Internet's spheres seems to me inherently detrimental to those community's interests."

And it's unquestionably - as is unquestionably the case in this case, the wire - the mobile wireless community was objecting to -- actually twice -- to two different competitors in the field trying to have kind of that closed generic, that exclusive access. And so in this case, the International Chamber of Commerce expert did open it up and make it open. So to Steve's proposal, I'd say we need some very special consideration where the registry is a competitor in the field. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Jeff wanted to make a comment and also I wanted to note that since I drew a line under the list, Kristina came in and there's one remote, but I will, to be fair to the next work track, basically cut the conversation. So please be short.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. I just wanted to note, again, I guess I'm taking my chair hat off and just as a comment, that Kathy the .mobile case was sort of a retrofitted decision. It came after the board decided to prohibit closed generics and it was almost kind of a decision that seemed to backwards - in a backwards way try to use the board's closing of - or not allowing closed generics as justifying its decision. It was almost circular.

Kathy Kleiman: That was not a criteria in the decision.

Jeff Neuman: But what I'm saying - but I just want to make sure everyone knows the facts. Again, this is completely personal. I do want to say that, yes, there were a lot of comments, but when you go into it, a lot of the comments were by competitors, you're right, they were by competitors and one needs to consider is that because the competitors were upset that one of their other competitors applied for it but would have had a different position had they applied for it. So a lot of it is kind of reactionary, right?

I think we need to examine this issue, we need to look at harms, and I do appreciate the comment as well that it's hard to look at harms since it was never actually allowed. It's hard to figure out what harms there actually were. And, again, it's still a very open issue and completely appreciate all the comments.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I have Michele, Greg, and Kristina and a remote, but please be short. There's five minutes left on this.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Avri. Michele for the record. I've been on the record multiple times since back in 2012 or thereabouts with - on my opposition to the - to this concept of closed generics. I've written blog posts. Several of us have written letters to the ICANN board. We've written more public letters. We've had letters supporting our position coming from a wide variety of stakeholders from across the globe. So I find it a little bit sad that we're revisiting this and it's being viewed by some as being an open topic, whereas I considered it to be pretty much closed. But be that as it may.

If you look at what happened in the first round of new TLDs and you look at some of the applications that were originally submitted as closed and you look at what happened to them, so taking for example the case of .blog, I mean .blog it's one of those TLDs that lends itself beautifully to that kind of content expectation. You go to a .blog domain name, you're going to find a blog or something to do with blogging, bloggers or what have you.

They launched less than a year ago. They have close to 100,000 names active. And unlike many of the other TLDs out there, the percentage of parked domains is significantly lower. So that means that approximately, according to our own TLD stats, approximately 70% of .blog domain names are actively in use. So they're actually being used by companies and individuals and organizations around the world. So they are actually using those domain names to share content and to do interesting things.

And another example is the one of .cloud, which was applied for by at least one company that wanted to close off who could use it. Again, you're looking at a TLD that has in excess of 100,000 active names and these are companies and individuals who are operating sights, services, and everything else, you know, that in some cases does give you that innovation. Like food.cloud is a prime example.

If you have a look at food.cloud and have a look at what those guys are doing, that is innovation, and innovation is not something that I would see often coming from the registries, it's going to be coming from the content providers, the content generators, in other words the registrants of the domains.

The argument around competition is an interesting one, but for somebody like me, my opposition to this has nothing to do with competition. I don't have that skin in the game. I just want my clients to be able to register and use a .blog or a .cloud without having to jump through hoops. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Greg, please be brief.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. First, the term generic of course is troublesome, especially when you apply it to for something like food, which is a trademark, but I'm not going to get in that whole rabbit hole here. More thinking -- and this is my personal view -- if we're talking about innovation it would be - you can't decide kind of which types of innovation are good, which type are bad.

And while I agree with Michele that the innovation often relates to what content is there as well as what business model surrounds the TLD, it's clear that if somebody has a closed generic, they're also going to be the content provider in that generic, in that TLD. So they are - they're looking to innovate and to create content. I think that's a pretty good assumption.

And so deciding that, you know, books.com is okay but .books is not in terms of innovation, business.com is okay but .business is not, in terms of what can be closed and what can be open, a lot of it has to do with whether we review top level domains as spectrum in a sense or whether we view them more like second level domains and that they're going to be a billion of them maybe someday.

So some of it is philosophical too but I don't think that by closing off the concept of closed generics, we're fostering innovation, it's just a matter of trying to look at different business models and see which ones shake out. So personally I see, while there obviously should be some, you know, process around it, as Steve DelBianco has said, just shutting the door on it as a per se just seems to be going too far in the direction of stifling innovation. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Greg. As we've hit the hour, my apologies to Kristina, but you had a chance before so if it's okay I'm going to move on to the next.

Kristina Rosette: I actually am going to disagree with that because Kathy specifically referenced an objection…

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: …extremely short?

Kristina Rosette: Sure, absolutely. Jeff accurately pointed out one of several irregularities with that objection decision. Taking the view the discretion is the better part of valor, we'll leave it there. But I don't think this is the forum to litigate some of these objections.

Avri Doria: Thank you, and thank you, Michael. And the discussions will continue in track 2 I am sure, along with many other topics. And at this point I'd like to move to

Work Track 3. And who's…? Karen? Okay, thank you. So Karen, the floor is yours.

Karen Day: Thank you, Avri. This is Karen Day for the record. Today for Work Track 3 we are going to look at GAC advice and GAC early warnings. In our charter under Work Track 3 applicants freedom of expression, we were tasked with examining whether GAC advice, along with community processes and reserve names, impacted the goal, the stated goal and the principles of applicant freedom of expression.

First I want to run through a little brief history and give some - update you on some statistics from the 2012 round, and then we'll open it up to discussions on - and get your viewpoints on how GAC advice and GAC early warnings impacted the goals of the 2012 gTLD process.

First of all GAC early warning. This subject has an impact on predictability and our stated principle of affording applicants a predictable process. Then GAC advice has said before we look at that through the lens of how does this impact applicant freedom of expression. The GAC early warning process was developed to enable governments within the GAC to notify an applicant that its application was seen as potentially sensitive or problematic by one or more of the governments in the GAC.

If an applicant received an early warning, it could use the information to initiate discussions with the concerned government or there was the option of withdrawing the application within a short window after receiving the early warning. GAC early warnings were issued for 187 applications in November of 2012. Only two applications took the opportunity at that time to withdraw their application and receive the entitled refund.

Then the GAC advice process itself was intended to address applicants that were identified by governments to be problematic that potentially violated national law or raised sensitivities. The design of GAC advice in the gTLD

process was based upon the ICANN bylaws and the GAC operating principles.

So if we go on to Slide 2, there, we will see that of the 2012 round GAC advice and early warnings, only 38% of the applications that were subject to GAC advice actually received an early warning. So what we want to consider as we have this discussion today is does that reach our goal of providing predictability to applicants when we have a small number of applications that receive early warning, yet much later in the process we have a large number of applications that are subject to predictability - excuse me, subject to GAC advice.

If we go on to Slide 3, there we go. GAC advice -- excuse me -- was enumerated in Section 3-1 of the applicant guidebook and it describes three possible forms that the GAC advice could come in. We have GAC advice enumerated for you here on the slide, GAC advice that's consensus advice, GAC advise where concerns were expressed, and then GAC advice where remediation is suggested. Those are the three types of GAC advice that were anticipated in the applicant guidebook.

And as we can see here, on the GAC advice issued on specific applications, the numbers are broken out. Six of that - six of those were consensus advice, two of those were under the category two concerns expressed, we had nine under category three outlined the AGB, applicant guidebook, as remediation suggested, and then we had 18 application-specific pieces of GAC advice issued that did not fall into one of the predefined categories.

Next slide, please. Then in the Beijing communiqué the GAC also had two annexes where they issued more generic advice, more broad category advice on groups of applications or groups of strings. And you can see those numbers here of - the top graph is of the specific application advice, the bottom graph is of a string-related advice, which covered multiple applications.

GAC defined category one strings as -- excuse me -- consumer-protection sensitive strings and regulated markets. Category two was broken into two parts. Part one of category two was for strings. The registration restriction should be appropriate for the type of risk associated with that TLD. And part two of the category two advice list was for strings representing generic terms. Exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal.

So this is an overview of the design of GAC input into the application process for the 2012 round. These are some of the numbers that we have to deal with. And now the questions before us are, again, did the early warning process as designed serve our principle, our goal of predictability for applicants, and secondly, did the GAC advice process have any impact on the stated principle of allowing application freedom of expression. So those are what we are looking for input on today, and we'll open the floor up.

Avri Doria: Thank you. That gives us about 20 minutes for a discussion of this. I've been informed that Kristina's hand is stuck and that it's not an active hand, but please let us know if indeed it becomes and active hand. So Steve DelBianco, you're first. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Avri. Steve DelBianco from the Business Constituency. My recollection is early warning was an attempt to be fair to an applicant and the GAC was a conduit for an early warning objection from a government. So it's very different than principled substantive GAC advice about general things like closed generic and public safety.

The presentation thus far sort of conflated the notion of early warnings on a particular string, perhaps from a particular government, to more global advice from the GAC that comes later. And I know that's what any members of the PDP think, it might be what a public person might perceive when they look at the slides.

So let's try, please, to separate an early warning about an objection that's coming from a government to your string. That's a perfectly appropriate mechanism to provoke the discussion that has to happen and to allow the applicant to modify their application, obtain a removal of the objection or perhaps take their money back and give it up.

So parking that aside, turning to the GAC advice that comes down in principle, the question would be is the GAC advice that we already have received from this prior round is it all still in effect? Do they still reflect GAC's views and do we assume that they have to be adhered to in the next subsequent rounds or does GAC want the opportunity to revise and extend its advice judging be the experience of what's happened and the new procedures and mechanisms that are implemented?

We could fall into a trap in the sense that we'll ask GAC what do you think of this new procedure for the subsequent round and GAC's answer is see our advice from 2016 or see our advice from 2014. Sometimes things have moved on, we've made changes, and the GAC doesn't adequately consider that in its advice. And remember there are new rules with respect to GAC advice as a result of the transition in terms of locking in the notion of consensus. I don't think that'll affect the advice but it's there as a break on a small population of governments obtaining advice. It now has to be consensus advice to carry that higher level. So are you considering the early warning as a complete distinction for more general GAC advice that applies to all applications?

Avri Doria: Thank you. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Avri. Michele for the record. I mean Steve does raise some very valid points. And I suppose one of them for somebody like myself who has a specific interest in the closed generics topic, you know, the governments were pretty clear on that. Unless the GAC were to say to the community that

they suddenly changed their view on that, then I would see that as being one way of closing that off once and for all.

The other one which I think has come up in multiple occasions over the last couple of years is around I think it's the country names and certain other terms that as some governments to have issues with but other governments don't seem to care. And, you know, that kind of thing where you have - where as an applicant or as a registry operator you don't know whether you can actually proceed or not to actually offer these domains, that kind of inconsistency is problematic.

Being able to say with, you know, assurance, even whatever they are saying is - might be a little bit strange but at least knowing, okay, that is the rule, that is the view would be a lot saner for all parties concerns. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Jim?

Jim Prendergast: Michele, we're really vibing today. This is Jim Prendergast. One of the new GNSO principles for the new gTLD program was predictability for applicants. I don't think any of the applicants in the 2012 round predicted the scope and the detail and the breadth and depth of the GAC advice received. I think it's five years now and we're still - I asked the question in the chat room, has it been implemented, is it - are we done with it or is it still outstanding?

So I'm going to throw what I would say is a very radical idea out there and I'll probably get laughed out of the room but I think it's something we should seriously consider and that is, having been through this big round where the GAC has invested a lot of time, energy, and effort in developing advice and delivering it to the community, what more is there that GAC could give advice on? We've sort of seen it all.

Now there may be one or two strings that come along in the future that do deserve an objection, and I'm not saying that should be foreclosed, but the

broad blanket GAC advice that impacts applicants that, you know, who are just trying to go out there and run a business and aren't trying to walk the edge, why can't we ask that the GAC have its advice finalized before the opening of the application window to provide predictability to applicants?

Avri Doria: Thank you. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. As a co-chair of the overall group, I appreciate you throwing out radical ideas and I'll throw out one again, not because of a personal view but I think it's something we need to address. So initially when the concept of GAC advice came up, it was not a given that it would create what I think the guidebook now says is a rebuttable presumption that the TLD won't go forward. That was actually a separately negotiated item between the GAC and the board the resulted out of the 2011 Brussels consultation.

So my radical question is do we still believe that GAC advice should be a rebuttable presumption that the TLD should not move forward? Again, this is just throwing the question out there. I have no personal - I'm not expressing a personal view on this.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Could either you or (Emily) call who's next? My computer just died on me and while I'm trying to get it back, would you take over? Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. So Volker is next in fact, followed by Maxim.

Volker Greimann: Yes. Maybe just an annex to this topic. The influence of the GAC over the new gTLDs does not only extend to the TLDs that are distributed where they can give advice but they are also extremely a large part of (unintelligible) of how an allocated gTLD is actually being used as in what second level domains can be registered if they, for example, mirror a country name or a abbreviation of that.

And that also severely limits the ability of applicants, especially .brands but other applicants as well, to allocate second level domain names to themselves or to customers that they might have a very good non-infringing and non-confusing method to use but cannot use overall in general because every country has their own principles of how to allow - to allocate the allocation or even not to allow the allocation of these domain names. So that's something that we maybe want to consider as well by turning this around, allowing the GAC or the countries the veto power after the domain has been allocated and is used in an abused way instead of prohibiting the allocation altogether.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Volker. Next is Maxim and then I see there is a comment in the remote so we'll bring that up after Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually just a small notice. If we ignore - yes if ICANN ignores GAC advice, it might lead to creation of local legislative acts which regulate us. And I think it's simpler to just follow the unfortunately current unpleasant procedures but not to be regulated by local laws. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Maxim. I'll put myself in just to say just to respond to that. I hope my comments weren't taken, although they may have been, as saying you should ignore GAC advice, it was merely saying that there's - the board can accept GAC advice or can reject it but there's also a provision in the guidebook that specifically states that if GAC advice is provided against the top level domain, that creates a presumption that the domain won't be accepted. So my question was more towards that statement in the guidebook. That was not - there is a distinction. So I just want to draw that out.

I'll come back to you Maxim in a second. Let me go to Donna - actually, no, there was a remote. (Emily), do you want to read the remote?

(Emily):   This is a question from Anne Aikman-Scalese of the IPC. "Regarding new rules, isn't true that one of the new rules is that the board can only go against GAC consensus advice with a 60% vote?" End question.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks. I think my last comment hopefully addressed that. It wasn't - I hope, Anne, that addressed it. I'm going to go to Maxim to respond, then Donna, then Greg.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Just to respond to that, unfortunately governments are not bound by (unintelligible). That's it, thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks Maxim. Donna, then Greg.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Jeff. Donna Austin from Neustar. Just in relation to category one and category two, so I think they were identified as highly regulated and regulated strings, that's the categorization that they used. I think the GAC advice also said at the time that they - that the list was not exhaustive. So my question is, you know, what - should we be looking to the GAC to identify, you know, what are highly regulated strings, what's a regulated string?

                And - because I can see that potentially new gTLD applicants for any future round that might be considered a highly regulated or regulated - they should give a heads up that, you know, this is potentially going to impact them in some way with regards to safeguards. So I think it might be understanding what the category is and whether safeguards are automatically applied to it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Donna. We'll note that question. We have next Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. Again, this is a purely personal observation. I don't think there's any reason to assume that the only two choices are to consider GAC advice as sacrosanct or believe that we're going to go to a scheme of national regulation and Internet fragmentation and the end of the world as we know it. GAC advice was on the previous round.

Everything is open for consideration and the GAC will have its opportunity to give advice on this version as well. So I would not create a rebuttal presumption that the GAC advice is perpetual. You know, we'll need to consider everything on its more merits. Ultimately this will all get worked out in the process. And that's why we have a process.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Greg. Samantha?

Samantha: Thanks, Jeff. Samantha with Serans. In response to what Greg just said, I mean I'm in agreement. I don't think there's any way to really predict what the GAC may or may not do. So I guess a question to pose to the group is does this group have any power to kind of make policy that puts the GAC in a lane and make sure that the governments stay in that lane?

Avri Doria: Whether the group has any power or not is a difficult question to answer. We certainly can make recommendations. If the GNSO approves those recommendations, then the board has to deal with them as GNSO recommendations that have a supermajority that requires, you know, them to take the measure. So is that power? I don't know. Can we make recommendations? Certainly, I believe so.

Jeff Neuman: Yes on that one too, I mean, you know, obviously the role of the GAC in ICANN is a much a bigger issue than this group but we could, in theory, again this is not necessarily my view, but in theory we could say we recommend that the provision that makes GAC advice a rebuttable or - that makes it a presumption that the TLD won't be delegated should be removed. That does create a little uncertainty as to what the board then will do with GAC advice other than what's in the bylaws as to what it has to do with GAC advice.

We could also say that we recommend that if GAC - if the GAC does provide advice that it should go back to the GNSO for its thoughts on that issue. These are things I'm not, again, I'm not suggesting we do it, but there are

things if we as a group felt strongly about we could make recommendations on. Whether the board accepts it or not is something completely different.

So I'm seeing an empty queue. Does anybody else want to jump in? How much time do we have on this?

Avri Doria: We only have five minutes left.

Jeff Neuman: We have five minutes. Okay Kathy wants to jump in and Michele.

Avri Doria: We have five minutes, then we have to close it out.

Kathy Kleiman: Kathy Kleiman. I normally find myself agreeing with Jim but what you said kind of keeps resonating in my head and, I don't know, I have to disagree. I think there will be something new under the sun coming in and I think the GAC will probably have things to say and I think there are things we didn't see in round one. So I don't - I think they'll tell us they can't anticipate everything ahead of time. So. The early warnings were a fascinating process and I think they helped. I mean I think they helped a lot of applicants or at least I think cutting it off will not be beneficial. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Kathy. I have Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Jeff. Michele for the record. I'm just - going back a little on a couple of comments others made around .brand registries and TLDs, I think this is something that needs to be addressed somehow, and I honestly don't know how. But to do so would involve accepting the concept of some form of categorization of TLDs and strings in that at present a lot of .brand applicants and registries are faced with restrictions around the strings that they are able to delegate.

They're not able to delegate I think it's the country codes, the country names. And, you know, the question I've always thought about is, you know, what's

the harm? It's, you know, it's a close registry, it's not open to the public. You have a single registrant. If they want to register crazystring.brand, let them. If they want to register ie.brand, fr.brand, Ireland.brand, what's the actual harm? And I think that's something that needs to be addressed with the GAC separately from many of the other issues because this is the kind of thing that where I would say, yes, this does stifle innovation, this does have a negative impact on consumer choice.

Because the thing with the .brand, if done right it means that you're able to say to a consumer, and again this comes back to my point about content expectation, if I go to ie.amazon for example then I would - excuse me? Oh, sorry, Kristina, that wasn't intentional. Just both of you were sitting across from me. I'm sorry. My apologies. I wasn't trying to poke the beast. Not helping, sorry.

If I go to - so let's say -- I'll choose my own company -- if you were to go to ie.blackknight you would expect to find information about Irish operations in either Irish or English, if you go to fr.blackknight, you'd expect to see it in French and you would know it was run by that company. Whereas if you go to blackknight.whatever unless we go off and get an EVS, a sales cert that gives you that nice bit of assurance that it's registered to the company name, you don't have the same level of assurance.

But I think that's some - that kind of thing, being able to clearly carve that out is something that does need to be addressed and to get the GAC to understand this is a different type of TLD, it's not the same as an open one that's open to anybody. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Michele. And just to note that that issue is actually one that is being addressed in Work Track 2. So that's the legal and regulatory one. And they've had discussions on that and if - so we'll take down your points and make sure it goes there. There is a remote and then we'll go to Work Track 4.

Emily: This is a comment from (Yannik Scow Thompson Trumplock). "If GAC
                ICANN decides to keep safeguards, these should not be allowed to be added
                after the announcement of the opening of the application window. And the
                requirement to enter into agreements with sector industries should not be
                delayed. This is hard to find/define in all cases and gTLDs can be
                international." End comment.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Emily. Okay. With that I want to go to Work Track 4 and so I know
                (Cheryl) and (Rubens) are both here. And (Rubens) you're taking the mic?
                Okay. Can we go to the slides for Work Track 4.

Rubens: Thank you all. Good morning. Testing, testing, 1, 2, 3, yes better. You're
                actually ambitious to have selected five topics to discuss here. So we'll just
                discuss them till we run out of time. The first one is IDN variant TLDs, which
                is one we already discussed but have received comments from ICANN staff,
                from SSAC and some others.

                There's currently - in the current GNSO policy recommendations there is one
                that has been used to prevent buying TLDs so far, which is to say that strings
                must not be confusingly similar to an existing top level domain or apply for top
                level domain. We discussed some implementation, possible implementation
                solution, identified three of those, but preferred to not prescribe a specific one
                and we also preferred not to specify whether implementation should prescribe
                one or whether implementation should prescribe that to an applicant's
                discretion. That's where we are so far.

                And one of the reasons for doing this discussion is to confirm that we are
                okay with that. So possible language to it would be that IDN gTLDs need to
                be variants of already existing or applying for TLDs would be allowed
                provided they have the same registry operator implementation (unintelligible)
                by force of agreement, a policy of cross-variant TLD bundling and it must also
                be true that top level label generation rules and second level label generation

rules were already established for that script and language at time of evaluation.

So first Work Track 4 question is are we comfortable with leaving these to implementation discretion or to an applicant's discretion or not? Or do we think that this possible language reflects Work Track 4 consensus? I'll give people some seconds to think of that.

Avri Doria: Kristina?

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, Amazon Registry. Thanks, (Rubens). I just have a couple clarifying questions. When you say a policy of cross-variant TLD bundling, does that mean that when a registrant registers a second level name in one of those IDNs they automatically be deemed to have the same second level name in one of the variant that the registry operator is operating?

Rubens: That's up to implementation. So it depends on one - at least one of the implementations that would be true, but it would at least have that registrant let's say a reserve capacity for that other string. So if you register one, that same registrant would be the only one that could register the other variants.

Kristina Rosette: Got it, okay. And I'm cognizant of the fact that Paul Diaz is sitting right behind you and can probably speak to this more knowledgeably, but my recollection is that PIIR does an RSEP for bundling in NGO and ONG. Under this proposal would the registry operator once they go through the whole process, would they then have to do an RSEP so that they could do this or would it be implemented just solely through the contract?

Rubens: One of the three possible implementation solutions is actually the PIIR, NGO ONG bundling, but whether that would be up to a new RSEP or not is yet to implementation. It's not something that - if we close it on one specific implementation, we could say that oh that doesn't require anything new, but depending on implementation policies, if it is - if specific implementation for

the applicant that might or not require an RSEP. So that's not a question that we can answer without closing. So since the work track prefers not to close on a specific implementation, I cannot answer that at this point.

Kristina Rosette: Got it. And then the last part of the clarifying question is what's the down side to that, this proposal?

Rubens: I don't see none but I don't remember anyone bringing one up. So the downside of not adopting this is what we have today, that we can delegate variant TLDs. So for instance, the city of Quebec couldn't apply to Quebec written as in French. So they will be meant to do that but I can tell them not to. So I haven't - I only remember seeing upsides and not downsides. But Maxim has hand up. Sorry, Avri. I'll let you manage the queue. Sorry.

Avri Doria: So yes, thank you. I did have Maxim with his hand up but I have (Emily) with a remote before and - okay, then Maxim and then Jordyn.

Emily: A question from (Yannik Scow Thompson Trumplock). "Any chance Latin-like characters such as the German umlaut, the French (ex onti gu), the Danish vowels with two dots over them could be accepted as variants?" End question.

Avri Doria: And Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: I'd just like to share the relevant experience as a TLD which has Moscow and (Mosqua). One is (unintelligible), the other is only Cyrillic Russian. At this point in time we decided that we do not bundle. All we need is just the advertisement that both are available. And end users are pretty good at knowing what they need actually and they removed all this mess with (unintelligible). And to say more, for some reason for example old issue of small letter l and 1 and capital I is not still resolved in English, while trying to squeeze possibilities and to make it more for the IDNs. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Jordyn?

Jordyn Buchanan: Thanks. This is Jordyn Buchanan from Google. I just wanted to comment, first of all I mostly like this language and, to (Rubens)' point, it seems like it creates a lot of opportunities without a lot of downside. I would say I would tweak the first condition, number one here, to not necessarily require that the same the registry operator enforce the cross-variant bundling, just that it is enforced.

You could imagine scenarios in which like in a, you know, you might have a registry operator in Taiwan and another one in mainland China that like, you know, figure out how to technically coordinate to automatically deliver bundled TLDs as opposed to necessarily having it in the same TLD or the same registry operator.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. I have no more in the list, so I guess it goes back to you, (Rubens), for your next question.

Rubens: Thank you. Could you go to the next slide?

Avri Doria: People with their hands up may want to put them down for confusion's sake, thank you.

Rubens: The other topic we had discussed was name collision framework for subsequent procedures, both work track discussions and procedural comments. And what we come to was for those name collisions procedures to use data-driven decision, using data that's accessible at least for research purpose, even if they are not public database for ICANN organization to provide the do not apply list, which they already did for 2012 round, but also exercise care strings.

So that would be a list of strings that are more prone to name collisions and that list didn't - although it was suggested by RSAC, ICANN didn't manage to

publish such a list last time, and we're hoping that now they do that. Every application could file a collision mitigation framework whether for a string not on that list or not, so they could be proactively saying what they will do in case of name collisions or apply for strings (unintelligible) to the risk of collision, which they already did in the 2012 round.

We mentioned three risk levels: low risk, elevated risk, or high right. The intermediate level name is up from grabs, if anyone wants to suggest a better one. If the applicant string was to deemed to be high risk, that would terminate the application but if this was deemed to be an elevated risk, then it gave the applicant an opportunity to file a mitigation framework or it already filed a mitigation framework, that framework to be evaluated.

Could we go to the next slide, which is for the same, this same topic? All low risk strings would have a common framework that would be mostly the same as we used in the 2012 round without interruption, but the suggestion was we start without interruption as soon as the classification for low risk was given. So this would put a collision framework into the management of the ICANN organization instead of the applicant so they can start right away long before a contract is even signed.

We started on a 90-day interruption period due to the - being the consensus option, even though there were people that disagreed. If the - some mitigation framework needed, it would be evaluated by the registry service technical evaluation panel, which already exists for gTLDs and for applications. There shouldn't be any alternative path to delegation or any other per label lists unless some specific mitigation was required for them. Any possible label specific could either be the standardized current response or something that would return an existing domain as soon if ICANN approves it, so specific cases that would require the mitigation technique would be used.

(Unintelligible) is not something that we settled on yet. And we mentioned that we should do outreach like ITF DNS operations list, (unintelligible) DNS

work group and DNS wide membership on that framework. So the question here is do everyone mostly agree with what's been proposed so we can start doing outreach of these ideas or do we need to discuss them more among ourselves?

Avri Doria: Thank you. I have two names. I have Volker and Jordyn. So, Volker, please.

Volker Greimann: Thank you. Volker Greimann speaking for the record. First, one question. I mean we've gone through the entire exercise of controlled interruptions and what have you in the first round of gTLDs. Do we have any findings or results or comments from anyone that would have been affected and has been saved by a controlled interruption? Do we have any thank-you notes, do we have anything that shows that this was actually a necessary undertaking or was it just a big waste of time for a registry operator or for ICANN?

It seems to me always being similar to shooting cannons, cannons being the proposed remedy, at sparrows, sparrows being the perceived problems, and therefore I would like to see before we embark on this undertaking, if there's any feedback that we have received from controlled interruption in the first round.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Did you want to…?

Rubens: Volker, there are very anecdotal reports of people noticing the controlled interruption, usually people complaining, saying my internal website is not working anymore due to the controlled interruption. So we know it has at least been useful for people. It was possibly exaggerated that it could make - kill someone, some could die from controlled interruption. So that part was a bit of an overreach, but it has shown to be useful.

Avri Doria: Thank you, (Rubens). This is Avri speaking. And I said that this is Avri. We have to remember to give our names at the beginning. I haven't been but

neither have others. So please. Next I have Jordyn and the I have (Sarah L). Please go ahead, Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchanan: Sure. It's Jordyn Buchanan. And just to sort of enhance (Rubens)' response to get to - before I get to my question, we've certainly seen a number of instances where controlled interruption provoked a response, and in one case went so far as to withdraw our controlled interruption setup and wait on continuing to proceed with the TLD because it broke third party applications sufficiently badly that we wanted to give them some time to correct it. But that's been unusual and we had the flexibility to do that.

I will say that I think we've seen very little evidence to support the 90-day period. Like almost all the problems that controlled interruptions has identified came very, very quickly, probably within the first few days or certainly the first 30 days of a controlled interruption delegation. We have some TLDs that we have kept in a controlled interruption state for a long period of time, years in some cases, and the most interrupty (sic) of those I still see a trickle of complaints, but there wasn't really a difference between 30 days and 90 days in terms of response.

I have a question though, (Rubens). Is this framework intended to also apply to the remaining TLDs from the previous 2012 round that are still sort of stuck in limbo as a result of not being sure what to do as a result of name collision issues? And if - let me just start with the question.

Rubens: Thank you, Jordyn. (Rubens) here. It's not intended to address those issues since it's not in our charter. So it's not in our work charter to decide what to do with (.home), (.cork) and (.mail), but we probably have no objection of ICANN applying that to those but it's not we have the authority to describe.

Jordyn Buchanan: So yes, I would just certainly suggest that the - like, even if it requires re-chartering, like having the GNSO actually resolve this issue once and for all, not for those three specifically but passing a general policy to resolve issues

of name collision as opposed to passing one going forward and leaving a gap with regards to the in-limbo names from the previous round. Because the GNSO should be deciding that issue and as so far is seems like as a policy matter, it's just been delegated to letting the board and staff sort of make up stuff on the fly.

Avri Doria: This is Avri to comment. And while I agree that that issue seems to have been rendered to limbo, I don't think that it - re-chartering this group makes any sense. Certainly making an appeal to the GNSO directly by those that care that they do something about it is a reasonable thing, but to change this group's focus and have it be backward looking would probably put us in a very difficult situation and make the progress much more difficult. So. But certainly you going to the GNSO and recommending that they look at something, that would be a different issue. But I would certainly be uncomfortable.

Jordyn Buchanan: Avri, I don't think it requires a broad re-chartering. I don't think there's many pending issues from the previous round, but this is one, and there shouldn't be like a donut where there's a hole left where we say like oh we figured out policy going forward, there's not policy from the past and therefore the stuff is just stuck forever.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. So next (Sarah)?

Sarah: Thanks, Avri. And I understand that people are looking for expediency here. We're seeing it in this discussion. We saw it in the run up to the 2012 discussions. And when you just look at it at face value, some can categorize name collision and the name collision period as getting in the way of this expediency, but let's look at the statistics. Jordyn just talked about an issue that Google encountered.

ICANN received at least 37 formal reports of name collisions. I don't know, Jordyn, if that's included in the one that you're talking about here. That's just

what was reported. We believe that there were more that were never formally reported.

There've also been discussions about how controlled interruption as designed wasn't effective in dealing with a large and unpredictable number of attack scenarios and some recommended solutions, such as Internet protocol version six, or IPV6 solution for controlled interruption hasn't even been acted upon yet. And we shouldn't make changes to name collision without a new and informed position on this topic. You know, we can't go about dismissing security implications of name collisions in lieu of expediency again. I just wanted to put that in there. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I've got Maxim and then I've got Jeff.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba. Just a historical thing. The name collision was based on (Jaz)'s report of the life of the Internet, which was taken during not so statistically clear period where everybody was trying to answer all kind of wild things into the browsers. And when they were asked during the sessions to provide us probability of reoccurrences, they were asked more than five times, they failed to do so. And without probability, it's just a list of symbols. It means nothing. So I think that only high risk things. We should have two deep in the current software and hardware important, and medium risk, small risk, it's the same. It's almost nothing.

Avri Doria: Thank you for the data point. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. Just a quick point. I posted it in the chat. There is a final report that was done by (Jaz) that talks about I think our - I should say it this way, I think the recommendation that is (Rubens) has presented is in line with the recommendations from the (Jaz) final report. So there is some support there for these recommendations.

I'm not sure, I don't think the final report went out for any kind of comments or anything. There were comments to the initial reports but I haven't seen anything. But (Sarah), for those comments, if there are comments on the final report and VeriSign wants to submit them or anyone wants to submit them, I think we'd love to see that. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. This is Avri again. With that, I don't - I no longer have a queue for this. We have eight minutes left without going to final, so do you have another question you think you can fit in adequately within that eight minutes?

Rubens: Thank you, Avri. I just want to respond to one of (Sarah)'s point about IPV6 and controlled interruption. DNS protocol is agnostic (unintelligible) or IPV6. So even a DNS recursive server serving and IPV6 only network would still get the IPV4 controlled interruption response and could act upon it.

So it's not that IPV6-only networks would not see it, they would still need to decode it as saying, oh, this is controlled interruption, and that would still happen. So the fact that we don't have it, so it's not really a problem unless we phase out IPV4 of all DNS servers on the Internet, which is not the case. ICANN still requires all TLD service to also have IPV4 and so forth. So that's not a problem.

So we can go to one more topic. So we can go to the next slide, please.

Avri Doria: Actually at this point, first of all (Sarah), is that a new hand up?

Sarah: Thank you. I was just going to say that's not the only recommended solution that wasn't put in place. That was just an example of one, but thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. At this point -- this is Avri speaking again -- I'm going to beg the indulgence of Work Track 4 in that you were so efficient, you made it through two topics, we've got only five minutes left, and it's been a very conversation

full. So please, you know, next time maybe I'll put you first and go in the reverse order so the advantages fall differently. But I wanted to thank you for that and apologize.

So with five minutes left, I wanted to take a chance. So basically we've gone through about a third of the topics that are being discussed in the working group. All of these are still in progress. None of these have been closed out yet, even where a group is advanced as Work Track 4 is already talking about, you know, proposed conclusions with almost word-smithing, there's still lots of conversation, lots of opportunity to get involved.

I want to really thank everybody for having gotten as involved as they did in this conversation and that I want to remind people that we stayed away from one huge subject, which will be coming up later today in the geo names at the top level cross-community discussions. We stayed away from that. We're hoping for a lively conversation there on those issues. So we're not quite done with new gTLD subsequent procedures yet.

You know, I want to thank everybody. Jeff, did you have anything you wanted to add? So gee, we're going to actually end with a little bit of time. I do want to ask if there's any other business that anybody wanted to bring up? It's on the agenda and I wanted to make sure that we did hit that question. I see no one with any other business. Oh yes, I do.

Jonathan Robinson: I know you - it's Jonathan Robinson. I know you (unintelligible) I mean did you flag - I mean - and maybe you can clarify that the meeting today on geographic names is to be focused around the strawman proposal from the two co-chairs or is it, you know, just to give it a couple of words on, you know, how see the structure and organization of that relating to this group. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Jeff, please.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. You're going to ruin the surprise, Jonathan. No. It's - yes, so
                 essentially the format for today is basically to go over very briefly kind of a
                 history of what we're doing here, why we're here. Then the facilitators, we
                 have facilitators from an organization called CBI, Consensus Building
                 Institute, very, very impressed with them. Great, great team. They are going
                 to give their impressions of they had some discussions with a number of
                 members of the community. They're going to try to summarize the different
                 concerns as kind of a neutral player.

                 And they, yes, we will start with the - we have a series of questions based on
                 the straw person example to just kick off discussions. And so that's basically
                 the format of today. We'll try to then take the outcomes of today to set the
                 agenda for the sessions on when - Thursday, sorry. And then, you know, one
                 of the things we really hope to achieve is a comfort level within the
                 community that within subsequent procedures, whether it's we create a
                 separate work track or however we deal with it, that we can discuss the
                 geographic names issues at the top level in one place as opposed to a
                 number of different efforts that are underway.

                 So I think from my perspective, and Avri may have a little bit different
                 perspective or the same, I think we can define, you know, we're not expecting
                 to come out of the sessions this week with an agreed upon proposal as this is
                 the definitive proposal. We would be happy with a path forward, an agreed
                 upon path forward as well as kind of a recognition that within the GNSO PDP
                 is the place to work on this solution.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. And apologies for referring to that as a strawman, not a straw
                 person, which it is how it's described.

Avri Doria: We went through quite a list of names, and I had a different name that I
                 wanted to use but he wouldn't do it. Yes, I essentially agree. And it's basically
                 what we're starting this afternoon is essentially a three-day process during
                 the - there's another three hours of it on Thursday and so today starts the

discussion, tomorrow the team from CBI will be here and be talking to people and see how they can find ways to move it forward, and then we'll have the meeting again on Thursday. So it's really a process that's starting here.

I have high expectations and hopes for it but, yes, we'll see where it goes. So with that, any other other business? I want to thank the team leaders for the preparation and the talks and all of you for contributions. I want to thank the staff team for their efforts in keeping us going and keeping us coordinated, and couldn't do it without them really and probably wouldn't even try. So. And so, yes, Michael had suggested that we have a round of applause for (Steve), (Emily), and Julie. It's up to you. You can start it. They keep shaking their heads at me, but.

And thank you all for this morning and hope to see you all at geo names at the top level later today. Thanks. The meeting is closed.

END