ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call
Monday, 30 May 2017 at 15:00 UTC
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 audio is also available at: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-30may17-en.mp3

Adobe Connect Recording: https://participate.icann.org/p21dituonyc/

Attendance of the calls is also posted on the agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/CtTRAw

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Coordinator: Recordings are started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. And welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent procedures working group call on the 30th of May 2017 at 1500 UTC.

In the interest time there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. Kavouss and Louie I have you both listed on audio only. Is there anyone else in addition on audio only at this time?

Hearing no further names, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this I will turn it back over to our co-chair, Avri Doria. Please begin.

Avri Doria: Thank you Terri, and hello everybody. Okay first to review the agenda we will first go through the SOIs, then go through the work track updates. Basically,

what has happened in them since we last spoke in full meeting and where they are headed over the next couple of weeks.

Then there will be a quick update on community comments too. There will be an update and discussion on the GDD's response to the select questions from the GDD Summit that is referred to issues that at the time were being called. Gating issues so that terminology may not be accurate.

Then we are going to go to the second one of the drafting team updates. In this case it is framework for community engagement and predictability. We will do a walkthrough of that and see if we can generate some interest and some conversation on that.

I am very happy by the way, just as an aside with the amount of conversation we got going and even list activity that we got from the last meeting's discussion of one of the drafting team issues on category.

So it did bleed into the next one on rounds first come first serve or whatever. But that is the way all of our issues are interconnected. And then any other business.

Does anybody have any other business they want to add to the agenda right at this point? Okay I will ask again when we get there. So thanks.

Any changes or comments, amendments, what have you to the agenda? Okay well then we will go with that agenda.

In starting I want to mention as always the statements of interest. Remind people that if their circumstances change especially in any way that relates to the work of this PDP Working Group they need to update the SOI and let the group know.

Has anybody made any changes at this point that meet that qualification? Seeing none, hearing none. Okay move onto work track update.

So for Work Track 1 let me see I haven't noticed which of the co-chairs we have yet. If the co-chair willing to report raises their hand I can call on you. Do we have – thank you Christa. Please go ahead.

Christa Taylor: Hi can you hear me?

Avri Doria: Lightly but I can hear you.

Christa Taylor: Sorry I will speak loud. Christa Taylor for the record. For Work Track 1 we haven't had a meeting in the last (unintelligible) but we do have a meeting in two hours from now at (unintelligible) UTC.

The agenda is (unintelligible) topics the current progress and where we are going to go from there. And revert back to the RSP document and (unintelligible) requirement.

So for anyone we just sent out the agenda a few minutes ago. There is a link in there if anybody wants go to the Google document and/or (unintelligible). That is it.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Are there any questions for Christa? Okay seeing none we will move onto Work Track 2. Yes (Michael). Please thank you.

(Michael): All right thank you Avri. In Working Chart 2 we have a meeting scheduled for this week on Thursday at 21 UTC this week. We were looking at discussing, having a continuation of the discussion on vertical integration. I almost said virtual integration, sorry vertical integration.

But it seems that the data that we requested back from ICANN staff is still not available. So we are going to be likely moving onto the global public interest and discussing that. Unless we can get that data back.

If we can hit global public interest this week we will have covered every topic in our working track at least once. Big round of applause. Thank you everyone for coming to the meetings.

But then we will also have one more meeting before the (Joburg) ICANN meeting. And that will be in two more weeks after this week. So thank you very much. We look forward to seeing (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Thank you (Michael). Are there any questions or comments for Work Track 2?

Okay seeing nothing, hearing nothing. Yes Jonathan.

Jonathan: Thanks Avri. Quick question and if I am missing something or if it is inappropriate to ask it now it is fine I understand.

But I just wondered if there was any sort of outcome or initial conclusions on vertical integration? That peaked my interest and if it is more appropriate to simply point me to the document that is fine. But that is the question thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. (Michael) I see your hand is up so please go ahead.

(Michael):   Thank you for the question Jonathan. While we have not reached any conclusions at this point basically what we are looking at is whether or not we really even need to kind of reopen the discussion itself.

It is a big and very debatable issue. But at the same time we are actually looking at seeing if there is important data to try to see what – to see if any of the original, you know, harms or the potential harms that were thought of that

would come up with vertical integration came about in the New gTLD program.

We are requesting some data from ICANN to see if we can find kind of evidence of any of that harm happening. Sorry, any harm that might have taken place.

And if we do – are able to find that then we may go further into discussion to see if there is not some recommendations that we need to come up with there. So I see (Jeff) also probably wants to contribute on this issue.

Avri Doria: Please (Jeff) go ahead.

(Jeff): Thanks Avri and thanks (Michael). Jonathan I would just say I guess what (Michael) said just a little bit differently. And that the chairs had recommended that or had positioned that, you know, the door is open, the cat is out of the bag if you will on vertical integration.

So the question now is not necessarily should we have vertical integrated entities or not? But really does the contract and the circumstances allow for the flexibility and the – what is the word?

The efficiencies that were predicted by the economists in opening this space up while at the same time limit the harms that were potentially created by opening up integrated entities.

And if not, what things could we do to either increase the efficiencies that were intended while at the same time and/or limit the harms that were predicted if in fact there are harms? So it is really just around the edges and not opening up the whole issue.

Avri Doria: Thank you (Jeff). Any further comments? Okay and I do invite people to go to the work track meetings on some of these issues if they come up if you do have concerns.

Okay then I will move onto Work Track 3. So Karen or Robin or which one of you – yes Robin please go ahead.

Robin: Hi this is Robin. Can you hear me okay?

Avri Doria: Yes I can thank you.

Robin: Can you hear me? Okay great. Yes so in Work Track 3 our last meeting we had some really good conversations again about (unintelligible) community, the benefits of the process, how it can evolve for next time which I believe somebody taken a stab of a first draft of how we could more carefully define community.

And so now we will have some discussions about that. Hopefully on the list in terms of our actual meetings the next meeting we will switch gears a little bit and focus on accountability mechanisms with respect to the New gTLD program.

And that would be on one week from today, June 6th at 2100 UTC. So we will start talking about the accountability mechanism. And the existing ones we have already within ICANN that are sort of organization wide and their adequacy and maybe some discussion about do we need something more specific with respect to New gTLDs.

Particularly in terms of beefing up the accountability or are the existing mechanisms sufficient. So that is just sort of a preview of the next meeting

which I hope people who are interested in these topics will attend. And again that is a week from today on June 6th at 2100 UTC. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you Robin. Any questions or comments?

Kavouss Arasteh: Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I am sorry (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: I understand. Go ahead please.

Kavouss Arasteh: I am not quite understand in what sense we would like to send or apply accountability mechanisms to the New gTLD? What part of the New gTLD? General part how is it the status part? Which of the gTLD need to have accountability mechanism?

Is accountability (unintelligible) and we have to see in the scope of application and how (unintelligible)? Appreciate if Robin could kindly describe a little bit more for those people who do not attend the meeting and just attend general meeting to be clear. How accountability and (unintelligible) to be applied to the New gTLD. In what sense?

Avri Doria: Thank you Kavouss. Either Robin or Karen would you like to take a – I don't even know if Karen – yes Karen is here. Would you like to take a crack at an answer?

Robin: This is Robin. I would be happy to.

Avri Doria: Thank you great.

Robin: I think we want to actually take a very broad look initially. And look at the entire gTLD program and particularly trying to find more accountability. Do we want to like sort of divide up the issues in terms of procedural accountability or accountability on substance of the process?

Maybe we need different mechanisms depending upon whether the issue is a procedural one or whether the issue is a substantive one. So you know we have got a lot of existing accountability mechanisms that ICANN – reconsideration request, independent review panel, the ombudsman, these types of things.

And so I think what we want to do is we really want to look at how are these particular accountability mechanisms addressing the needs of the gTLD program? And are they sufficient? And where there are gaps how could we possibly close them? I hope that helps. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you Robin. Any other comment or question?

Kavouss Arasteh: I have (unintelligible) accountability to apply to the (unintelligible) implementation of gTLD which part of (unintelligible) accountability and who is providing that accountability? And who is controlling that accountability?

What are the procedures for (unintelligible)? (Unintelligible) provide clarity (unintelligible) but nothing that we want to see in the applications or the (unintelligible). We have to see what really we need and how – what areas we (unintelligible). Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay yes thank you. And I think Kavouss many of the things that you brought up are indeed part of this whole discussion. Now it may be that we find out that for all of those for the application process. For the intermediate processes for, you know, going through review and such.

That all the accountability mechanisms that exist are sufficient and are working fine. They also may find gaps. So I think you are asking very relevant questions. I see (Jeff) has his hand up so I will give him the floor. Please (Jeff).

(Jeff): Thanks Avri. Some other things that have come up as well include, you know, right now the accountability measures mostly look at the process as opposed to the substance of the actual decisions being made. And whether, you know, the board violated the bylaws.

I think some maybe looking for appeals mechanisms that can actually go back and look at the substance of the decisions. Again I am not saying that this is going to be adopted. It was just a topic that was brought up in the discussion group.

So for example, let's say the string similarity panel finds two strings not to be similar. Or I should say it the other way around. Let's say similarity panel finds that two strings applied for are similar.

The question at this point is can you appeal that to someone else to make the substantive call? And the accountability measures may not provide for that type of substantive appeal. So that is the other types of areas that are going to be discussed. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you (Jeff). Okay any other comments, questions? Okay in which case we will move onto Work Track 4. But I do invite again anybody that is concerned with this issue to join the Work Track 4 conversations when they are occurring.

I mean Work Track 3 sorry. Work Track 4 please Cheryl.

Cheryl: Thank you Avri. Cheryl for the record and the invitation is certainly extended to Work Track 4. Don't remove your invitation. We would love to have more people joining our call.

Last call which was this Thursday of last week was an excellent update and presentation from Patrick Faltstrom regarding the SSAC papers that have been published over the years. In particularly obviously one of our main topics of interest was on name collisions but it was not limited to that.

And in fact we were privileged to get a little advanced (unintelligible) on the – at that time unpublished but it was published a few hours after our last call. I forgotten the number now. It might be 97 or so on the emojis. So the use of emojis in domain names.

sTLD said we have got some excellent material in the audio and meeting records. So if anyone is not available to attend the call and is interested in that this is one of those that I would very much encourage you to go and grab the record and take yourselves through a very informative 45 minutes or so.

It wasn't the only thing on the agenda but it was the lion's share of the agenda. I also need to note very briefly for the record that (unintelligible) unfortunately suddenly drop from today's call. So he please would like you to know his apologies and regrets that he had to do that.

Our next call where we will be continuing our discussions is set for Thursday, the 8th of June at 2100 UTC. And we will be here forwarding our agenda which will surprisingly enough the continuing talk on naming collisions and some other important measures at that time.

So (unintelligible) any questions?

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Are there any questions for Cheryl on Work Track 4? Okay and a bunch of notes have been put in about Patrick's presentation.

Okay I want to say one last thing about work tracks and just give people sort of a view. A lot of you have already heard me speak of this in the various work track meetings because I have been going from work track to work track sort of making this or explaining this.

So in almost all of the work tracks at the moment with a few exceptions we have gone through all of the topics and had the first conversation. I have called this conversation at various times, the blue sky conversation. (Jeff) has called it the collection of pros and cons conversation.

But by and large what we have tried to do this first cycle threw all of these issues is get the issues on the table. Make sure that we all have a common understanding of the various points of views. The pros and cons. The things we might do to change. The things we might never want to change.

And that has been pretty much a very open conversation on each of the issues. Bringing in experts, presentations created by our staff support, et cetera.

Now with the CC2 conclusion and Steve will give us an update on that in a bit. But with that conclusion as all of these groups finish this first cycle they will go into a second cycle which is look at the review comments. Look at those review comments in comparison to the ideas that were information during the first cycle through.

See what places we are starting to come up with provisional initial approaches to consensus. Notice all the qualifications I put before the word consensus. These groups don't come to the consensus. That is the full group.

But basically to come to their initial views and basically go through all the comments, exhaust the discussion, come up with answers. Then they will

actually be a third pass that the work tracks will be asked to do before this comes back to the (unintelligible).

And that is then to look at each issue and have an answer for or have a reason for lack of answer for okay, we know what was in the policy. We know what was in the AGB. Does it look like there will be consensus for changing?

And if there is consensus for changing do we have the beginnings of an idea of that consensus for what to change it to? And to basically get all of those recorded and where those answers are indeterminate to basically get the (shides) of the issue explained in such a way that then the full group can come to it.

At that point the work tracks would basically get all their work together. The recommendations to the full group, et cetera. Their issues, their problems. And basically send that to the full group for discussion.

At the full group level, the full group would, you know, will consolidate all of this into a document that will become our initial recommendations report. And you know we will deal with any of the open issues in the approach to that.

The work tracks at that point will go dormant. Now I don't recommend that we close them but they will go dormant. Now if in the discussion of some issue we talk and talk and talk and find that a more consecrated discussion at a particular point is warranted.

Then the full group could certainly ask the work track to sort of, you know, wake itself up and take on that issue. But by and large we will be coming into the full group for the discussion.

So just wanted to let people know about these three cycles and the fact that we are nearing the end of the first one and about to enter the second one.

Are there any questions on that as a process? Any disagreements with that as a process? Or even objections. Just wanted to make sure. You know we are reaching sort of a midpoint here with the CC2 and getting ready for our initial, you know, recommendations at the full level.

So just wanted to do that check in with people and make sure that we are heading kind of okay.

Okay as I say, willing to talk about this more. We will, you know, be going through it. We will be living through it. Always willing to amend the process if it is not quite working. But that is the way we are working on it now.

So with that I will go to an update on Community Comment 2. And either Steve or Emily could you do the honors please?

Emily Barabas: Sure Avri this is Emily Barabas from Staff. I can give a brief update about CC2.

So at this point we have received 25 comments which is great. It has been a good cross section of the community and we will drop the link into the chat if people are interested in getting a head start on seeing what has been submitted so far and so forth.

And officially the period is closed although in practice the forum is still accepting comments. So if someone tried to submit one right now it still would be possible.

Although we are asking if anyone on the call is still sitting on comment that they are finishing up if they can get that in as soon as possible that would be great.

Our goal is to have by June 5th the document deadline for Johannesburg. All of the comments into a comment review tool and have that submitted by the document deadline. So that is the goal.

And at this point staff is sifting through the comments, putting them into spreadsheets separate by questions that are easy to review. And we are almost done with that process just doing some QA to make sure everything is where it needs to be. So this should be available to the work tracks soon to start sifting through.

And if anyone has questions please let us know. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Any questions? I would just like to point out that while it is closed and while staff may be benevolent and take some things still into account before the deadline as June 5th is rather soon.

It is rather unlikely that anything that comes in much after today would have any ability of being considered in that document. It doesn't mean we can't talk about it the work tracks but it means certainly that it won't be included in any report.

So – at least any report ready before Johannesburg. Any comments on CC2? Questions? Okay so thank you Emily for that.

Okay the next issue is update and discussion on the GDD response to select questions from the GDD Summit? So who is it that is making that? Is that you Trang? Or is there someone else that is giving us that update?

Trang Nguyen: Hi Avri it is Trang. I can provide an update on that.

Avri Doria: Please go ahead. Thank you.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you. I have circulated an email responding to a set of questions that were raised at a recent GDD Summit from (Jeff) and Donna. The questions raised were primarily around (unintelligible) areas that ICANN organization need. Certainty or answers to before implementation preparation and next steps can be taken.

And then how much time does ICANN organization need to prepare? And then there were also some questions with regards to the CCT review team recommendations. And their report as well as the CDAR report that was recently published. What the next steps on those are?

So I have provided a response. Sorry (unintelligible) I will try to get closer to the phone here.

I had provided response to these questions in the email primarily as it relates to what items the ICANN org needs clarity on before we can move forward with next steps.

The major item there really is whether or not applications would be accepted and processed in realms or as first come first served. As I previously mentioned on one of these (unintelligible) calls is applications are to be received and processed in a first come first served fashion. That would ultimately, you know, fundamentally change how we would do things.

So before we can start on any sort of system development or any sort of implementation preparation. You know that is the one area where we would love to have some certainty around.

Another item that is currently under discussion in the working group. I can't remember which one – which work track it is. But it is the RSP topic. Obviously if there is going to be some sort of an RSP program of some type that would be a new thing.

And there is not much in terms of preparation or implementation that can be done at this point in time until the working group decides whether or not there would be such a program. So that is one thing that we wouldn't be able to start on until there is some certainty around it.

So really those are the two big things. As it relates to how much time ICANN needs for preparation. It really depends on the answers to those questions. And it also depends on sort of the phase of the discussions and when it would make sense for us to start.

Obviously as I've mentioned in the past there's also some level of implementation preparedness that could be done. You know, we can, you know, make what we're doing right now follow your discussion, figure out what project we would need to work on, identify the internal team that we need to work on those. But there's only so much we can do and as we have more certainty of really what point in the discussion are things more set and that we can take some action on. So, you know, we would love to continue to engage with you on those. Avri mentioned sort of the three phases of work. You know at which time during those phases would it make sense for us to start for example drafting the AGB?

And then lastly as I mentioned in the email as it relates to the CCT Review Team and any recommendations from that review team once the final recommendations are available they will go to the board for consideration. And if the board approves it then we ICANN organization will then go about implementing the recommendations. And for the (CDAR) report the next step there would be for the board to consider a. So I hope that answers all of the

questions that were raised at the GDD Summit and I'm happy to answer any of follow-up questions or any other questions. Thank you Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you Trang. Yes I mean I'll give you by my first approach to I think sort of a very clear point of demarcation in the whole process I was talking about. And that's when our draft recommendations are prepared and go out for comment. So that – at that point the group will have reached at least initial consensus. You know, obviously they can change based on comments but all have reached initial consensus on all of the issues. And so that for me marks a demarcation point of where there is a certain amount of the beginnings of certainty. I'll go to Donna please.

Donna Austin: Thanks Avri. Thanks Trang for the update. I just have a question on the timing of when the board is going to consider the CDAR report whether you have any insight as to when that would be? And the reason I asked the question is because depending on what the outcome of their consideration as it could have quite an impact on some of the discussions we're having within this group. So for example if the board decides to stay with the current rate of delegation which is, you know, maximum of 1000 per year then and, you know, the next application window ends up with 5000 application than that has an impact on how we move through the process. So do you have any idea timing?

Trang Nguyen: Got it.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I'm sorry is Trang trying to speak?

Kavouss Arasteh: Avri could you put me in the queue please?

Avri Doria: Sure Kavouss. I'll put you in the queue but Trang please.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you Avri. Thank you Donna. I - my expectation is that it will go to the board for consideration at the board's June meeting but let me confirm that for you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Kavouss? Please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes Avri as you have been noted that before I have serious concerns about the use of the first come first serve in this process. And I have mentioned that ICANN does not have any experience whatsoever about the consequence of first come first serves. Other people outside the ICANN they have in the similar application. It is very, very complex issue and could be used and an abuse of the whole process.

I have seen one person sending something yes we need to create that in order to create dispute in order to create this agreement because dispute this agreement and the struggling with each other is gives rise to innovation. I don't agree with that. I don't think that innovation comes from the controversial issues and so on. So before deciding on anything to put in a recommendation we should carefully examine all advantages and drawbacks of the first come first serve. We should well document it and provide that of who will benefit of that.

Many, many people they have expressed concerns outside the working group because they are not participating in the working group. When I talked to them they say that they have no possibility for one or other reasons and so on. Please take it. This is my personal professional view. Don't interpret it by anything that's representing this or representing (by). This is a technical professional view that it is a very tedious and very complex and very subject to abuse and warehousing of the TLD. If you take that kindly be careful. It's (unintelligible) entirely and later or provide or lease all advantage and disadvantage and then they decide other issues proposes are better or not.

Thank you very much. I'm sorry that I jumped into the queue. I'm very, very sorry but that is the only thing today I have. I can't be in the line to ask no one (to). Thank you very much.

Avri Doria: Thank you Kavouss and no worries about jumping into ask for the queue. That is the way it's done and I know it's difficult to find the right moment when I've been quite long enough that you feel safe to not, you know, that there's actually quiet. I have to remember to leave more silence space for that to be done. Certainly I'll give you a first answer and perhaps others will. Certainly that has not been decided as you know. It's one of the pending CC1 issues. It's one of the – it's the topic of one of the drafting teams indeed to look at what the subsequent procedures are, rounds, open periods, windows. And yes the use of first come first serve or perhaps an eventual evolution to it.

Those – that issue is still very open. I invite anyone to take part in the drafting team to look at the document that's there to comment on it to put their ideas in it. But certainly that issue it will be on the agenda of our next full meeting. It will be the third of the drafting team reports that we go through so it'll be on the on next agenda. So now's a perfect time over the next two weeks to look at that document and to get your comments and suggested text into the document as part of that careful consideration. No decisions have been made. No consensus is even up close yet I'd say. And at the moment I'd say I think were in that period of careful studies so this will be a topic for our next full meeting. Any further questions or comments on going back to the GDD response on those issues?

Are we okay with that for the moment? So oh Trang, you know, when you have the update on when the board will consider it please let the list know so that that can be covered but thank you very much for your update. Anything else on that?

I see typing. I'll pause for a second. Thank you Trang. I see the will do. Okay in which case if there's nothing else on this the next one is to go to the

drafting team update and talk about the framework for community engagement and predictability.

And where is that? So that's coming up. This is another document the first part of which was contributed by our support staff and such. I have started making comments to it but it hasn't gotten much work. So I'm wondering Steve if you would care to do a first instruction to it then I can talk about the stuff that I've added to it and see if we can't get some discussion going in the group. Would you be okay with that?

Steve Chan: Sure Avri. Thanks. This is Steve Chan from staff and I'll try to do an initial walk-through of this document. To be clear the drafting team - well the document that you're looking at right now and that's available on Google drive is not considered a final document. It's primarily a staff document right now that has been supplemented by Avri at this point. So I would take try to take the opportunity here to hopefully recruit a few more people to look at this document because from what we've heard from people this is a pretty important thing to try to get some clarity on. It's essentially I guess you could look at it as sort of a change control management document. And that's sort of how we've taken a first pass at this is to say that despite all the hard work and planning and data-driven analysis that we might do as a working group there are likely things that will be missed. And so acknowledging that things might still need to change even during implementation or even as the program is being executed what this framework is intended to do is try to provide a predictable and clear way for things that come up how they are resolved in the end. So again it's not to say that we'll solve everything in this working group as hard as we try but, you know, if things do come up how do we fix them and how are they resolved?

So the way that it's organized is it provides a problem statement here. And it says the applicants and other parties interested in the new gTLD program expect a level of predictability and stability within the program after launch

that many felt was not adequate (unintelligible). And how can predictability for all interested parties be enhanced?

So the way that staff understood this is the scope that we're looking at is primarily after program launch and not so much as the group's recommendations are being implemented although I saw Avri actually started adding some things related to the Implementation Review Team so I think getting some clarity about the exact scope of this document would be good. So sorry, I have to sync the document again but it starts talking about the community engagement aspects part of making sure that the program is predictable and well understood by the community is by having a very engaged and participatory community. So this top section about the community engagement talks about the ways in which community, the community is solicited for opinions worked with to make sure that they are familiar with what is being developed by this working group.

So to the extent there's things that we could do in addition to these things I think that would be a good thing for the working group members or the drafting team to suggest added to this section and make sure that we actually do some of those things. Scrolling down is where you actually get to the framework.

And so the way that we divided this up is to say some changes will be more operational in nature and then secondarily there might be things that are quite substantial in nature and you could say there possibly even policy level changes. And so within each of these two categories we tried to provide some definition of the type of update, some could be minor process updates where it doesn't actually have an impact on applicants or people watching the program that are may be interested in providing the objection or any other reason. And so the example here is a change in process both for contracting or pre-delegation that doesn't actually impact any timelines or change of process for any of the applicants. And then so the expected mitigation strategy here is none expected.

So but when you go down in this list of changes the changes are more substantial. And sorry I haven't looked at this document in a little while. So the next one is change in ICANN's internal processes that might have an impact on the community members. In this case where there's actually impact to the community's ideas that they would need to be consulted before the change is actually made. And I saw that Avri started adding some things down below to try to get an idea of what level of change would result in public comment. That's still debatable and for the drafting team to consider.

So I won't go into detail for all these but the last thing is the new process or procedure. And of course that's more substantial than the one I just mentioned. So the idea there would be there would of course have to be staff working with community to consult the change and inform once the changes are agreed and deployed.

The very last part that so I actually touched on this briefly. It's the changes that are possibly policy level changes. And we categorized two - categorized it by further by two elements here. One is revision to something that is already recommended by the working group. And then the other change could be something completely brand-new.

And there are mechanisms by which policy can be changed. But one of the first things that would need to be determined is what the nature of the change is. So you would need a community agreement on whether it is a fundamental policy change or if it might in fact be just operational change that ICANN org could actually implement and perhaps within consultation with the community.

So one of the key I guess decision points that staff identified is who is actually making these decisions? The idea that I mentioned is that we're looking at kind of issues that arise after the program has been implemented so post IRT and so most of these things are as the programs being executed. So once

something comes up presumably the IRT is not necessarily still in operation. So who is the proper party to consider the change that has come up and how it is best to be resolved?

Let's go on down a little further. These are the changes that Avri just made. And so I mentioned earlier that we ended intended that the scope would be after IRT but it's probably good to also consider how changes and how issues that arise during the IRT are also resolved. Although there are some prescribed methods within the bylaws and then also the GNSO operating procedures by which issues at that stage can be resolved. I'll say that provides some clarity and I'll turn it back over to Avri. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Hi. This is Avri speaking. I actually put in above my hand and basically so I'll speak for second chair hat off but on the comments I made. And basically while indeed the normal term of an IRP is the implementation and so you could have an assumption that once the AGB is published implementation is over. But here we're talking about changes to implementation. And I don't believe although I'll go back and check, I don't believe there's anything that actually prescribes when an IRP ends. And certainly in a program such as this where we have seen that implementation continues past the point of, you know, past the flag day when applications are accepted we'll need to look at that I think in terms of the IRP.

I'll certainly go back since I'm making the recommendation to make sure that there isn't something that says no, no, no, an Implementation Review Team is not allowed to exist past, you know, the AGB coming out. So I think these are still implementation issues and they still could be discussed by an IRP or something similar. So that's part of that.

And the only other piece I started is yes just to build a table there of, you know, when is it appropriate to go out for comments? Another piece that's missing from this that has come up in discussions which I'll add I'm sorry that the table is complete. I was doing my additions at the last minute and it was

time to call in for the meeting so I didn't get any further than I got. But basically we have had discussions of things like freezing changes and when certain things are frozen and become immutable and what the set of things that become immutable are was a discussion we had while we were sort of Blue Skying this notion at the beginning before CC1. So I think I'll be adding a section on that which is another thing we need to go and look at.

Is there immutability point in any of the processes were no, there are no changes allowed. And if so to what does that apply? So that's the end of me talking personally here, put my hat back on, put my hand down and ask if there any other comments people have other things to say about this?

I notice a bunch of you have jumped into the document. I hope you're not just looking but you're making suggestions because very much even if you don't want to sign formally onto a drafting team anyone in this group in fact anybody with a URL can go into this document and suggest changes and comment. So even if you just want to dip your toe into the discussion and add some text or add a point this is the time to do it. What I suggest we'll do going forward on this -- and this also applies to the other one's -- is having had some discussion on the list, having hopefully made some modifications to the documents people having actually suggested things or us having imported the things suggested into the document try to have a call, a drafting team call of those who signed up and others who have perhaps been interested enough to comment to actually try to talk through the suggested changes. And then after having done that we'll, you know, bring the augmented, hopefully augmented document back to this whole group.

But at this point, you know, I'd like to – nobody's got their hand up so is the document going in the right direction? Do people see it as being appropriate to use this change control metaphor as sort of the framework for the discussion? Does anybody think that it could be done better in some other way? Okay does anyone think that there any issues that haven't been spoken

of today or aren't in the document already that need to be added, need to be, you know considered and thought of while doing this? Please Trang?

Trang Nguyen: Thank you Avri. I just had a question more about process. I wonder if the working group may want to - may want some feedback from ICANN org frame an implementation feasibility at all and if so how and at what point in time may that be provided? Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. I'll give you my immediate answer with that is always basically want implementation feedback. That was one of the things we had in the process last time though it didn't work out as well as I had hoped but yes that the implementation folks were constantly looking at what we did and asking questions like if you do this in policy well we don't understand what that means in implementation or that would mean that - so I think any time I think you should feel free to comment in the document, make suggestions in the document even, you know, especially if you're not doing it as anonymous rabbit but doing it is trying - is a person with the, you know, identified at staff so that we know that it's a comment from staff and not a comment from someone random in the community. But I think anytime and then certainly, you know, in these discussions like now so if you have now for example a feeling one of these rises up and you look at it and say, "Oh no we would never be able to implement that," as your thinking please bring those things up when I, you know, when I or anyone else puts them in the document and we speak up in these meetings the sooner we talk about things that might be difficult to implement but maybe fixed by a tweak here and a tweak there please bring them up. So hopefully that answers – that always answer has been amplified that always looking for that.

Any other comments at this point on that? I see none so I'll assume we're going in the right direction. I'll assume that hopefully staff will look at this and comment especially because this affects the policy implementation working relationship between community and organization. So yes Steve I see your hand. Sorry.

Steve Chan: Thanks Avri. This is Steve Chan from staff and I just raised this so you did not miss me. So the first comment I wanted to make was just to reiterate that the membership for this particular drafting team is quite slim so please if you are concerned about this topic I know many of you might be in - perhaps you don't want to commit to joining the drafting team so as you – so as Avri said you can just make comments in the Google document. But to the extent you are – you care about this topic and you have the time to contribute we really welcome your participation on this particular drafting team. It certainly needs a little bit more support from the working group.

The other quick comment I just wanted to make is one of the things that staff had flagged as the possible inclusion in this document is related to change requests. I'm not sure if that's quite the right home for that topic. I just I would note I don't believe that we've talked about application change request in any other of the work tracks or any of the topics so it might be something that the working group wants to consider. It doesn't necessarily have to be in this particular framework or maybe it does belong here so just something for the working group to consider. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you Steve and I don't know whether we've created one yet but that sounds like a perfect issue for a parking lot to make sure that it gets recorded somewhere in that we don't lose it and that we come back later and check the issues in the parking lot to make sure that we have taken care of them somewhere. Yes and one of the things that I want to say about working in the Google Drive while I always am happier to have people put their comments in with their name and their suggested texts with their name the tool doesn't require it nor do we require it.

What's most important in these documents are these ideas and such. It's when we talk about them in the group that then we go to, you know, the consensus building. But these documents at the moment are a place to get good ideas and get them collected. And if you have a good idea but you're

afraid to call yourself by your name and you prefer for it to be in there as from the anonymous Tiger or the anonymous (given) please feel free to do that. We need the ideas. We need the thoughts. Later we'll get to the consensus of human beings and stakeholder groups, et cetera. So anything else on this?

Okay in which case I'll close this at the moment. These are scheduled as 90 minute meetings but because they're in the same slot as 60 perhaps people forget. But anyway we're almost done. We're at – I just see that there are several people leaving. At this point are there – is there any other business for this meeting? Seeing none, reading none, hearing none this meeting is adjourned. Thank you all very much for your participation.

Thanks everyone. Thanks Avri. Bye.

Avri Doria: Bye.

Terri Agnew: Thank you everyone. Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END