EN

ICANN Transcription

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group

Monday, 22 April 2019 at 2000 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://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/policy/2019/audio/audio-new-gtld-subpro-22apr19-en.mp3

Zoom Recording:
https://icann.zoom.us/recording/play/kYR4anrYTGHHL4BeVa3Aoi5DQxuCDO6JVNz7diEvLBIwifkKxoNSmJ_920BPhaT-

Attendance is on the wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/9xVIBg

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

JULIE BISLAND:　　　　Alright. Well, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on Monday the 22nd of April 2019. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. If you're only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourself be known now?

Hearing no names, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise. With this, I will turn it back over to Jeff Neuman. You can begin.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks, Julie. Hopefully everyone can hear me okay. So as you can see, on the agenda – and I apologize – well, I don't apologize, I was out last week, so I'm catching up like you all are as well, or some of you that may have been out. But we have the draft agenda up on the screen right now under Julie's screen. We're going to, even though I know we did a Zoom tutorial last week and we're kind of just doing another one, just before when everyone was joining, we'll spend a little bit reintroducing Zoom again because I think just doing it once is probably not enough, and then we'll do a quick update on Work Track 5 and then get into our main agenda topic.

So, is there anything anyone wants to add as Any Other Business? I'm not seeing raised hands. Okay, so let's first ask if there are any new updates to the statements of interest, noting that we had two last week. Do we have any changes to statements of interest this week?

Not seeing any, so why don't I go to Julie? I know you were giving kind of a quick rundown of Zoom. Do you want to just do an even quicker rundown of just the main things and perhaps again how to go over or switch between the two screens if Steve's showing his and Julie is showing his as well?

JULIE BISLAND:

Okay. Will do. The first thing you want to do if haven't already, please bring up the participant window and the chat window. You do that by hovering at the bottom of your screen, clicking the participant icon, click the chat icon. It brings up the two windows to

the right of your screen. You will need the participant window to raise your hand.

Please always mute your line. There's so many different ways to mute. Finding your name in the participant window, hovering over your name, clicking mute, the bottom of your screen to the far left mute, those are the two probably easiest. To exit full screen, you can use the view options up at the top, or you can hit escape on your keyboard. And lastly, to toggle between who is sharing their screen and what you want to see, up at the top, view options, shared screens, there's Julie Hedlund and Steve Chan, and you select which one you would like to see. So Julie Hedlund is currently showing the agenda. You can click on Steve and see what documents he's sharing. And I think that's it. Thanks, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Julie. Sorry, it took me a second there to find the mute button. I know there's like three alternatives, as you just went over, but still getting used to this.

Does anybody have any specific questions on Zoom that they need answered at this point in time that they want to ask? Yes, there is a coffee icon in Zoom. There are a couple others as well. I'm not sure I understand what all of them mean, but if someone wants to use the coffee mug, you're going to have to explain why. I think that means that you're on a coffee break, but anyway, there are some interesting symbols on there.

I do see a hand raised. Donna, please.

DONNA AUSTIN: Hi, Jeff. Can you hear me okay?

JEFF NEUMAN: I can. Your voice is a little scratchy. Try again.

DONNA AUSTIN: Maybe it's because I'm in Australia. So something new has come up on the screen this morning that I haven't seen before, so I've got the participants and chat on one side, but then I've got all the participants in little boxes on the black screen as well, and I don't understand whether that's because it's on Julie's screen and it's being reflected on ours, but it's new, I haven't seen it before. But it's taking up screen space on my laptop anyway.

JULIE BISLAND: Donna, up at the very upper right corner, are you seeing gallery view or are you seeing speaker view?

DONNA AUSTIN: Oh, I think I'm in speaker view.

JULIE BISLAND: Click it up there and change it to gallery view. I think that will help.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Now I just have ... okay. I still don't have the document on the full screen, I still have the big box with your name in it, Julie. But anyway, it's okay. I'll get through it.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi. Can you hear me?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes, we can hear you, Christopher.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Just to say that as far as I can see, I don't see any gallery view or whatever, but in the top left-hand corner of this view which Donna doesn't like – and I don't like it either – there's a minus sign, and I think if you click the minus sign, it disappears.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thank, Christopher. I'll see if I can find it.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I'm going to mute.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Thanks, everyone. Looking to see if there's any more hands, and I don't see any. So why don't we then go to the next agenda item, which actually, we need to go to Julie's screen which has the agenda, and that is an update on Work Track 5. So I'm just scrolling here looking to see. I know we have Annebeth and Olga and – I don't know if these are the only two. Javier, are you on as well? No, Javier is not on.

So Olga or Annebeth, you want to give a quick update on Work Track 5? Annebeth, please.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Hi, Jeff, and hi, all. Actually, I did not attend the last meeting. I was on holiday, so I've no clue what was going on. I think that Olga lead the call, so if she's on, she's the right person to give an update of what happened last time.

OLGA CAVALLI: Hello, can you hear me?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes. Absolutely. Go ahead, Olga.

OLGA CAVALLI: Well, we had a session of one hour. We keep on doing the revision of the compilation of the comments received in a fantastic job done by dear friends from staff, and we finished this question section part. Not finished, we went far, almost up to the end, and we will keep on reviewing the document the next call and the next one.

Unfortunately, the next one, I did share this last call, I won't be able to participate in the next one, but I think that Annebeth will be there and Javier was also in the call, and perhaps more can join us. So for those of you that are not following this process closely, what we are doing is reviewing all the compilation of the comments to check if the comments were [good] reflected in this

compilation and that we are not forgetting anything, any detail. We are not opening discussions or debating about different issues, we are trying to just review the compilation. I don't know, Annebeth, if you want to add something. This is more or less what we have been doing over the last three or four calls.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Yes, I think that is what we're doing now, so Olga, that is fine. I will be there on the next meeting, and I think that Martin volunteered to lead it since he was not at the last meeting either. So I will talk to Martin and we'll sort this out. So we hope to finish the document next time or the time after that.

OLGA CAVALLI: Yes.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Olga and Annebeth. I know Steve, you have your hand raised. Let me just see if Christopher has a question on this subject, and then we'll come back to Steve. So Christopher.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, Jeff, and first of all, through my participation in Work Track 5, again thank you to the staff for the enormous effort of producing these documents, compiling and summarizing the comments from public consultation.

I just want to be on record in the PDP that there are outstanding issues which have not yet been resolved in Work Track 5. I would

just summarize them. The first issue is the problem of allocating geographic names to entities that claim that they will not use the names for geographical purposes, and that that does not require prior authorizations or nonobjection from the relevant authorities or communities. That is not agreed.

Secondly, certain members of Work Track 5 think that the general international principle of freedom of speech allows anybody to apply for any name –

JEFF NEUMAN: Christopher?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Yes.

JEFF NEUMAN: Sorry, these are relevant points, but for Work Track 5, can we –

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: No, Jeff, I'll be very short. These are not limited to Work Track 5. When Work Track 5 reaches the PDP, the PDP needs to be well aware that these issues are present and need to be resolved. I've mentioned prior authorization and freedom of speech. There are others. Thank you.

EN

JEFF NEUMAN:	Okay. Thanks, Christopher. And when it comes back to this main PDP group, you should feel free to bring up those issues again. Okay, let me go to Steve. Steve, I know there was something on Zoom, one more thing on Zoom. If you could just go over that real quick, and then we can get back to the main agenda.
STEVE CHAN:	Sure. Thanks, Jeff. Actually, just to start with Work Track 5 for one quick second, and just to clarify that currently, they are looking at the questions that were put out for public comment. They should complete that in the next call, but after that, there's a number of additional proposals that were put out for public comment as well. so there's still a fair amount of material still to review in that regard, although having gone through public comments a little bit last week, I think it should be a little bit easier to get thought that section, because it's mostly a little more straight forward support or do not support.

So yeah, just that clarification. So we do have more to do than just – probably the next call. And actually, just a reminder, if you're not speaking, to please mute your line.

So to the issue that was raised by Jamie about whether or not ICANN staff has access to the private chats, I'll just start by saying that no, that is not the case. If there is chat between, say, Jamie and Jeff, staff does not get a chance to see that. We do not see that unequivocally.

So what we do see though is let's say that for Julie Bisland as the SO/AC support person on this call, she would download the chat

after this call and distribute to the working group. So the private chat that would be downloaded is only the private chat that is directed at her, so if Jeff or Jamie were to write a message directly to Julie, that would show up in her chat transcript and then I think what they're planning to do is make sure that that private chat is removed from the transcript before it's shared with all the working group members.

However, as I stated, I just want to be very clear that any private chat between members, staff will not see that. Hopefully that's clear. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Thanks, Steve. I'm seeing some people that may not be muted, so just as Steve said, just make sure you mute your lines when you are not speaking. Anybody else have any questions before we get on to the main part of this agenda?

Okay, great. So I now encourage everyone as I will do the same to go to view options and then click on Steve Chan so we can see his screen, and on Steve's screen, it's showing you the next topic which is on systems.

Now, just as a reminder here, what we're trying to do with this exercise is to summarize the information that we have now, the recommendations if there were any in the initial report, to look at what the comments, the trends were in the comments, to see whether those changed or in our minds would change those recommendations or add to those recommendations, and then if there are new ideas or concepts, to see whether those new ideas

EN

or concepts have any support within the working group to pursue further and whether those would operate to revise any of the recommendations.

So all of that said, we are now talking about systems, and I am pretty confident – I think that we can get through this whole topic if we put our minds to it.

So just to give a little bit of background, if you're looking at Steve's screen, this was a addressed in community comment number two, and there's a link there, but the notion [of systems] was also subject to a number of recommendations in the initial report which is section 2.4.3, and our goals that we indicated both through the report and through the community comment two were that for the system, security and stability must be a priority during design and development. System usability and user experience must be a priority during design and development, and then the third one, the working group recognizes that some of the implementation guidance provided may result in additional expenditures and potential delays in development. As such, the working group has sought to prioritize its recommended implementation guidance if and when decisions need to be made. So one of the items we'll be talking about towards the end is how to prioritize those recommendations.

Okay, moving to 2.4.3C1, the first recommendation which had support from all of – sorry, Steve, we can see what you're doing. I'm not sure – okay, sorry. 2.4.3C1, the ICANN Org should ensure that enough time is provided for development and testing before any system is deployed. This had support from all of the commenters, and it just seems like a pretty generic, general

recommendation. So I don't think we need to spend too much time on it unless there is utter disagreement.

Moving on to the next one, which is systems – this is C2 – should undergo extensive, robust quality assurance, user interface and penetration testing to ensure that they are stable and secure and that data is properly protected and kept confidential where appropriate. And as Steve says in the comments, if you want to follow along in the Google doc, then you can click on that link, but if Steve were to click on the link, we'd all be looking at that link instead of the document that's up on the screen.

Alright, that's another general comment recommendation I think had support from all the commenters, had no one dissenting from that and no new concepts. The third one, same category, was supported by everyone and was that applicant-facing systems should be usable and integrated, ideally with a single login. No objection to that one?

So why don't we move on to the next one, which is C 2.4.3C4? Once a system is in use, the ICANN Org should be transparent about any system changes that impact applicants or the application process. In the event of any security breach, ICANN should immediately notify all impacted parties. Most of the commenters supported this recommendation. The registries had a minor edit to notify all possibly impacted parties in that last sentence because it may not be readily apparent who is impacted once the security breach occurs, so ICANN should send out or should notify any parties that could be impacted. And the ICANN Org filed a comment basically stating that ICANN does have a procedure that's on that link over there.

So as I was thinking about this particular recommendation, for some of you, you may be aware of this, others may not, but ICANN has a naming portal for use by the registries that controls all of its or allows registries to control its contact information, customer support with ICANN, and through that portal, about a year ago or so, actually maybe just a little bit over a year, just about a year ago, ICANN amended its terms of use for its portal to include a provision on what to do in the event of a security breach, and I thought that it may be a good idea to show that provision that's included in the terms of use to see whether this group wanted to make the recommendation that something like that provision should be included in this particular recommendation.

So Steve, do you have that readily available? There it is. Great. So what you're looking at now is the final naming services portal terms of use, and if you scroll down to section 3.7, there's a section called security breach, and in that section, ICANN commits to using commercial reasonable efforts to maintain industry standard safeguards, and then it talks about notifying – the you in this case is the user of the portal, so any user of the portal, to notify you promptly if ICANN determines that an actual and verified breach of security of the portal has or will cause a material disruption in your use of the portal service. And then there's some steps that ICANN needs to take. I'm not going to read the whole paragraph, but I thought that suggesting something like this language be included without the portal, within the policy recommendation as to what ICANN should do upon a security breach and how that notification is worded may be something relatively simple for us to recommend that's already been vetted through ICANN Legal and through the organization as

something that they can live with. So I want to throw it out there to the group to see if this type of language is something that we could recommend in our recommendations. And Maxim states that the terms of use can be changed at any moment. And I think that is somewhat true, Maxim, but these provisions can't be changed without our review at this point. Sorry, I'm confusing this here. This security provision can't be changed by ICANN without the registries and those that are parties to the portal having a chance to review it. So I think if we were to make this recommendation, it would be that something like this should not just be changeable at the whim of ICANN.

Does anyone have any thoughts on that? I thought it kind of fit in both with ICANN's comments and the registries' comments. Okay, I am not seeing anyone with a raised hand. Let me just give a second though in case I'm missing something. [inaudible].

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Jeff. So I think we can cite this as an example that there should be language to address – we can make a recommendation that maybe there should be some language to address security and stability incident and then you could cite what's been used in the registry portal terms as an example. But let's not get wedded to language, because then we'll ... well, it could take a lot of time to agree on that, so maybe it's a high-level suggestion and a place to point to, I think it's a fair thing to suggest.

EN

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Thanks, Donna. I think that makes a lot of sense. Anybody else have any comments on that? Okay, good. Then we can move on to the next section, and again, I'm still getting used to Zoom like everybody else, so if I missed someone, it's unintentional, just speak up or yell and I'll get back to you. But I don't see anyone. So okay.

2.4.3C6 – no, I'm sorry, we're still on five even though six is highlighted. But C5 basically states that ICANN should offer prospective system users with the ability to beta test systems while ensuring no unfair advantages are created for individuals who test tools. It may accomplish this by setting up an OT&E, operational testing and evaluation environment. And that had support from all the commenters, no new ideas, so it seems like this is pretty safe to go in as a recommendation.

And then looking at C6, any agreements, terms of use for the systems access, including those required to be clicked through, should be finalized in advance, including the applicant guidebook with the goal of minimizing obstacles and/or legal burdens on applicants.

And I think the last time we discussed this, there was a proposal to take out the words "and included in the applicant guidebook," there were some that had mentioned that it should be [inaudible]

JULIE BISLAND: Jeff, we lost you.

EN

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Yeah, I've lost Jeff.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm only on audio. I guess it would be best if – Steve, can you continue while we get Jeff back?

STEVE CHAN: Sure, Cheryl. I can try to keep us moving along. I do see a couple hands though, so maybe we'll go to those first. Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Actually last time, AGB itself changed, so I'm not sure there is a lot of value in saying that it should be included in applicant guidebook, because you can change guidebook after some period of time and include new terms. Just note. Thanks.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Maxim. We saw your note in chat as well, or at least I did, so thanks for raising that verbally. Christopher, please go ahead.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Steve, I don't want to go into anything which in French we would regard as a [procedentantion,] but I have noticed that the people who are most concerned about being able to click through and simplify the application processes are those who have the intention of making multiple applications simultaneously. This raises, in my mind, very serious concerns, not the least in

EN

geographical names. I've no objection to the efficiency of the systems established, including clicking through questions and responses, but I have very strong reservations about facilitating multiple applications from warehousing interests, portfolio interests and etc. I think that is not appropriate for the next round. Thank you.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Christopher. Just to make a note or an update for Jeff, we're trying to reach out to him. I think he might actually be on. There he is. Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, I don't know what happened there. I don't know where I got lost, but I'm trying to log back in.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: And join the family. I shall mute.

JEFF NEUMAN: Steve, can you just give me an update on where you lost me and what's going on?

STEVE CHAN: Sure, Jeff. I can try. I don't remember exactly where you dropped off, but yeah, and if there are a couple of you that want to react to Christopher, I don't actually honestly remember exactly where he dropped off. I think you're just wrapping up on C.6. Actually, you're

talking about discussions at ICANN 64 about removing the reference to "Included in the applicant guidebook." I think that's where he dropped. But as I noted, I think there's a few people that want to respond to what Christopher just said, although I would actually note that I think that that discussion is on a different question, if I'm not mistaken, but Jeff, back to you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. I'm not actually in Zoom yet because I'm still rebooting. My whole computer froze. So Steve, if you can just control the queue for the next minute or two, and then I will jump in.

STEVE CHAN: No problem. Actually, I think it's just one person, so Jim, go ahead.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Yeah. Thanks, Steve. I think you may be confusing two different topics. I know your concerns about your previously stated concerns about portfolio applicants and speeding up the process for them. What this particular section is actually referring to is once you become a contracted party and your interface to ICANN is through a whole online naming services portal, unless you're a contracted party, most people are not even familiar with. So anytime you want to open a service ticket or talk to ICANN, you have to use this portal. Submitting reports has to go through this portal, etc.

When they launched the new portal, there was a new set of terms and conditions that were proposed by ICANN, which the contracted parties said, "Hey, wait a second, we've got some problems here.

So what I think Jeff is trying to – what the point of this section is trying to do is saying any systems that ICANN may employ in the future, if you do become a contracted party, those terms and conditions need to be laid out in advance so that you know what you're getting into besides just becoming a contracted party. So the click through here refers to the first time you logged into the portal, you had to accept the terms and conditions in order to proceed, and there were several operators who refused to do that until the terms and conditions were negotiated further. I hope that helps. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Jim. So Christopher, you still have your hand raised. Do you have a follow up on that?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: No, no further comments. Thank you, Jim, for that explanation.

JEFF NEUMAN: Great. Okay. So then we can go on to C7. Thank you, Steve, for scrolling. This is, again, one that had a recommendation that had broad level support, everyone supported it, and it's that applicants should be able to enter non-ascii characters in certain fields. I

think the business constituency had made a statement that we should be as specific as possible as to which fields should allow non-ascii characters in them. now, one could say all fields, but then that would be fairly complicated, and so the question is whether we mean things like contact information, obviously the name of the string, and address information, e-mail addresses because you could be using an IDN name as your e-mail address. So the question is, what should we include as – which fields should allow for IDNs? And looking at the chat, at least the TLDs should be allowed as IDN. ICANN required applicants to be IDN-ready while having non-IDN-ready system. Okay, does anybody have any thoughts?

In general, I think the application system previously did allow for contact information, I believe, to be a non-ascii. Certainly the string contact information, including addresses, e-mail, etc., should be IDN. Has anyone else given any thought as to which other fields they thought should or must allow IDN scripts?

Okay, not seeing anyone in the chat or raise their hand, so why don't we just then move on to C8, which is that – this deals with support, so the recommendation was that applicants should be able to access live, real-time support using tools such as phone help line or online chat to address technical system issues. This had support from all commenters and no other additions.

So unless anyone's got any burning desire to say something on this, I think we can jump to C9, which is a single applicant to submit and access multiple applications without duplicative data entry and multiple logins.

I see Donna's got her hand up. Donna, is this on the previous one, C8, or is this on C9?

DONNA AUSTIN: Jeff, it's on C8.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay, go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks. So for some reason, this seems similar to a conversation we had last week, and I'm trying to understand what the difference is. And it's a piece that says applicants should be able to access live, real-time support using tools such as [find help line] and online chat. I'm sure we had a conversation about this last week, and there were some concerns raised about the ability to be able to do that and whether that was feasible or not. But were we talking about another system? Because I think we were talking about the possible application system, but is this one talking about something different?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, so this one deals with any technical issues that you might have accessing the system. I believe the one last week was referring to questions about the guidebook or questions about certain procedures. This is really – if you have some technical issues and need help, you should be able to get that help immediately. Does shat help?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, Jeff, it does help, but is it possible to provide some kind of cross reference back to that other discussion? It might be okay that we're distinguishing between the two pieces, but I'd really like some kind of cross-reference there back to that previous discussion, because I think it is relevant, but maybe it's not once we've completed the whole run through of this. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Yeah. Thanks, Donna, and that does make sense. So it does say here technical systems issues, but we will also ensure that we distinguish that from the other types of support questions that were talked about, I think, in the communication section. So we'll definitely do that.

Okay, going back then to C9, this is – I just want to remind everyone that this C9 and then for one later on, this is not about whether we like the fact that we have portfolio applicants or we like the fact or we don't like the fact that people can submit multiple applications. This is merely on the systems, and so this is saying that the systems should allow a single applicant to access all of their applications and to submit multiple applications without having to do duplicative data entry and have multiple logins.

It had support from all of the commenters, and ICANN had a concern that it expressed, ICANN Org, about a number of these. We did request in Kobe of ICANN to come back on which specifics on these recommendations they believe would truly add to complexity, cost and time, so we don't have that yet, but ICANN

Org did raise the concern that we're adding complexity to the system.

So I see Anne in the queue, so Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks, Jeff. I just wanted to note you had said that this was support from all commenters. [inaudible] summary document says support from most commenters, but probably more importantly is the fact that I think there are concerns expressed by more than just ICANN Org. The BRG states that this should be a low priority in terms of that priority exercise that we talked about that we would ultimately get to at some point, and then I'm not going to speak for Donna, but Neustar also – there were concerns about the delay that might be involved in implementing this recommendation, and so the concerns were wider than those of ICANN Org because concerns were expressed by two other commenters. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Thanks, Anne. So I think looking at specifically the BRG and Neustar, Donna's here so Donna could probably weigh in. There was support for the recommendation, but as you stated, if it comes between choosing and prioritization, this may be not one that's of the highest priority, and we will get to that exercise, but I don't think that there was opposition to the specific recommendation if it could be done without actually adding to the cost and time and complexity. Donna, did you want to weigh in on that?

DONNA AUSTIN: Jeff, I think that's as fair characterization from Neustar. I think we were generally supportive of most of the suggestions, but we did have kind of an overarching caveat that there has to be some kind of understanding of whether by doing all of these things, will it slow down the process? And I just can't remember the language off the top of my head, but I think it was just an overarching concern that when you look at all these things that have been identified as would be nice to haves, you need to balance that with the overall objective of making sure that I guess it works effectively and it's not going to hold up the [process.]

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Donna. I don't meant to cut you off, but I sounded like you got cut off, or I'm hoping I didn't get cut off again.

DONNA AUSTIN: No, Jeff, I may have hovered on the wrong button too long or too short or something. So I think I did it inadvertently. But I'm done. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Thanks, Donna. In looking at the chat, Justine says I wonder if in this action we should use the term "user" instead of applicant to avoid confusion as to which system we're talking about, user being an already contracted party versus an applicant being an actual applicant for a new string.

EN

I think that's a good call, Justine. I think we need to be careful when we use certain language. I agree with you, it should be "users." In this case, in C9 it's about applicants, because it's talking about a single applicant should be able to submit. But there may be other recommendations that apply to users in general, so we should be very careful as to make sure that we – because it's not just the applicant system, it's any other systems, so we need to be careful as to who the comments are directed towards.

Anne has just brought up Neustar comments in the chat just as a reminder. Okay, jumping to C10, applicants should be able to receive automated confirmation e-mails from the systems. [I don't think that had] support from everyone. No new ideas on that one?

So we can go move on to C11, which had support across the board, which was that applicants should be able to receive automated application fee-related invoices. This seems like a no brainer, but was very difficult to, in the last application system, and so this is something that many, especially companies and entities – sorry, not just business entities but any entities needed invoices for their systems or for their own purposes for their organizations, so this had blanket support.

C12 is that applicants should be able to view changes that have been made to an application in the application system. This had support from most of the commenters, and ICANN Org, the same overarching comments, and the support from most commenters is not all likely to the same comments that Anne had brought up before about certain things being of a lower priority than others. And we will get to that exercise.

There's a good suggestion from – I apologize if I mispronounce your name – [inaudible] from ISOC Cameroon has a good comment in there saying that if we do maintain both of those terms, applicant and user, we should have a definition somewhere early to make sure that we are avoiding confusion. Christopher, please.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi. On that last point, I think it should be made clear who is going to make the changes to an application just from first principles, I'm rather surprised that there's a problem arising from changes to an application that the applicant doesn't know about. I'm sure there's a drafting question behind here, but I would just make it clear who – is it the staff, is it other applicants? Is it competing applicants? Who is going to make these changes?

I'll leave it at that for the reflection of those who know about these things. Since I've got the floor, may I just say that some of the things that I would like to say, I would be equally prepared to say in the chat, but as a technical matter vis a vis Zoom, I have discovered how to make a private chat to one or other of participants, but I've not yet discovered how to make chats to everyone. Maybe the staff could send me an e-mail or a chat that explains what I'm missing. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Christopher. Someone will send you an e-mail on that, but in the "to" column, there is a selection option called

"everyone," so you hopefully have that in the dropdown box, but if not, someone from staff can help you out.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: The [inaudible] column? No.

JEFF NEUMAN: It's where you have "to," it says to the person, and if you want to send it – there's a dropdown box in your chat, group chat. Anyway, I'll have staff send you a message on that so that hopefully you can find that.

going back then to your question, this is governing changes that [inaudible] I believe and someone can correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe this refers to applicants being able to see a redline version when they themselves make changes in the application so that they can see as they're entering the application in.

I think that's what it's meant for, but I'm waiting to see if anyone disagrees with that. Okay, so we should probably make that more clear. Going ahead to 13, this again had support from all the commenters. Applicants should be able to upload application documents in the application system. I think there were some questions that allowed the upload of documents and others did not. This is just maintaining that we should be able to upload documents as opposed to having to type everything in.

Okay, next one is C14, this is guidance as well. Applicants should be able to update information in multiple fields without having to copy and paste information into relevant fields. This one had

support from most of the commenters. There was an ICANN's standard concern about adding complexity and cost and time, and then there were comments, concerns that were expressed in ICANN 64 that allowing the copying and pasting of materials may have the effect of reducing the distinctive, individualized nature of an application, particularly as it relates to the mission purpose of the proposed TLD.

So without wanting to get into an extensive discussion on this again, the discussion at ICANN was one that had not been had before, which was a new goal – if I could classify it as that – of ensuring that each application was of an individualized nature. That is an appropriate conversation to have, whether we should require all applications be unique, and if so, in what areas they should be unique. But that is not the discussion that I think is appropriate for the systems discussion.

If we do from a policy perspective – and I'm not saying we do or we don't, but if we do believe as a group that we should endorse the notion of an individualized nature of applications, and if we do in fact believe that only certain fields should be allowed to be the same from one application to another, then we can come back to the systems discussion and make sure the systems reflect that new policy, but for right now, there is not that policy, which again, we can change, and we'll have that discussion again, but from a systems perspective and only a systems perspective, it's saying there where allowable – and you're allowed to have the same information – you should have the ability to copy and paste into relevant fields.

Now I'm going to open up the discussion, and I would like us not to focus on the policy of having an individualized unique application but on the policy of having a system that allows you to copy and paste. So let's go to the queue. Christopher, your hand is up, and then I see Anne.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: That was an old hand, but since you've given me the floor back, I'll just say that this question is also relevant to my concerns about multiple in portfolio of applications. End of comment. I'll try and mute myself when I can find the screen again.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Thanks, Christopher. Anne, and then Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Actually, there is a thing we're trying to forget here. It's called IDNs, and if an applicant creates few TLDs, one is for example English ASCII, another is one local IDN, the third one is second local IDN, they will have to have lots of similar fields, because mission, technical parts of the application are going to be the same, because that is the same. So why punish IDNs? Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Maxim. That's a good point as well that that's not been part of the conversation, but I think that's important. Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks, Jeff. I did want to note that I think that we don't have consensus on this one, and a couple of procedural points. I think what you were referring to is having the ability to copy and paste. That ability already exists, and the question here is really more about autofill, which is not a copy and paste exercise, it's – I believe that what this is saying is that you have the ability to say, "Okay, I have 20 applications, and with respect to question 18, fill that in with the following language and put them in all 20 applications." So I would just make the issue clear, I would refer to that as basically it's autofill, it's not – copy and paste was available as I understood it, and existed in the system.

You said that there's a policy issue that was not discussed before. So I have to go back again procedurally to a reminder that before the initial report went out, not only was there no consensus call, but in fact, the various questions that were developed were not discussed [fully] in the full working group. So at this point in time saying, "hey, guys, we never talked about this before and this is a new policy issue that you're bringing up" isn't quite fair from my standpoint when the full working group did not consider the initial report questions as a full working group before they went out.

And then finally, the concern her with respect to autofill is not only – as I thought about it more after ICANN 64 – in relation to mission and purpose and question 18. I think autofill is also a concern in relation to an issue that I raised several times in Work Track 4, and that was regarding question 23, in which the applicant is asked to provide a list of services they intend to provide using the TLD, and there was a disagreement within Work Track 4 about whether there was a requirement to describe all

those services at the time of application and have them open to public comment, and some felt that that had never been a requirement. I believe that question 23 always did require the disclosure of all services, and there's a tradeoff there because you might want to argue competitively that it's better if we don't have to disclose the services we're going to render because that's part of our long-term business plan and we want to be able to provide innovative services and be competitive without disclosing at the time of application what all those are.

On the other hand, the tradeoff is that public comment period passes and people don't watch the [inaudible] process as closely as they watch the application process. So in short, I think there's a lot more discussion that needs to be had here in relation to trying to come to a consensus on the C14. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Thanks, Anne, and first thing I want to note is you're correct, it's not about copy and pasting, it's about autofill, or something like that. So I want to just agree with that. I have stated it wrong as just copying and pasting. But it's actually not copy and pasting but autofill, so you're right on that.

What I'm trying to do with this question – and Kathy says in the chat, "Should the systems question or question whether the systems question would override or replace concerns raised in other sections." I'm actually looking at this differently, Kathy, in the opposite way. It's not we're taking this system question as a substitute for the policy of individualized unique nature of certain fields. So I'm putting that discussion in the parking lot o get to it in

EN

a future call, but the discussion I want to have is for those questions where we do think it's appropriate or could be appropriate for autofill that the system allows it.

So for example if you don't want to have to put your address, your contact information individually in 20 different applications because you're applying for a string in 20 different languages, should you be able to auto populate or autofill? Should the system have the functionality?

It's not whether we – this section which deals with the system features and functionality is not a substitute for the policy which we will talk about as to whether we like the fact that they're identical or not. It's, should the system have the capability? And what I hear and what everyone had commented on prior to ICANN was – and even in the comments – is almost all of them had supported the notion of allowing an autofill. It wasn't until ICANN 64 that someone said, "Well, wait a minute, does that override the concern we have about the individualized nature?" And we got talking about that policy.

I'm promising you we will have that discussion again about the policy, but I don't think that's the proper discussion here in the systems section. And I promise we will not allow the system section to override the concerns if in fact the group has concerns about having certain answers be the same in every single application. So let me go through – sorry, Maxim, you have your hand up. Is that an old hand or a new one?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Actually, it's new one. Yeah, also lots of fields are going to be the same in the TLDs which share the same software platform. So for example the description of some internal items are going to be totally the same because I don't see value in forbidding people from using same kind of software. And talking about the IDNs and TLDs, I'm not sure the ccTLD experiences might be applicable, because we're talking about gTLDs and GNSO in general. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Maxim. Steve, you have a hand. Please.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Jeff. You had mentioned parking lot in passing. I just want to take the opportunity to remind you all that within this summary document that's been displayed, there actually is a parking lot at the tail end of each section. So to the extent you think it makes sense to add this concept of – it's highlighted right now, but – reducing the distinct individualized nature of applications, if you think that's worthy of a separate discussion in and of itself, then there is a place within the section to capture that concept and make sure it gets flagged for future discussion. So I just wanted to flag and remind you that there's a parking lot in each section, so hopefully there's an appropriate section if maybe this makes sense to discuss somewhere else. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Steve. And I want to make some progress on this issue, so I'm looking at Anne's [last] comment. It says the system

section's in fact relevant if agreed – what Anne is saying is that – I'm rewording this, Anne, but let me know if this is correct. There's not consensus to autofill as it relates to mission purpose and services to be rendered, but can we say that there's consensus or not consensus at this point because we haven't done a consensus call, but can we say that there's general agreement for the other fields? So we can get past this and put the issue of autofill with respect to mission purpose and services in the parking lot. Is that a way forward in order to make some progress on this issue? Anne supports that approach. Kathy, is that an approach you'd be okay with?

KATHY KLEIMAN: Jeff, can you hear me?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes, Kathy, go ahead.

KATHY KLEIMAN: The answer is yes, but provided it's technically possible. There may be issues why it wouldn't be, that if you create an autofill facility, it may be for every field. So we have to look at technical, so we have to keep the question here too. Is it technically feasible? So it has to stay here as well as to move into other areas.

So if we can document this extensively and make sure that this is the agreement and that also it's both technically and substantively discuss later and the concerns are raise and addressed. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes. Thanks, Kathy. It's a good point. And all of this, just as a reminder, is implementation guidance. So it's not saying that – it's basically saying to ICANN you should do this unless it's not technically feasible, and so I think you're right on documenting it and making sure that it states exactly what we just discussed.

So I'm seeing some support for that approach so that we can get past this question, and we will add the policy of individualized and distinct nature of applications specifically on mission – let me go back to Anne's comment – purpose and services to be rendered. We'll add that to a future call so that we can have a through discussion on that.

Okay, sorry, Steve, can you just go back for a second to – I know you're taking notes very diligently, and that's great. Let me just start the discussion on 15, which I think is – okay, applicants should be able to specify additional contacts to receive communication about the application and/or access the application and be able to specify different levels of access or additional points of contact. The systems should provide means for portfolio applicants to provide answer to questions and then have them disseminated across all applications being [supported.] So to the extent that this one has got a reliance on the previous question, we should make sure that that is referenced back, so to the extent that we1re talking about mission, services rendered and – sorry, forgot the third one already – purpose. There we go.

So that's going to be referenced for C15 as well, and then there are definitely the same ICANN Org concerns that this would – they

understand why we want this but this would certainly add cost, complexity, etc., and then the BC comment about this could result in mistakes. So I think basically, this one ties to C14 and we should make sure it says similar things.

Maxim, while I'm taking a drink, why don't you go ahead?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Actually, we're talking about services, but some services had to be the same. There are services required to be fulfilled by registry, for example last time it was WHOIS, EPP, and yeah, when we're talking about services, please beware that there are some which have to be there, that have to be similar. And if you're not going to be as an applicant to investigate what our step is when you spend lots of money for literally – yeah, just investigating if it's going to be allowed or not. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes. thanks, Maxim. It's an important point but one I wanted to save for when we do talk about services rendered. I do think that that's critical, like you said, that there are certain services that are required and will be common across all applications, but that also may be addressed during accreditation – sorry, pre-approval programs.

Give me one second, guys. Okay, we're on 16. Maybe, Steve, can you just do 16 for me real quick while I get some more water? Thanks.

STEVE CHAN: Sure. Good luck getting water, Jeff. Looking at C.16, yet another piece of implementation guidance, talks about the system should provide clearly defined context within ICANN Org for directing particular types of questions. So there was support from most commenters, but there's a new idea and some divergence.

The BC or the Business Constituency suggests that questions should be rooted through a central system and eventually fed into the knowledge base, I assume referring to the responses. So ICANN Org expressed some divergence in a sense, noting that the global support center or the GSC, they actually serve as a central contact point for ICANN Org, and so to the extent there is expertise needed on certain topics, the GSC directs those questions to that particular subject matter expert.

So I think the BC new idea is actually consistent with how ICANN Org is saying that it's already done. So, are there any comments or questions about this? And Jeff, are you feeling any better? Kathy, I see ah and from you, but I'm not sure if that's an old hand or a new hand on 16.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Old hand, Steve. Sorry.

STEVE CHAN: No problem. Alright. Actually, just to dwell on this one a little bit longer, so the ideas from the BC and ICANN Org are actually in opposition to what is proposed in 16, so I guess it'd be good to get a sense of whether or not there's agreement with what was proposed in 16 about applicants [inaudible] direct questions

directly to the specific contact or if it makes sense to utilize the existing system of relying on the Global Support Center and them to be able to direct questions to the appropriate party. Does anyone have thoughts on that? Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Actually, last time, despite numerous contacts in different offices, the only office which could help was Los Angeles, and having something in different belts would be nice, but if it stops us from having future applicants from having future applications, it might be not that important than be able to have application round. Thanks.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Maxim. Are there any other comments? I guess I would note in the chat from Anne, she notes that C.15, that the BC comments that each application should be treated independently. And I would also note that maybe we have lost Jeff permanently at this point, so I'll just keep going at this point.

JEFF NEUMAN: I'm here.

STEVE CHAN: Welcome back.

JEFF NEUMAN: I was just enjoying listening to you.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks. Back to you, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. So finishing up on 16, Steve, if you could just scroll down. Okay, this one is talking about – no, we just did this one, right? This is about clearly defined contacts. So we're just now on – there was a referral in this part – if we go back to this – so these are the sections of this document that has the parking lot which we talked about a little bit earlier, suggested next steps, but there was also another comment that – and I think this is more for the communication section that we covered on the last call, butt the registrars had made a comment that more frequent updates during each of the evaluation process and allowing for more interaction between evaluators and applicants may be helpful, so that was just something that we need to make sure we fit into the discussion on the evaluation process I think especially.

As Steve is filling in the parking lot section that we just talked about with respect to services, mission, purpose, that is in our parking lot to continue the discussion on a subsequent call, and then in the last section, on these particular subject areas, especially systems that we're talking about today, there were a number of comments as Anne I think referenced earlier that said – and Donna – that a lot of these are nice to haves but some of them may not be the highest priority, and if it's going to add time, cost, complexity, it may not be worth doing.

So what we're going to try to do, the leadership and staff, is to try to use the comments, see if we can create a prioritization based on the comments that we've received so far, plus any new comments, so this is kind of a homework assignment, is to – if you would rank the recommendations in the systems section to which ones would be high priority for you, which ones would not be high priority to help us kind of try to capture that for the next discussion, the next time we pick up this particular issue.

And then of course, the overall comment from ICANN and others, which is to make sure that where we do have new recommendations from 2012, to make sure we indicate those in some sort of redline fashion or some sort of way to differentiate that we're recommending something that's different than the way it happened in 2012 or the same.

Any questions or comments on this? So Kathy has put in the chat, "Suggestion for parking lot, as agreed on April 21nd – that's today – it is, A, technically possible to not have autofill in some of the fields and autofill may not, without further agreement, be used for all fields."

Okay, thanks, we'll put some similar – actually, I guess Steve just copied that. So there we go, that's in our parking lot. Any other questions or comments on systems?

Okay, not seeing any others, we've come towards the end of the call. If Julie or Steve want to post when our next call is – thanks, Kathy – I'm feeling okay, it's just I've got into a coughing fit at the end of this call.

If we could just post when the next call is. I know it's every week, so it'll be next Monday. There we go, it's actually technically on Tuesday, because it's at 3:00 UTC because that's the next time in the rotation. We don't do calls on Sunday, so that's why it's 03:00 on Tuesday, which for those in the United States is actually still on Monday.

Okay, thank you, everyone, and have a great night, morning, afternoon, wherever you are in the world, and talk to you next week. Thanks, everyone.

JULIE BISLAND: Thanks, Jeff. Thank you, everyone. This meeting's adjourned. Thank you for joining today, and have a good rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]