
MONTREAL – GNSO - New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG (1 of 4)

Saturday, November 2, 2019 – 12:15 to 13:15 EDT

ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Good morning, everyone. Or I should say good afternoon now. Thank you for joining the SubPro PDP Full Working Group Meeting Session 1. For those who are members of the working group, or work track 5, please feel free to come up to the table and help yourself to lunch. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: We'll let people eat for a couple of minutes and then kick it off. Probably about four minutes.

Okay, we'll get started in one minute. Just a one-minute warning. Swallow all that food.

Okay, let me just look at the technical team. Okay, we're good to get started.

Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Jeff Neuman. I am one of the co-chairs for the Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Working Group. And over in the corner over there is Cheryl Langdon-Orr, the other co-chair of the SubPro Working Group. I want to welcome everyone here to the meeting of the full working group where the subject matter that we'll be talking about for these first two sessions involve the introduction or the issue of generic names at the top level. There will be one break in between these two sessions. And if we finish

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

with that material, then we can go on to other materials for the full working group but we've allotted this time to use for this subject matter.

So, without any further delay, let me introduce the four co-leads of work track 5. We have Olga Cavalli over there. It's hard to see this table. Then we have Javier, who is still eating. Martin Sutton. Annebeth Lange. So, let me turn it over to them.

ANNEBETH LANGE:

Thank you, Jeff, and welcome to everyone. It's good to see so many people here. First of all, I would like to thank all those who have been working with us to go through all these difficult questions we have had to deal with, as we know, many different views on how the outcome in the end should be.

But now the final report has been delivered to the full group. It's out on the GNSO Wiki and what we will do today is to go through the slides and explain to you what it was, what it is, why we have done it the way we have in the work track 5. If you have questions, we would be grateful if we leave most of it to the end after we have gone through all the different slides. It might be that what you are going to ask about will be covered at a later stage. But, please, write it down if you have any interesting questions, so you don't forget it. And if it's urgent – really want to put it – you can put it in the chat and we will try to follow that [along the way].

So, where are we now? Could you please move the slides for me, whoever is doing that here?

We have these four stations. We are starting now with the introductions and status. We will lead you through the recommendations from the work track 5, issues considered, and then questions and answers in the end. Next slide, please.

So, for those of you who do not know what work track is, I'm sure most of the people sitting here today have been through this before. But, just to be sure, the work track 5 is a subteam of the [inaudible] group of the new gTLD subsequent procedure policy development process working group, and now we have concluded our work. So we are tasked with calling upon the community's experiences. It's a lot of stakeholders that's been engaged. We have different experiences from the years that's been before us, that was led up to the 2007 policy, and then the 2012 Applicant Guidebook. So it's a lot of knowledge out there that we now try to collect and use the experiences everyone has.

So what we should do, we were set out to try and find out if there should be any changes to the existing 2007 GNSO policy for the introduction of new generic top level domains in 2007.

As we know, most of us is that from 2007 to 2012, there was a lot of discussion in all the different stakeholder groups and we ended up in 2012 with a somewhat different result than in 2007.

But what was in Applicant Guidebook was never accepted at the time as a policy from the GNSO. So what we've been trying to do is align the

2007 policy with the rules that were used in 2012 in the last round to align it and to hopefully get a policy that we all can agree on.

So we have been focused on reviewing the existing policy and implementation only on geographic names and only at the top level. Should there be any changes? And if so, recommending those changes revised new policy as appropriate. Next slide, please.

The scope of work included geographic names at the top level only, as I said. It's been a little confusion at some time, that it also included second level. But that is not so. It is only the top level. Comprised the two-character ASCII letter-letter combinations, country and territory names, alpha three on ISO 3166-1, short and long form in ISO 3166-1, additional categories in section [22141] in the Applicant Guidebook.

It also included capital cities in ISO 3166-1, city names, subnational names – that is, county, province, state in the 3166-2. UNESCO regions and names appearing in the compositional macro geographical continental regions, geographical subregions, and selected economic and other groupings. And other geographic names, such as geographical features like rivers, mountains, valleys, lakes, etc. and culturally significant terms related to geography, also known as non-AGB terms, they were not covered in the AGB in 2012. Next slide, please.

So, where are now? Work track 5 has drafted final report to the full working group, including a set of recommendations for the work track to consider.

There has been plenty of opportunity to give input in this time we have been working with it. We have had it out for public comment, and now we have held a consensus call in the work track 5 on this final report. And the report was supported by consensus.

We know that it's different opinions and practice on how consensus is used in the different stakeholder groups. So it might be relevant and useful for everyone to take a look at the GNSO consensus rules. And what we mean with consensus in this is that it is a position where only a small minority disagrees, but most agree. And that was the result of the call we had out for this report.

So, work track 5 has now submitted its final report to the full working group and this, in a way, sadly, concludes the work track 5 work. Of course, it's good to arrive at what is considered to be our goal but it's been very interesting discussions and a very good thing to – perhaps for the first time to – have all stakeholder groups discussing a common problem with so many different opinions. It's been a really good experience for a lot of us.

So, it concludes our work, unless the full working group asks us to go back to deliberate on issues that we haven't covered. So, that's where we are today. Next slide, please.

So, all recommendations coming out of this work will be reviewed and discussed by the full working group and to the extent that they are included in the work track's final report will be subject to consensus call in the full working group.

The final report of the full working group will then be sent to the GNSO Council for further consideration and adoption. Once adopted by the Council, the recommendations in the final report will be sent to the ICANN Board, and following consultation with the GAC and the community, the Board will vote on the final report recommendations. Next slide, please. This is the last one, isn't it? Yeah.

So, just a few highlights. Inclusive leadership team structure with four co-leaders – one from ALAC, one from ccNSO, one from the GAC, and one from the GNSO. And as I said, I think this has been a really positive experience and I hope that, in the future, when common problems pop up, that we can do this in other group as well.

It has been 168 members and 99 observers. Members include those from At-Large, ccNSO, GAC, GNSO, and RSSAC. GNSO is [inaudible] stakeholder group for ... Yeah. These are all the different constituencies. I don't think I will repeat all these different abbreviations. You can read them yourself. You know where you belong.

Work track 5 began its meeting in November 2017, and actually following a study group that had been discussing these things for two years before that. Held 52 meetings over the course of nearly two years.

The co-leaders provided updates to interested groups in the community during ICANN meetings, so we have had a lot of face-to-face meetings as well, both in these GNSO meetings and also in each of our meetings for At-Large and ccNSO and the GAC meetings. It's been

discussed extensively for many, many years. There's been newsletters between the meetings distributed to all interested individuals.

We have also had additional community input that we have gathered throughout working sessions at ICANN, cross-community, high-interest meetings, etc. In ICANN 59, 62, meetings that focused solely on this.

I would say that I haven't experienced so many meetings for any other subject during the years I've been involved with ICANN, and that's been a lot of years now.

So, this is where we are now. I will leave the work to Martin Sutton, my fellow co-lead, to go through some of the rest of the stuff. Thank you.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Thank you, Annebeth. Thank you, all, for showing up on a Saturday to hear about the final report that's been submitted now to the full working group for consideration.

I think if we just look back at some of the context for the recommendations, I think Annebeth highlighted some of these earlier, but just to be clear, when we first started off the whole process, it was obviously noted that there were differences between the policy – so, going back to 2007, we started off with policy recommendations that were to address this particular area.

But the way it evolved and transpired into the final guidebook in 2012 was quite different. So, there's variations as to how the 2007 policy

recommendations were formed and what was finally implemented in 2012.

So, one of the real key areas for us to work through on this group was trying to bridge that gap. So, looking at policy and implementations on these topics that were aligned to subsequent procedures and working through those deliberations.

So, looking at those deliberations that took place, we did specify earlier on and I think this is familiar within the whole working group environment, that unless there was an agreement within the actual work track to change anything, then 2012 implementation would be the fallback option. That was made clear early on.

Now, that would also then have the opportunity to bring all of those implementation rules into a defined policy under the GNSO. So, we did have many, many discussions. Two years it's coming up to now. So, we've enjoyed lots of debates, lots of open discussions amongst the group, different ideas and opportunities to make some changes.

So, after those extensive discussions and a lot of work by everybody, there was not much areas where we were able to agree to recommendations that actually sway away from the 2012 implementations. We'll go through the individual recommendations shortly but just to outline that particular fact.

That's not to say that we didn't attempt to. We explored various opportunities and ideas to make some changes that different parts of

the group thought would be beneficial for the work track to put forward as recommendations. Are we getting feedback?

Ultimately, work track 5 recommendations updating the GNSO policy recommendations to be consistent with the Applicant Guidebook of 2012, largely maintaining the Applicant Guidebook provisions for subsequent procedures. So, this will bring the policy recommendations from 2007 in line with the 2012 implementation.

Now, we as the co-leaders have worked in the background to discuss how various ideas and thoughts were generated within the group and try to progress any of those ideas, but ultimately we consider still that despite not having much variation from the 2012 guidebook – this is a big achievement in the sense that it actually brings the implementation guidance into actual policy. That was with very diverse opinions and perspectives brought in from across the work track 5 membership. So, in terms of trying to define compromise, it has been challenging but there were definitely strong attempts to do so. I congratulate the work track 5 members in terms of trying to make those changes and put forward those ideas and the way that those deliberations took place. Let's move to the next slide, please.

So, we're going to rewind a little bit here for those that may not be familiar with work track 5 activities, and just as a real reminder as to the background.

The 2007 policy recommendations, as they stood at that time, were recommendation 5 that strings must not be a reserved word and recommendation 20, an application will be rejected if an expert panel

determines that there is substantial opposition to it, from a significant portion of the community to which the string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted.

So, within our discussions of recommendation 5 in the report, include a reference to the Reserved Names Working Group final report. Again, there's lots of other activities that preceded work track 5 and we'll probably highlight some of those as we go through. But on the actual Wiki page, there is plenty of information and background attempts to explore and figure out some of the challenges that geographic terms at the top level created. So, do refer if you want to go deeper dive into any of those conversations and background material. They're all sourced very easily from the work track 5 Wiki page.

In that Reserved Names Working Group final report it is stated that there should be no geographical reserved names. The proposed challenge mechanisms currently being proposed in the draft new gTLD process would allow national or local governments to initiate a challenge. Therefore, no additional protection mechanisms are needed.

However, new TLD applicants interested in applying for a TLD that incorporates a country, territory or a place name should be advised that the GAC principles and the advisory role vested to it under the ICANN bylaws.

We recommend that the current practice of allowing two-letter names at the top level only for ccTLDs remain at this time. So, this is going back right to 2007, so 12 years ago. Move onto the next slide, please.

So, how did it compare with the 2012 implementation? So, with the fact that it recommended no reserve geographic names and rely on some curative mechanisms to address any issues related to geographic names, there was a difference. So, the 2012 implementation differed away from those GNSO policy recommendations.

However, there were many discussions, many different ideas put forward and certainly input from the GAC was important and the ccNSO to help steer this. So, the ICANN Board, the urging of the Country Code Supporting Organization and Government Advisory Committee, directed staff to exclude country and territory names from delegation in the Applicant Guidebook, and also other geographic names which were listed required a letter of support or non-objection, though for non-capital city names, the need for the letter was dependent upon the intended usage of that string. So, whether it was intended to be used for the purpose of a geographic relevance. Let's move to the next slide.

So, within the 2012 implementation, the two-character strings element remained in place, so applied-for gTLD strings in ASCII must be composed of three or more visually distinct characters. Two-character ASCII strings are not permitted, to avoid conflicting with current and future country codes based on the ISO 31661-1 standard. So, that was carried forward. Next.

To be clear, this is from, again, how the 2012 implementation carried forward, that under this particular section, treatment of country or territory names. The following strings were not available for delegation. So, these are a long list in front of us here. So, the alpha three-character

codes, the long-form names, short-form names. I won't read through the whole list. This is all lifted from the 2012 implementation guide. But it tied back most of these to the 3166 list but also included permutations or transpositions of any of the names included in items from one to five. Permutations include removal of spaces, insertion of punctuation, and additional removal of grammatical articles, etc. So, there were some discussions that we had on that and we'll see some revised language that came through in the recommendations. Also, a name by which a country is commonly known that may not be actually on the ISO 3166 list. Let's move forward.

Then there was another subset of geographic terms that, whilst they were not prohibited from applying, there was a requirement that the following ones must be accompanied by a document to support or non-objection from the relevant governments or public authorities. So, this included capital city names and in any language, according to the ISO 3166 standard.

An application for a city name where the applicant declares that it intends to use the gTLD purpose for the purposes associated with a city name. So, those that were not associated with a city name did not need to go through any approval or non-objection requirement.

So, those were essentially it, plus a couple of items here. Three and four. There's a sub-national place name, such as county, province, or state. Again, listed back into the 3166 list. And an application for a string listed as a UNESCO region or appearing on the composition of macro geographical, continental, regions, geographical subregions, and

selected economic and other groupings which we are all familiar with, I'm sure. We'll carry on to the next slide.

So, that gives you a background of where the work really flowed from and the rules that were in place from policy recommendations in 2007 through to implementation in 2012. Now I'll hand it over to Olga who will talk us through the recommendations put forward.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Martin, and before reading the recommendations I would like to take this opportunity to thank all our work track 5 members because we have been working together for two years and we had a lot of discussions and debate. It has been, for me, a fantastic learning experience. I would like to thank Jeff and Cheryl for their guidance as co-chairs. And a special thanks to my dear co-leads, Annebeth, Martin, and Javier. I enjoyed very much working with you. I will miss you. I don't know what I will do with my time now. I have to find another activity, another working group to engage with. So, if you have any ideas, let me know. So, thank you for that.

Let's see the recommendations. Work track 5 recommendation #1 consistent with section 22132, string requirements part 3, 3.1 of the 2012 Applicant Guidebook continued to reserve all two-character letter ASCII combinations at the top level for existing and future country codes. And this recommendation is consistent with the GNSO policy contained in the introduction of new generic top-level domains policy recommendation from 8 of August in 2007. This is the first recommendation.

Let's go to the second one, please. Work track 5 recommendation #2. Maintain provisions included in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook section 2, 2141. Treatment of country and territory names with the following clarification regarding section 22141. How do I read that? Permutations and transpositions of the following strings are reserved and unavailable for delegation. They are long-form name list in the ISO 3166 -1 standard, short-form name listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard, short or long-form name association with a code that has been designated as exceptionally reserved by the ISO 3166 maintainers agency, and separable component of a country name designated on the separable country names list. Strings resulting from permutations and transpositions of alpha three codes listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard are available for delegation, unless the strings resulting from permutations and transpositions are themselves on that list.

The third recommendation – next slide, please – is the following. Maintain provisions included in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook section 22141, geographic names required in government support with the following update regarding section 22124 that says the composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical subregions and selected economic and other groupings list is more appropriately called the standard country or area codes for statistical use [M49] and the current link for this resource, there is a link and you can see it in the report. The 2012 Applicant Guidebook provisions contained in section 22142 are inconsistent with the GNSO policy recommendations contained in the introduction of new generic top-level domains from the 8th of August 2007. This recommendation would make the policy

consistent with the 2012 Applicant Guidebook and therefore represents a change to the existing policy recommendations.

So, these are the three recommendations and I would like now to go to the next slide to review with you what has been considered. Of course, this is a summary of the issues that have been considered during these two years of deliberations. Can we move to the next slide, please?

So, what the work track considered in deliberations have a very, very high level. Two years was a lot of time, a lot of exchange of ideas and concepts. So, at a high level, the work track 5 deliberations included the following.

Considering principles that might guide the development of policy and implementation guidance. For example, increasing predictability, reducing the likelihood of conflict, promoting simplicity and allowing for introduction of new gTLDs. Sharing different views on the extent of which the following should drive policies and rules regarding geographic names in the new gTLD program, like international law, national law, local law, norms and values and other factors.

Discussing the appropriate mix of curative and preventative measures that should be used in the new gTLD program with respect to geographic names. [inaudible] perspectives on intended use. Should the way the applicant intends to use the string impact the rules that the new gTLD applicant must follow, for which strings.

Considering which parties should have a say in the delegation of strings with geographic meaning. Reviewing issues experienced and observed

in the 2012 application round, including those perceived as policy shortcomings and implementation issues.

The next slide is about the same considerations. Can we move to the next slide, please? Thank you.

More specifically, the work track considered different perspectives on the pros and cons of the existing implementation for each category of terms included in the Applicant Guidebook as well possible alternative treatments for the different categories of terms, like some of these proposed alternatives suggested an increase in protections, restrictions, and other suggested [inaudible] protections and restrictions – so, you can see the difference – relative to the 2012 Applicant Guidebook.

Whether additional types of terms should be subject to rules in subsequent procedures, which terms and what rules might apply. Ideas to address perceived implementation issues that some members identify from the 2012 application round. The extent to which translations of terms protected in the Applicant Guidebook should also be subject to the same rules, as well as the languages covered and the translation provisions. Whether work track 5 should address the issue of delegating three-letter codes listed in the ISO 3166-1 which are currently reserved and unavailable for delegation to anyone and whether there should be new or additional rules regarding their resolution of contention sets that involve one or more geographic names.

As you can see, considerations have been very broad, very different. Different perspectives. And I will give the floor to my dear colleague, Javier, for the last part of the presentation. Thank you very much for your attention.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET:

Thank you. Again, I join co-leaders on the feelings and thank you to all of you. Also, I'd like to express our thanks to our staff. Incredible, professional work. I think Emily is online. Thank you, too. But, Steve, Julie, thanks a lot for all the work.

Co-leads and the work track have done something here. One of the overriding objectives of this endeavor has to do with certainty and predictability and definitely aligning 2007 and 2012 is a statement on clearer rules and predictability. So, that is important to reiterate.

So, continuing on the proposals, go through the slides to slide 28-3. The initial report details 38 proposals put forward by work track members that the work track asks the community to consider in public comment.

Proposals were on the following topics. Proposed changes to the overall scope of protections for geographic names at the top level. Proposals on the treatment of country and territory names. Proposals related to the requirements that applicants obtain a letter of support or non-objection from relevant governments or public authorities to apply for certain strings. Proposals regarding additional categories of terms not included in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook. Proposals suggesting

changes to the implementation of the program with respect to geographic names at the top level.

The final report [inaudible] additional proposals considered by the work track that members put forward following review of public comments on the supplemental initial report.

And for those online, please be reminded that you can ask questions online and also members here can post things in the chat even though we're going to go in at the end. But just don't forget to chime in if you have to. At least remind yourself.

Slide 24. Public comment review and further deliberations. 42 public comments from a diverse set of stakeholders were received on the supplemental initial report. The work track carefully considered all comments received using a similar approach that the full working group is using for review of public comments on the initial report.

The work track focused additional deliberations on several topic areas that are considered particularly challenging and discussed additional proposals put forward by members on these topics.

One, the extent to which translations of certain strings into different languages should receive protections, as well as the languages to be included in these provisions.

Two, whether there should be additional categories of terms not included in the 2012 AGB that should be included in future Applicant Guidebooks.

Three, the treatment of city names that are not capital city names.

Four, resolution of contention sets that include one or more geographic names.

And overreaching implementation changes to the program in relation to the treatment of geographic names. The additional deliberations and proposals are detailed in the final report.

And before we go to the open floor for questions and answers, another thing that ... It was mentioned I think by Annebeth in the beginning and Martin, I think, is another achievement of this process is the experiment of having this almost or cross-community type of – and Olga mentioned it, too – cross-community type of working group which we’re talking about legitimacy [inaudible] just before in ALAC and it makes it very legitimate, very representative and informs the full working group already with an incredibly varied set of opinions. And multi-stakeholderism is hard, so we arrived at where we arrived because it’s hard. But we arrived. So, that’s another important thing to remind ourselves of.

So, with that said, questions and answers. The floor is open. Is there a queue? There has to be questions. So, is that it? Jeff, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. Thanks. I want to thank also the co-leads who have just done an amazing job with all this work. So, thank you for the great work. I just am honored to work with one of the first – I consider this one of the first truly multi-stakeholder policy development working groups that we’ve

had and I think this is a good model for going forward. Regardless of the outcomes – and I think, Javier, you said it. The legitimacy of involving everybody in the community and having everyone in the same room or in the same meetings at the same time, I think we all understand each other’s positions. We all can see that everybody coming to this debate has a good heart, good intentions, and wants to do the right thing. And when we can involve everyone in those discussions, even if it’s not the outcome that you may not have wanted going in, you certainly develop a deep appreciation for the outcomes and for the way things can work. So, thank you very much for that.

I do want to say to the full working group that it’s now our job to incorporate this into our final report. Our job is to make sure that the work track 5 has covered all of the issues that we believe are involved in looking at geographic names at the top level. Our job is to make sure that the processes were followed and to make sure that we clearly understand all of the recommendations and the rationale for those recommendations because, as was said in one of the earlier slides, when we do a consensus call at the overall full working group, this is going to be a part of it and it’s our expectation that unless we hear discussions otherwise, it would be very surprising to us to receive or to not have support for the recommendations if there’s no discussion at the full working group level otherwise.

So, this is the start of that opportunity. The full working group obviously has a number of issues on our plate and we will not wrap up our work probably until Q1 of next year but this is probably the only face-to-face discussion that we’ll have on this very topic. So, this is your opportunity

and hopefully – and I’ll turn it over to Cheryl. Hopefully, that will give some members, full group working members, and others in the community some time to think about if they want to ask any questions. So, let me turn it over to Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Jeff. I just want to raise two points. One specifically to the work track 5 team. And I do use that word team because it has been. And I’m not separating here the leadership, although I will give them a particular accolade in a moment. But I do want to note that, in general, collegiate nature that the whole of work track 5 has conducted itself with. There were deeply divided views at the beginning. There are still some deeply divided views at the end. But it has been a privilege and a pleasure to work through this process. It really was, I think, an exemplar of how even very prickly at times decision, discussion, deliberation and sometimes not getting an answer can be gone through.

So, I think kudos to all of those who were involved. And it was a large group. Yes, we put up how many members and how many observers there were but the core group that worked well exceeded that usual 80/20 rule. It was a very well-attended set of meetings.

To the leaders, though. I’ve worked with a follow people over a few years in this organization – just a couple. I think everything but the ASO at this stage. Anyway, suffice it to say, tiny little bit of experience. And working with you all and the way you’ve conducted this work track has

been a delight. And I think Jeff would join me on wanting everyone to give a round of applause to all of you.

That said, you are now passing your baby onto the full PDP working group. And I think it's important for us in this plenary to think about what you've been told in how much care and diligence has gone into developing this report. And we need to look at how we treat this now, not without obvious question, not without doing all the cross checks and has process been followed and all those things that is our duty to do. But also I'd remind us all, with the respect this piece of work deserves – I would hate to see us just take this “thanks for the fish and so long” sort of attitude because we had something special here, and whilst obviously we're going to debate and discuss it, I don't think we should forget where it's come from and how much effort and energy has gone into it. So, that's what I wanted to say to the plenary.

But I also wanted to make sure that we're very clear we will still get public comments in on these issues. This is a part of the journey. This is not the end of the journey yet. So, if you're in part of the cohort that didn't get what you think your voice heard loudly and clearly enough, there is the opportunity in the systems. Feel free to use it. And of course when it comes to looking at consensus, we've been given a consensus result from work track 5. I am so thrilled about that I cannot begin to tell you how pleased I am to see that happen.

But when we're talking about our consensus call for the full PDP working group, if you've got a minority view to put through, put it through, because we've got the processes to manage it. So, there's no

losers but there are a bunch of winners and I think some really good experiences. So, kudos to all those involved. And with that, I guess we get our plenary time back, do we? Unless people have more questions. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yes. Thank you. It's Anne Aikman-Scalese, member of the SubPro full working group but I haven't been involved in work track 5 at all. I also wanted to express great appreciation for what you've presented. It's super impressive. I'm just really wowed. I just wanted to say one question I have about continuing involvement of work track 5 members is there are many inter-related issues. It would seem that your final report rests heavily on curative mechanisms, and of course we're doing work generally in the full working group with respect to objections and the cost of objections and what's reasonable there. So, I'm kind of wondering will there be a number of you from work track 5 who will continue in the full working group?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You actually tied their legs to the table [inaudible]. It is a joke but it's tempting.

MARTN SUTTON: Thanks, Anne. I think that's a good point. There is a large number of members in work track 5, some of those do not participate in the wider working group but there is a good proportion of those that are actively engaged in the full working group and that will continue. And I'm sure

that if there is anything that needs to be fed back to work track 5, we'll still have the vehicle to achieve that for the remainder of the subsequent procedures work.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Great. Thanks.

JORGE CANCIO: Hello, everyone. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. I just wanted to join the thanks to the co-chairs of the working group and to the co-leads of the work track. I think it's been a very useful experience in bringing into, as Jeff said, the cross-community working experience we had in other efforts, like in the Accountability or in the Transition to a PDP process. And I think it sets a very useful precedent and also an example for all the 3.0 PDP discussions you are having in the GNSO. Or better said, we are having together in the community on how the GNSO PDPs can work better.

I think we can still improve things, of course. At least, from the government side, it's still a very big challenge to get people active into such intensive work efforts, but at least this is a very big step ahead from other PDPs where it's much more difficult to get involved from the government side.

So, I think that on substance we might be equally unhappy or more or less and equally unhappy on the results. Some of us would have wanted to see some better framework for avoiding future cases of some TLDs which are still lingering from the 2012 round but we didn't get there,

even when there was very good work from all parts of the community in trying to get to solutions – to pragmatic solutions – for addressing that.

I also wanted to thank all the fellow colleagues and members of the work track 5 because, perhaps in the first months, we had more harsher exchanges, but in the end, there's been a lot of collegiality and civility in discussions, really trying to understand what the other part was trying to get at. Although, of course, we represent different interests and sometimes you get to some red lines you finally cannot cross.

But as [inaudible] Jeff and some of the co-leads expressed, I think this is something we should build on. It may appear that we stuck to the 2012 rules but we didn't just do that. We put the policy on geo-TLDs as top-level domains on a much more solid ground. It's no longer something which is absolutely disputed. But at least on this work track 5 level, which has had such a good participation, it is not consensus proposal from the four SOs and ACs of the community. So, thanks again. Looking forward to [inaudible] future engagements.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Paul?

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thank you. I know we're doing a lot of echoing, but I think sometimes echoing is a good thing. I want to just thank the excellent leadership, both at the work track level and at the working group level. A special thank you at the work track level. I feel like the three co-chairs really did

a fantastic job of guiding the discussion. I never once felt like anybody's thumb was on the scale. I thought that it was extremely professionally run and I want to thank the three of you for that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Four.

PAUL MCGRADY: Four. Four of you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Only three of you.

PAUL MCGRADY: Pick which three. No, the four of you. I also want to echo what Jorge said about the collegial environment. When people disagreed with each other on the substance, there were times it did get spirited but it never got surly and I think that as community one of the things that we really struggle with is culture and I think that this work track 5 group was a great example of who we can be when we're being our best. I really enjoyed this group for that reason and want to thank the other members.

Lastly, I just want to praise the environment that was created. It was an opportunity for open and honest and comprehensive communication. We turned over all the rocks. I personally think the Applicant Guidebook 2012 went too far for geo rights. I didn't get anything that I wanted in

this process in terms of rolling that back, but I can honestly say that I was heard and I was understood and I wasn't shoved off into a corner. So, I really think that the open, honest, and comprehensive communication that came out of this was again one word – you don't always get what you want, but to be listened to and to be heard and understood by your colleagues around the table is us being our best. So, thank you.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Thank you, Jorge and Paul for those observations. I think that's really important because that doesn't tend to come across in a lot of the slide decks here where we're trying to get the information across but the experience within the actual group itself was excellent. The team spirit. At times, yes, very divergent views, but there were really good signals where there were attempts to compromise and I think if we can take that as a learning exercise and move that forward, it will get better and better as we take that though to different policy development activities.

PAUL MCGRADY:

And Martin, I'm sorry for leaving you out of my head count of the work track chairs.

MARTIN SUTTON:

I knew it was me.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. Thank you for the comments, Jorge and Paul. Nothing of what we have done, absolutely nothing, could have been achieved without the fantastic support of the staff. Emily, Julie. They are absolutely fantastic. Super professional. Always there for us anytime, middle of the night, middle of the morning, Saturday, Sunday. So, all this work has a fantastic background and is their work. So, many thanks for that.

MARTIN SUTTON: Okay. Sorry, Jorge.

JORGE CANCIO: Just quickly. Just coming from the ALAC and At-Large perspective, one of the things that this type of cross-community or more legitimate and more comprehensive group of people does, at least from an At-Large perspective, is that At-Large or ALAC, ALAC is an advisory committee really weighs in late in process in PDPs because that's the way it's set up. It's advisory.

And of course we have At-Large members in different PDPs. But in this case, not only we had incredibly good and great participation from At-Large in this work track – some of you are here, Justine, Greg, Christopher I think might be online, others. But also having today to be part of the team here is really a way to kind of help cure some of the structural things in the way that maybe there's late participation or later participation from ALAC or the At-Large world in general in these PDPs. So, that was at least very important for me to be able to be here

and achieve that, that this process can inform future processes as it has been mentioned here that this way forward really gives a lot of legitimacy to these PDPs that maybe in the past have been seen just as a GNSO thing with some sideways communication. This is different. We've said it. Everybody is mentioning it. And I think that's an output that has to be remembered.

The other thing is that we started out behind and we caught up to the actual work track, the working group, and that seemed like a tall task at some point and now we're like, "While we're here" So, that's it. Thank you very much.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thanks very much, although I'll be happy to say Jeff Neuman. I just wanted to say, picking up on the point that Jorge just made and attaching that to the comment that Jeff made about how the working group will be very surprised and the leadership will be very surprised if there are, let's say, if there's negative feedback received at the eleventh hour.

I think, although there are very many of us in this room and many of us have been involved in SubPro, the vast majority of the community is outside of this room and not hearing these accolades and hasn't had the benefit of these slides. So, I think it behooves all of us to go back to our respective communities, whether that's the ALAC or the GAC or the GNSO or the RSSAC or the SSAC or whoever it is and communicate what has happened in the room today, the messages that have been heard, the general positive feedback that's been received. Really, it behooves

us to inform our colleagues who haven't been part of this effort so that we don't get to a point at the end, as Jeff has said, where we receive any sort of surprise feedback. Thank you.

ANNEBETH LANGE:

Well, I started this presentation and now I will end it and say thank you so much to everybody and I really hope that we can continue working in the spirit that this group has worked. I will join the others in saying that it's amazing because, in the beginning, it's difficult. You have, even as a co-lead, you represent one point of view. As Paul said, a compromise is when nobody is really happy. That's what we have achieved. But at the same time, what we have achieved is to know each other much better.

I've been in the ICANN community or 20 years now and it's such a change. This is a step towards the way to acknowledge each other and understand the other point of view and that will help everyone, even if you lose, even if you didn't get exactly what we wanted. We have been heard and it will still be opportunities, as has also been mentioned here by Cheryl. If you have a minority view, please come with it.

So, thank you, again, I also would like to join Olga in I would never have survived without that wonderful staff. I've been working in many surroundings but this is the best staff I have ever worked with, really.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. Speaking of the wonderful staff, we've been working behind the scenes because we thought there would be some more discussion on this issue. But it's great.

We do have a break scheduled now anyway until 1:30. We'll take that break and then I'll start the next session with an update from some of the NCAP work that's going on and then we'll get into some of the substance that I know was scheduled for Monday. We'll talk about some of that today and then make sure if there's follow-ups talk about that Monday as well. So, we'll get into the predictability model and string contention, and if time, the appeals mechanism.

So, take a break. Everyone come back and there's still a lot of work to do. So, hopefully, everyone will come back.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]