

Karla Valente: Good morning everybody. My name is Karla Valente. I'm with ICANN. I'm Director of Communication Product Services. I joined ICANN in 2007 as Director of the New gTLD Program. I saw the program up to the launch of the first Applicant Guidebook, and now I'm concentrating my time more on outreach and communication activities around the program.

When you joined us at the reception, you probably received a package, and in this package, besides the agenda, you have a fact sheet about the new gTLD program. And this is the program that I'm going to be talking about. You also have a fact sheet about IDMs that speaks very generically about IDMs. And you have a fact sheet about Fast Track process, which is a different program, different from new gTLDs. And, Baher is going to give a presentation a little bit later today and talk about IDMs.

Also, you should have received a feedback form, and we would appreciate if you could fill out the form and tell us what you think about the different programs that we are running at ICANN, and also about this event.

So for now, we are going to go over ICANN's mission and new gTLDs. Why is ICANN doing new gTLDs? How is that tied to ICANN's mission; a brief historical background about gTLDs, the development of the policy, and also, some aspects of the gTLDs or generic top-level domains before, and, the policy development overview, and the program overview.

ICANN's mission and new gTLDs: So, new gTLDs are part of ICANN's mission or part of the founding documents. One of them is the 1998 ICANN Agreement with the USG and you can see there that define and implement the predictable strategy for selecting new generic top-level domains. In addition to that, we have a white paper in 1998 that also talks about new gTLDs.

Ultimately, the goal that ICANN has is to foster choice and competition in the domain name registry services around the world.

Historical background: So, as you know, we have in the top-level domain space, we have the ccTLDs, over 250, like .ae. And we have the generic top-level domains. The expansion is on the generic side, and if you look back in history, you have now 21 generic top-level domains in the root, and ICANN has an agreement with 16. There were eight that predate ICANN, and one of them is a well-known one which is the .com. And you see others.

We had round that happened in 2000, and you see the list of the names that were introduced in 2000. And, the most recent round happened in 2004. so, I think it's not maybe an accurate thing to say that these are new generic top-

level domains, because top-level domains were introduced previously. So now we are expanding the top-level.

And the difference between what happened before and what happens now is that the program nowadays is much more complex. We learned a lot of lesson from the previous rounds. The previous rounds were very small in scale, very few applicants, and the new round is expected to receive eventually much more application, and is a much more open process and complex process.

So, all of the experiences from the previous rounds helped in developing part of the process, and also helps the policy process, and helps us to develop the program itself.

Some of the key benefits of new gTLDs: And probably this is one of the challenging things to say, because we're talking about the future and we're talking about a future that, to a certain extend, was going to be shaped by the market, because we don't know what generic top-level domains are going to be applied for, how many we are going to see. Are we going to see many community-based, are we going to see many geographical-based, are we going to see many brand-type of TLDs? Are we going to see more of geographic generic? So, we don't know exactly.

So, predicting the future is a bit challenging because it will really be shaped by the market and by the applicants and by the way these TLDs expand and are used in the marketplace. But, one of the main goals that ICANN has is to encourage and foster the creativity and the innovation, the consumer choice in the marketplace, the competition in the domain name space. Also, very important is the introduction of internationalized domain names.

So as I mentioned to you in the beginning, you received three brochures. One of the brochures is going to talk about the Fast Track program. This Fast Track program introduced IDMs into the marketplace, but has very specific rules, and I encourage you to read that. And the new gTLDs are also a way to introduce internationalized domain names and has different requirements.

Nowadays, you see IDMs in the marketplace. You see them on the second level, you see them on the third level. Sometimes you see the internationalized domain names being introduced in the marketplace by the generic top-level domains like .com, or sometimes you see them introduced by the country code top-level domains, for instance .pierre in Poland.

When they introduce IDMs, what kind of languages are chosen, how the introduction is made, whether or not they choose to introduce in the second or the third level, all of those things are really up to the registry to decide. So if you look at the marketplace in the past year, there has been an increase in the introduction of IDMs, but it has been quite inconsistent. It's very difficult to predict what registry is going to introduce and why and how. And what you're going to see in the near future is the IDM on the top level, which is quite different from what we have seen up to now.

The policy development: So as **Lisa** explained in the beginning, at ICANN, you can really divide in two pieces, if you will. One is the policy development side, and the other one is the implementation side. So, the policy development for the new gTLDs started in 2005 and ended in 2007. So as you can see, the GNSO, which is the Generic Names Supporting Organization of ICANN – this is one of the organizations that is the bottom-up process – took two years to develop a policy that is quite complex.

If you look, we have 19 recommendations. Actually, there are 20, but one of them doesn't really count. We have 19 recommendations and those recommendations really serve as a foundation for the ICANN staff to build on the criteria and the processed that you see on the new gTLD program. The policy was approved by the ICANN Board in June 2008, and this was during the ICANN Paris meeting.

The policy conclusions: So, if you look at all of the 19 policies that were developed, what kind of main things could you draw from this policy? One is that new gTLDs will benefit the registrant choice and competition, so a registrant is the one that registers the domain name, which is different than the user that simply searches. Implementation plans should be created and this is what we're doing now. When we say new gTLD program, this is the implementation plan that we're working on.

Implementation plans should also allow for IDMs and ideally, implemented at the same time as the new ASCII TLDs. New gTLDs should not cause security or stability issues, and this is one of the main concern ICANN has in everything it does. For us, it's extremely important that no matter now the Internet grows on the top level, no matter how many TLDs we have out there, we have an Internet that is secure and we have an Internet that is stable and operable around the world.

And then we have also, in the policy, the protection of various interests that require some specific mechanisms, and I'm going to talk about them a little bit later.

Internationalized domain names: I'm not going to expand too much on that, because we have Baher giving an in-depth information about IDMs. But this is just a very quick way to take a look at what happened. They have existed on second level since 2003, and now, we had technical development and we have policy development around IDMs to make sure that they work when they are introduced. And we have two programs within ICANN right now that will enable the introduction of IDMs into the marketplace. And here, it's probably a very dark PowerPoint, but here is what is the availability today, and you see that on the second level here. And, this is the future, which is the TLD on the top level.

Program development and community participation: So we have the policy development aspect, which took two years, and the GNSO group is formed by actually, quite diverse members including intellectual property representation, we had registry, registrars and so forth. So this quite diverse group took two years to develop the policy.

Now, when ICANN implements the criterion, the processes around new gTLDs, one of the important things for us is to make sure that the community is involved in this process. And the way we do that is by sharing, ongoing, sharing the information and getting the input from the community about the different aspects of the program.

There are two ways that we get input. One is when we have public comments, and public comments is really, we say, it starts on a certain date and ends on a certain date. This is the proposal that we have at the table. And what you need to do is just register, and in writing, provide your feedback on what we are proposing.

The other way to give feedback is in meetings or sessions like that. What we will do after this session is just summarized the outcome, and we get back to management and the Board and say, "This is what happened in the sessions. Those were the issues raised. Are they the same or not as the ones we received in writing," and so forth.

So what we have done in the new gTLD program so far? We have published a draft Applicant Guidebook, so the Applicant Guidebook is a document that should explain to the future applicant, from A to Z, what to expect during the application process, what you are going to be required to provide in terms of information, in terms of documentation, some rules around the extension that you're going to select. There are some things that you can or cannot do. So for instance, if you choose an extension that after the dot is composed only by numbers, this is not allowed. There is a technical issue for that.

So, the Applicant Guidebook is a very important document if you are contemplating on applying for a TLD, because it explains to you from A to Z what to do and what to expect during the evaluation process. And we so far have published two drafts. So we published the first draft in November last year. Then we went through a public comment round. We gathered all the comments and then, based on the comments and based on internal, we work a lot with consultants too in different areas of expertise, so we gather the comments and also, continuing input from the consultants. And then, we created the second Applicant Guidebook, which is an advanced version or a modified version of the first Applicant Guidebook. And this sometimes is confusing to people, because "what is the document that I actually have to read in and what is the information that I actually need in order to understand the new gTLD program?" And if you go to the new gTLD page right now, we have over 30 documents and links there, and one can get lost quite easily.

But what I recommend you to do is to read the draft Applicant Guidebook, very badly named DAG, because of this bad habit that ICANN has with acronyms, Version 2. The Version 2 is the most up to date version. In addition to that, there are some excerpts that were posted recently and we expect to post a Version 3 before the ICANN meeting that takes place in Seoul.

So, this is an important document for you to read and for you to understand if you're planning on applying; the Applicant Guidebook.

Now, in addition to that, people are very interested in understanding why certain decisions were made and what is the criteria or the thinking that we had behind, for instance, establishing a \$185,000 fee, why it's a fee like that. How did you come up with this number? So, we would have some papers. For instance, explanatory memoranda that are going to explain a little bit more in depth why certain choices were made for the criteria or for a process within the program. And there's a series of explanatory memoranda, and what they do actually, is they compliment the Applicant Guidebook explaining the thinking behind the choices that were made.

So, we continue gathering the feedback, and we continue engaging the community as we develop the program. We have a long way to go still. Our goal is to launch the program, and by launch, I say open the application process to the world. We expect to do that in 2010, but we still have a long way to go. And, it's very important that at this point, you take on the few additional opportunities there will be for public comments. So when the Applicant Guidebook Version 3 is posted for public comments, please look into it and give the feedback to ICANN, because this really helps us to inform the process. This really helps us to understand what people care, especially

around the world. We have posted the previous versions in six languages, and we are going to post the Version 3 also in six languages, and the way we choose the language is just by using this six United Nations languages so far.

However, the program itself is in English, at least for this first round, at least for now. So, when you see the Applicant Guidebook, even though you will read that the Applicant Guidebook in six different languages – you can do that – when you apply for a TLD in the future, the system is in English, the application process is in English, the evaluation and so forth is in English, the contract that a future registry signs with ICANN is also in English. So, it's an English-based program with materials that are provided in other languages, at least for now. We do have a goal to, in the future, expand the program and make it truly multilingual.

Where are we in the process? So, we continue to balance the desire to move forward with also exercising some caution about the issues that were raised and how to resolve that to this other section of the community. So, one of the metaphors used is that we have one foot on the accelerator and another one on the brake all the time balancing out what needs to be done.

We're working on the Version 3 that we plan on posting. And, we're seeking comments to the participation overarching issues. I'm not going to expand too much on the overarching issues, because that is going to take probably half of the day to explain how they were identified, what kind of actions were taken, and what comes next. It's quite a complex thing to explain in a one-day session that we need to cover a lot.

But what happened is that when we posted the Applicant Guidebook Version 1, and even the Version 2, the number of comments that we received from the community, if we classified the comments in a certain way, they fell into four very distinct categories of four overarching issues.

One of the main comments we got from the public was economic analysis. What is the market impact? What is the demand for new gTLDs? And what ICANN did for that is really to work with economists to post economic studies around the issue, and share the economic study with the community, and again, posting it for public comment.

The second issue that was raised by the community was trademark protection on the top level and on the second level. So, several special intellectual property practitioners came back to us and said, "You know what...this is good; however, you're not doing enough to protect the intellectual property protected trademarks in your program, and there's some

things that we would like to see happening. We would like you to be a little bit more rigorous in your criteria. We'd like you to amend some processes in a different way."

Now, I'd like to remind you that when we had the policy development process, we did have the input from the intellectual property community during the policy development. And now we had again, feedback from the intellectual property community in the process development. Of course, when you see things in the process, they look different, and then you can, in a more tangible way, offer some solutions.

The Board came back to the intellectual property community and said, "Work with us, form a group." The group is the IRT, Implementation Recommendation Team. "Work with us. Provide us with proposals. Tell us exactly what the issues are and what do you propose to resolve this issue from a practical standpoint, and we will evaluate that." And they did a remarkable job in a very short period of time. A group of intellectual property experts was assembled with some geographical diversity and they put forth a proposal that is now on the table. It was also submitted for public comments and is now on the table for the Board to see. And this is the second overarching issue.

The third overarching issue is consumer protection or malicious behavior. So, there's a lot of malicious behavior that happens nowadays on the Internet and the concern or the fear from the community is that when we have an expanded number of TLDs, does it mean that the malicious behavior is going to increase and we are going to see X number of security issues in the near future? What is it that we can do in terms of curbing or in terms of somehow controlling the malicious behavior?

Now also, we have to keep in mind that a lot of the things that happen from the malicious behavior at some point nowadays is for the Internet that we know today, but what it's going to be in the future and what kind of malicious behaviors are going to happen in the future is something that we cannot know. So, we need to keep some flexibility in the program.

We have groups like Anti-Phishing Groups and all kinds of consumer protection groups that are now working with ICANN to look into the malicious conduct issues and see what kind of recommendations can we put forth to really help to address those issues in the future with the new TLDs.

And the fourth overarching issue, which is very important for ICANN, it is the root scaling. So, you have the root, and now we're adding generic top-level domains to the root. But we're also adding IDMs, we're also adding DNS

Sec, we're also adding IPV 6, etc. So, a year and a half ago, maybe a little bit more, when we looked at expansion of the root in terms of new gTLDs, there was nothing that was identified in the preliminary assessment. Nothing was identified that said by adding an expanded number of gTLDs we are going to have an issue with the root. So preliminary findings are so far okay.

Now what we're doing is we engaged the SSAC and RSSAC, which are two technical groups from ICANN, and those groups are looking into, more in depth, on the root scaling, not only taking into account the introducing of an unlimited number of gTLDs, but also looking at the root impact as we add IDMs, DNS Sec, IPV 6, and all of the other changes that are taking place. So what's going to happen to the root and how is the root impacted moving forward, again, keeping in mind the security and stability concerns that ICANN always has?

I'm going to – yes, please.

Male: Do you want to take questions now or at the end?

Karla Valente: Whatever works for you. Now is fine.

Male: You don't mind? So, maybe I can ask a quick question. I was in London a month – sorry, my name is (23:01 unintelligible).

Karla Valente: On the 15th.

Male: And there was some discussion in London about what is going to happen after the draft 3 of the Guidebook. So, do you think you can move directly to the final version, or would there be a Version 4 of the Guidebook? What's the current (23:23 unintelligible) because there was some discussion in London (23:26 unintelligible).

Karla Valente: Yes. So, we're discussing that internally, because ideally, we would like to see the Applicant Guidebook Version 3 to be as close as possible to the final, right? And we have these overarching issues pending. So if you look at the four overarching issues, two of them have some advanced work done, which was the economic demand and the trademark protection has very tangible proposals on the table to be evaluated.

The malicious conduct is still on the way. And the root scaling is the study that RSSAC and SSAC is going to provide us with. This is – I would say end of Q3, beginning of Q4. So, we really need to see how we are going to move forward. We're resolving those issues and there's a separate aspect to that, which is ICANN's operational readiness. We want to make sure that the

system is in place, we have the employees in place, we have everything ready to accept the applications. So, all this work is being done, is being constantly evaluated to see what's going to happen for the Applicant Guidebook Version 3, and can we realistically have a Version 3 and then jump to the final, and launch. Or, as Kurt, I think, raised in London, we might even have an Applicant Guidebook Version 4, depending on how much work we can do from now to Seoul.

So, to give you a long answer, just to say I don't know.

Male: So it's still an open issue.

Karla Valente: It's still an open issue whether or not we're going to need a Version 4.

New gTLD program: So what is the program? The program is just the development of the criteria process and the tools that organizations around the world will be able to use in order to apply for the future new gTLDs. The Applicant Guidebook is the main document that actually describes this process and again, every time we developed different pieces of the program or the process, we always kept in mind that we have to continue preserving the DNS stability and security.

Some of the principles of the program: Again, what kind of criteria, how did we go about developing some of the criteria or some of the process used? We looked at doing something that is conservative. This is the first time that we're launching at that scale. Even though we had two rounds before, at that scale, is the first time that we launch. We don't know the number of applications we are going to receive. We hear different numbers from anything that would say from 50 to 500 or thousands. So, we don't really realistically know how many effectively we're going to receive.

So, we tried to develop a program that is with care and conservatisms. We tried to do it in a very efficient manner, but we always look at implementation process in a way that it protects registrants, that is protects the DNS stability and security. This is very important for us.

The evaluation fees are planned to cover costs. So, there was a lot of comments and speculations about the evaluation fee and why ICANN has an evaluation fee being a not-for-profit organization. All of the fees associated with the program, and the evaluation fee is only one of them, it's not for us to have profit. ICANN is a not-for-profit organization, and one of the principles and one of the things about the development of the program, policy wise, is that we recover the costs.

Adrian...

Adrian Kinderis: The floodgates are open now (27:30 Unintelligible) question. Evaluation fee, is that the – well, I would understand as the application fee.

Karla Valente: That's right.

Adrian Kinderis: Because there are fees specifically further on in the process that you must pay should you be (27:45 unintelligible).

Karla Valente: That's right. Yes.

Adrian Kinderis: So, you're talking there about the \$185,000 application.

Karla Valente: That's right. Yes.

Adrian Kinderis: So, (27:55 unintelligible) how far is ICANN going back to cover costs? The new gTLD process has been going for, as you pointed out earlier, since the closing of the last round actually, and has been going. Has ICANN taken a conscious decision to go back and try to cover all of those costs or is it more recent? Where was the line in the sand (28:17 unintelligible)?

Karla Valente: Yes. So if you look at the cost documents, I think we're still looking into the model itself, but the model has the historical costs and at a certain point, we looked at the historical costs that dated from the policy development, then from the finalization of the policy. So, I need to check where we are now, because what is historical, right? I don't think historical dates back to the previous 2004, 2000 rounds if I recall.

Adrian Kinderis: (28:28 Unintelligible) importantly, it's good for people to understand that although \$185,000 is a lot, there is actually some history there that ICANN is trying to recover costs on. It's not just the cost from when the applications start going forward, it's actually there's quite a significant history there of ICANN (29:01 unintelligible) policy development to get to where they are, but you are seeking to recoup those costs.

Karla Valente: Yes. And I think that we are not going very deep into historical costs. We're really focusing a lot on the development and actually how much would we need really to process the evaluation cost. And we did have some explanatory memoranda that was around costing models and we're looking at the costing models now to see is this the costing model that we're going to have moving forward.

For most applications, we expect that the Applicant Guidebook or the processes that we offer are clear, predictable, and timely, a timely roadmap. So you, as an applicant, would know what happens on each step of the process and how long it's going to take for each step of the process. We also have objection and dispute resolution in some cases where strings - and there's four cases.

One is when the strings infringe someone's existing rights. So for instance, somebody has a trademark and there's a third party applying for the trademark. We have a mechanism for this party to object to this applicant. We have somebody misappropriates a community label, somebody applies saying, "I represent Community X" and then Community X can go back and say, "Wait a minute. This applicant does not represent our community as it stated."

Cause user confusion – and again, by user here, we mean any of us/all of us. When we look at the string after the dot and we put two or more strings together, are we likely to get confused by the string itself? And you can imagine what kind of complexity this means as we add IDMs in different languages.

Then we also have potentially go against morality and public order, which was probably one of the most challenging pieces of the program, because what does it really mean from a global perspective with different value sets and different laws, etc.

And we have, right now, independent parties that are experts in dispute resolution, and these organization are going to be the ones that handle dispute resolution. So, ICANN is going to process applications for new gTLDs, and we are going to use evaluators from outside ICANN, so different companies that we are going to contract with are going to be evaluating pieces of the application. In addition to that, aside, you have organizations or tree organizations that are in charge of managing this objection, the dispute resolution process. If you are going to object to some application, what you're going to do is to lodge an objection with those third parties, not with ICANN.

The application process: So, we are going to have an open predetermined application period. So ideally, the policy wants the new gTLDs to be introduced into the marketplace on an ongoing basis, so basically it's open and you can apply at any time, like nowadays apply for a domain name at any time. But, because we need to understand demand and we need to understand the complexity of the applications that we get, what we are going to be doing from now on is rounds.

So, the first round is envisioned to take place in 2010. It's going to have a very clear starting date for the application period and a closing date for the application period. And then, we're going to go over the evaluation process and at the same time, we plan on announcing when the next round is going to be. Next round again is going to have an application period, and so forth.

It will be web based, which means that you're going to go to the ICANN site and you're going to see a system that is called "TAS." TAS is the TOD Application System. You register, you create a user account, and then you are going to see questions that pertain to the program, for instance about the string you're going to apply, about the company that is applying for the TLD, the technical and financial capability of this company, etc. And you're also going to be asked to provide supporting documents to prove that this company is legitimate and it exists, to prove that it's financially capable of managing a TLD, and so forth.

So, TAS lodges all of these questions and all of the documents from the applicant, but TAS also serves the evaluator so the evaluators can log in and see the applications, and get the specific part that they are going to evaluate. And they can post the evaluation and reports. TAS works as a workflow for us internally too, so staff can see at which stage of the application or evaluation we have each of the applicants. And as I mentioned before, there's the Applicant Guidebook.

Now, who's the applicant? The applicant is any public or privately established organization from anywhere in the world. We're not receiving applications from individuals, so Karla Valente could not apply for a domain name. It must follow all of the application steps and rules that are pre-established and published. So, we are not going to receive incomplete application. Must demonstrate organizational, operational, technical and financial capability.

And probably, this is one of the parts that I consider being quite critical, because when you apply for a top-level domain name, it's not like buying a domain name from a registry or a registrar nowadays. You buy a domain name and your responsibility's only for the content of the site. This is not what is being proposed here. What is being proposed here is a business. So, if you are applying for the top-level domain, you are committing to establishing a business. You are committing to standards of an existing industry. You are committing to having to understand the kind of infrastructure that is going to be required. And, what kind of commitments you're making, not only towards ICANN but towards the community, towards the registrants, towards the registrars and so forth. It's quite a complex

industry and it's quite a complex business, so it's not only to prove your capability, but also to understand what you're getting yourself into. You're not buying a domain name. You're expected to run a business.

And, there's \$185,000 application fees. There's other application fees that apply depending on the application path, and I'm going to explain that a little bit later.

So, those fees have to do with the application and the evaluation process. Now, let's say that your top-level domain is accepted and you sign a contract with ICANN, which is – we call it Base Agreement or Registry Agreement, different names, but there's a contract and you find that in the Applicant Guidebook. In this contract, you're going to see that this business or the registry is going to have an ongoing financial commitment with ICANN as well. So, you need to understand from a financial standpoint, it's not only how much is the application fee, it's also other fees that you have to be prepared to pay. It's an ongoing financial commitment if you become a registry. And also, all the investments that one needs to do in order to put together a business like that.

Open application: So, we never really had the intention to develop types of application, even though in the industry, depending who's presenting this program to you is going to talk about geographic top-level domains or dot brand – I hear that a lot – the brand domain names or the community TLDs or the open TLDs. The truth is we never had the intention to do types and we don't refer to the proposals that we have on the table as types of TLDs. But what we have is certain requirements apply to certain applicant, depending on how they really identify the TLD that they're applying for.

So, let me explain that a little bit better. One of the things or the terms that we have used is an open application, which is one that I personally don't like. But an open application has not been designated as a community based, can be used for any purpose consistent with the requirements of the application evaluation criteria. So, I'm going just to throw something like that - .love, not community based, open.

I think a lot of confusion happens with the word or the term "open" when we see this. May or may not have a formal relationship with an exclusive registrant or user population. This is quite confusing and I think what we really mean is that when you have a gTLD or even a ccTLD, there's certain rules that apply. So just because it's a generic top-level domain, it doesn't mean that it's open to anyone everywhere. Sometimes a generic top-level domain has strict rules of who can apply.

So for instance, one of the generic top-level domains that we have in the marketplace is .museum. Well, guess what...Karla Valente cannot apply for .museum unless I am a museum. So this is a generic top-level domain that has restricted rules, so it's not quite open as the terms we use sometimes in the marketplace. Dot Asia is another example. Anyone can apply, yes, but you need to have an address in Asia and Asia has been defined as an X number of countries, and you have to have an address within these X number of countries. Is this open? Well, we say that this is open, but as you can see, there's some restrictions for the registrant in the future that apply.

It may or may not employ eligibility to use or use restrictions. And again, how this TLD is going to be used.

Community-based applications: So again, we have the open-base application, now the community-based application, and this is one that causes also a lot of questions. Community-based gTLDs is a gTLD that is operated for the benefit of a defined community consisting of a restricted population. So, during the application process, the applicant, when they go through the test system, they're going to be asked are you applying for a community-based type of application and if they say yes, they are then committed to answering a number of questions. And they have to be very careful when they designate community based.

When you look at the policy development, the GNSO that designed this community based application, what they had in mind and what they had at heart is really to protect communities like the Navaho community, the communities that really didn't have any other kind of protection, and they wanted to protect these communities in a certain way. And this is why we have this community-based application. If somebody's claiming to represent a certain community, then we need to prove that they indeed represent this community.

So what is the applicant of a community-based application expected to do? They have to demonstrate that they have an ongoing relationship with the defined community that consist of a restricted population. And what does that mean? A restricted population is a population that you can really define and if you have, for instance, somebody apply for .redshoes, people that like red shoes around the world are not quite a restricted population. It's too vague. So, we need this community to be more concise or we need to have a better understanding on how it works.

The term "community" – and that was an interesting aspect when we were developing the application process, because we looked in sociology, we looked in many different academic areas to find the definition of a community

that could be well applied to the application process. And, it was very difficult. Community is defined in different ways by – there was not really a way that was practical to be transformed into a process. It's almost the same as when you try to define culture. What is culture? Is it the language, is it some activities that a specific population does? What is culture? Culture also is one of those terms that has many different definitions.

So, community was quite challenging. So what we did is to define some kind of criteria for people that apply for community based. The gTLD string – the term string is actually what goes after the characters, the set of character or what goes after the dot. Saying top-level domain or TLD string is exactly the same. Strongly and specifically related to the community named in the application.

So, if I'm applying for the .navaho representing the Navaho community, I have the nexus between my TLD string and the community that I'm claiming to represent.

Have proposed dedicated registration and use policies for registrants, and it's proposed gTLD: So, once the registry's established and the TLD is available, what are the rules for the registration for the gTLD? How is this tied to the community that this applicant claims to represent?

Have it's application endorsed in writing by one or more established institutions: And this was also a very challenging one, because when we were developing the process, there came a question about something that is legitimate versus established. So, I originally come from Brazil and we have a lot of indigenous communities in Brazil that are legitimate but they are not established legally. Formally, there's no really piece of paper that might say this tribe is registered. So also, that was quite a challenging balance about what is established versus legitimate.

There's another – go ahead, of course...

Male: So, what I'm understanding in what you're saying there is that if you had (44:32 unintelligible) if you had a (unintelligible) it would be open and truly open so that anyone (unintelligible) have the name, or I could have it to a restricted community that may be...

Karla Valente: Distributors of, yes.

Male: Distributors, for example, of (44:50 unintelligible) products or I go for a community TLD (unintelligible) have to have strict rules around how you become eligible for that namespace.

Karla Valente: Yes.

Male: Why would I want to be a community? What's the benefit of applying for a TLD in community versus an open (45:06 unintelligible)?

Karla Valente: I don't know if it's a benefit, but if one applies for a community-based TLD and let's say that this applicant has a string that is identical or is similar to another applicant, the community-based applicants can go through what we called a comparative evaluation process, and other open applications have to resort to auction. I think this is one of the main differences.

Male: So, where I was heading is there is a - as an applicant, an inherent advantage to applying as a community if you (45:43 unintelligible) or have enough of a community backing to do so, you would have an advantage, would you not, over someone who is doing an open application?

Karla Valente: Yes. The one advantage – I'm looking from a business standpoint, I just don't know if I understand the word "advantage," because if you apply for a community based, you also might have some restriction rules, which might limit your number of applications and if you have an open, you might not. So, it...

Male: (46:06 Unintelligible) actually getting the TLD.

Karla Valente: So, there is a step in the evaluation process that there is advantage to the community-based applicant, because there is an additional string resolution mechanism there. There's the comparative evaluation.

Male: That was where I was heading looking from the slides, is there an (46:28 unintelligible) but there is an advantage to an applicant if you do have a community doing so (unintelligible).

Karla Valente: Yes, if you also have your string identified in a string contention set, right, which is really a leap of faith, right? You don't know. It really depends on what's applied for or what not.

The important thing is really remember what the GNSO had in mind, what the policy had in mind, and the policy – and Adrian is from the Council, he can tell better than I can – which was to protect the communities. The community-based application was nothing more but to protect small communities. That was the intent of the GNSO.

Adrian Kinderis: If I may elaborate.

Karla Valente: Sure, please.

Adrian Kinderis: Adrian Kinderis and I am a member of the GNSO Council. I think that it's the underlying theme was exactly that, was to ensure that the Internet was being represented in a – well, the TLDs were being represented (47:28 unintelligible) community if they choose to participate, and therefore, to give them preference - which is I guess what Tony's picking up on – preference within the process. So that if I'm the Boy Scouts of America and I'm going to go for .scout, I am in a defined community and therefore, I have a preference to that over somebody. If Tony decides to go for .scouts just using it as an open generic TLD, the Boy Scouts of America being a defined community would have preference over Tony. That's the advantage of (47:59 unintelligible).

It's merely an advantage in securing the TLD. Now, it may be that to make (48:03 unintelligible) Tony's idea, you might make him more money or might sell more domains. It's not about that. I think it's important that everyone understands ICANN's not evaluating on that premise. ICANN stays well out of that. Your business model is up to you. If I only ever registered five domains for being the Boy Scouts of America, ICANN stays well out of that. They asked (48:25 unintelligible) representative of the Boy Scouts community and therefore, am more eligible for the .scouts domain in this particular (unintelligible).

Karla Valente: Yes. And it's also important to remember that all of the applications will be evaluated the same way for the business, financial, operational, technical capability. So, this preference or advantage that you see, it's really down the road in a very specific type of path that an application can take. But, all of the applications pay the same fee and they are evaluated. The string of the applicant itself is evaluated on the same kind of requirements.

Male: The only reason I was bringing that up is that whilst that's true, it is very possible that there is an IDN, whether it's a geographic (49:11 unintelligible) geographic network, a corporate namespace, it's very possible that more than one person may be applying for the same string.

Karla Valente: That's right.

Male: And having a community is an advantage from that perspective to help (49:27 unintelligible).

Karla Valente: That's right. And I saw another hand on the back.

Male: (49:31 Unintelligible) means that would be given to you because you are a community?

Male: Absolutely.

Karla Valente: So...

Male: (49:47 Unintelligible) understand the word preference. Preference means (unintelligible).

Karla Valente: So, there's still the comparative evaluation. There's still a point system. So, it's not just because somebody designated an application is community based and in case there's somebody else that applies for this identical or similar string, it doesn't mean that just because one is community based, they're automatically going to be looked favorably and get the TLD. They still need to prove, from an application and string standpoint, the same as other applicants. And in the comparative evaluation, there is a point system. They still need to go through this point system.

Male: (50:29 Unintelligible) all of the community criteria, so I can't just call myself a community.

(50:36 Crosstalk)

Male: (50:41 Unintelligible) ten people are applying from Scouts, but (50:45 unintelligible) would be given to you.

Male: If I fulfill all of the criteria of a community and I have enough points, I've got the maximum amount of points I can possibly get, therefore, in ICANN's eyes, I'm 100% representative of the community that I was going for. For example, I'm pre-existing, I'm (51:10 unintelligible) domain that I'm going for is reflective of the community I'm representing, yadda, yadda, yadda, therefore, I get the – I am first preference in the line.

Now if there's two communities that go for it, (51:22 unintelligible) different set of circumstances. But, that puts me ahead of any open application, and ICANN's – and you can look on the records to see this - was all about who was going to bring value to the DNS. That was the term that (51:41 unintelligible) number of pages. That is saying that communities will be seen to be bringing more value to the DNS than an open, and to protect them, they give them preference.

Male: So preference means would be given to you if we score evenly. But if I'm better than you and I'm open, I can get it.

Male: You don't get a point score if you're open. (52:03 unintelligible). So, if a community's going for (52:06 unintelligible) you have to get a point score...

Male: So, if I'm open, how can I do better than you if you are a community? There is no way.

Male: You cannot, and that's (52:15 unintelligible) find a community that you are representative of; however, in doing so, you restrict your options. You may not be able to sell as many names. You might not be able to reach as many people. This is the real fundamental understanding here of this whole process is about understanding the difference between community and the difference between open, because they have very different impacts to in the process.

Karla Valente: And depending what you say in your application about the way you're going to serve or represent your community or be contractually obliged to fulfill that promise to this community in the base agreement.

Male: (52:51 unintelligible) change your mind afterwards. If ICANN gives you this as a community, you can't then turn around and say, "Oh, you know what...(52:56 unintelligible). ICANN are going to police this very strictly.

Karla Valente: Exactly. This was one of the concerns we had. Somebody applies as a community based to game the system, and then a few years down the road, they said, "You know what...I'm going to copy this other business plan over there because it's more money." We tried to create a system that avoids the gaming as much as is possible.

So, there's another category or another saddle of TLDs that we believe we are going to see, actually a quite considerable number, because a lot of the potential applicants have actually mentioned that, is the geographic names.

Is this about the community?

Male: Yes.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Male: (53:35 Unintelligible) I do understand that during the evaluation process, there is a time where people that can or parties that can object to certain TLDs from being given to certain party. Would it be possible for a party to dispute, at the same time apply for that TLD?

Karla Valente: Yes. An applicant can be an objector at the same time, yes, at least as the current proposal is on the table, yes. I saw another hand. Yes.

Male: What (54:11 unintelligible) someone applies for a .scout and (unintelligible) they might get it, right?

Karla Valente: Yes.

Male: And then (54:27 unintelligible) over there (unintelligible).

Karla Valente: Yes. So, we were looking at we call post delegation. So let me see if I understand the case. So, the gentleman applied for .scout or .navaho. Let me use the big one, Navaho, .navaho. But he applied as an open application, right, and later on after this registry was granted the TLD, signed an agreement with ICANN, and everything. Finally, somebody from the Navaho community understands what went on and says, "Wait a minute, this is not a TLD that his registry should have. This is my TLD. This is my community."

So, we're looking at what we call the post delegation objections. We don't have as much advanced work on that yet, but we're looking at some possibilities for people to later on take a look and maybe take an action, which is not very easy. Because, once the registry becomes operational, it's not only about this registry. Now there are registrants, there are registrars. There's a lot of parties involved and a lot of parties that are going to be impacted should any change take place. So we are kind of waiting what we can do there.

Male: (55:57 Unintelligible) talk about it, becomes very important (56:10 unintelligible) everybody knows this process is happening and be well aware of those who are applying, so that you can object during the process and not likely after. The unfortunate part is (56:20 Unintelligible) and it's good that ICANN – it's a great question – and it's good that ICANN is actually looking into well what happens if it does fall through the system and somehow someone does get the name (56:31 unintelligible).

Karla Valente: So in another way or another type of TLD that people talk a lot about is geographic names. We have heard geographic names as full spell of the name like .paris. We also have heard from applicants that want to do abbreviations like .nyc for New York City and things like that. But, it seems to me doing these kind of events and talking to communities and potential applicants, there's quite an interest from governments and business people in what we call the geographic names TLD. And this was also another area that we quite complex for us to develop, because when you look at

geographic names and the different languages that names of countries and cities can be spelled and different ways that they can be represented, how can we develop a process or a criteria that is going to be fair and apply well to all of these different variables that we see around the world around those names.

So, one of the things that we are doing is that if an applicant applies for a TLD that is a geographic kind of name, and by that you see that it's going to have sub-regional names on the ISO3166-2 list, capital cities of countries, territories, etc., city names only if the application self-identifies city representation. So, we're using some lists for the geographic domain names, but we are asking that the applicant has an approval or a non-objection of the relevant government. And this is still something that we are working on and it's quite complex, because who is the relevant government and the list of countries.

When we first looked at what list of countries or territories or cities to use, it was a challenge, because the United Nations has one list, ISO has a different list. If you put side by side all the different lists by international organizations that we could maybe use as an authoritative list, they're not standardized. So, this is why the complex area, and we got a lot of advice or we got input from the GAC, which is the Government Advisory Committee of ICANN. And, they come to the board with some advice on what to do with situations like that. In some instances, it has been very good. In some instances, the advice was still too vague to really establish a very firm and transform things into a process, a coherent and very tangible process, because there's still a lot of vagueness around those things.

So, there is going to be, for regional names, there's going to require substantial approval of relevant governments, and the Board asked for a greater specification of the terms "meaningful representation" and "substantial number," of course, right. If we have a region like for instance, the European Union, how many countries of the European Union should a .europe applicant get and from what governments, and so forth. So this is one of the parts of the program that we're still working on to have a better definition, better processes that are clear to the general applicant.

Of course, in terms of government representation, we go over all kinds of discussions. For instance, if you get an approval from one government and it's just between transition of governments in a specific region or country, what does it mean? If by the time of application you have a different government taking on the office, and all kinds of things like that. So, a lot of things are still being discussed.

Country territory, name definition: So, how are we going to define, what lists are we going to use moving forward. For instance, how are we going to separate names. Countries usually have several components to their names. How are we going to do that and how are we going to work around the permutations of the names that are listed above.

Regional names: So we have here the United Nations list of 49 regions. This is one of the lists we are using. We still need to do some development work around that.

Here's a very high-level way of looking into the application process. So...sorry.

Male: Going back to geography, how about natural features, like (1:01:31 unintelligible) .himalaya, how do you deal with that?

Karla Valente: I don't think this is one that we have really pinpointed well what to do. That was in the GAC communiqué actually when they had territories and then cultural. I'm trying to remember the exact words, but they had some identifiers and cultural identifiers that were beyond cities and countries, and this was also very complex too to develop. This is still something we're working on.

Male: (1:02:09 Unintelligible) I'm returning to geographic name. If you have two applications for the same name, (1:02:17 unintelligible) evaluation, would be resolved through an auction if I have two (unintelligible) applications for (unintelligible)?

Karla Valente: We have in the evaluation process a panel that is geographic names. So this panel is going to look whether or not the application is legitimate and they're going to look...

Male: (1:02:55 unintelligible).

Karla Valente: Then we have one mechanism for the string resolution, which is the auction.

Male: So, through the auction at the end of the day.

Karla Valente: The evaluation process, this is very high level and I'm ten minutes from you and lunch, so I'm going to try to be efficient.

So, application period again, is going to be a certain application date and a closing date. During this time, you are going to be expected to use the

online system and answer all of the questions, submit all of the documents, pay for the application evaluation fee.

Then we have an initial evaluation period. During this initial evaluation, we have different panels of experts, like the Geographic Names Panel of experts. We also have somebody that is going to evaluate the applicant from the technical standpoint, from the business and financial standpoint, and so forth. So during this initial evaluation, applications would pass or fail, and extended evaluation is something that an applicant can request in the case of failure. Or, depending on if the application actually is proposing registry services that are more complex than what is originally part of the base agreement or what we're used to, we are going to have an additional panel looking at the services that are proposed by this TLD to ensure that we can offer the services in the future and still keep the stability of the Internet.

Again, at the same time here, we have this objection dispute resolution. The objection and dispute resolution, you have to be very careful here, because the objection period is going to be set. So, there is a beginning and an end for the objection period, so we need to be very careful.

When the applications take place, we are going to see on our Website the list of applicants and the TLDs that are applied for. And when this kind of information is made public, this is where third parties would be able to know whether or not they are entitled to object. So again, the objection and dispute resolution is going to be handled by different organizations.

Then we have what we called here "string contention" and string contention is quite an important part of the program, because if we have several applicants for a TLD string that is either identical or similar, we need to have mechanisms that would allow us to resolve the dispute. Which one of these applicants gets the TLD assuming that all of them have passed the evaluation process and have proven to be capable of managing a TLD? So, the string contention happens. Again, we're going to have a panel. There's an algorithm, but most importantly, there is a panel that is going to look at the strings and identify these groups of strings that are either identical or similar.

And, I don't have much time to expand on this specific topic, but I encourage you to read explanatory memoranda about that, because this is quite complex. If you think about the fact that for instance A can be similar to B or B to C, but A to C not necessarily, so you have all kinds of configurations that we need to look at how this is going to play.

And also, the discussion about when you identify something as being similar, when you are grouping those TLDs, are you looking at that only from a visual

perspective and we're looking at visual similarity? Are we looking at meaning similarity, like happens with trademark? Are we looking also at sound similarity? So what do we mean by similarity. So far, we are dealing with visual similarity, but that has been proposed and there has been feedback from the community saying, "We think this is not quite enough," that is, only the visual similarity. So, I encourage you to read some of this document.

But, if we have a situation in string contention, there are two mechanisms that are going to be used in order to resolve the contention. One is auction, and the second one is comparative evaluation, and this is what was discussed a little bit later. The comparative evaluation is a slightly different process from the auction, but the comparative evaluation only applies to the community-based applicant applications.

Here we talk a little bit about the evaluation process, the fact that the applicant has to demonstrate organizational, operation, technical and financial capability. And the proposed string, again, there's some rules about what you can or you cannot do with a TLD that you're proposing. There is a limit of number of characters for instance or how the characters are composed, etc. So, you need to understand what those limitations are before you apply for your TLD.

We are going to have several evaluation panels and examiners. By the way, right now, we have re-opened expressions of interests for evaluators. So, evaluators are going to be selected based on their level of expertise and right now, if you have companies or there are companies that would like to be a panel of examiners, take a look at what you have – take a look at expressions of interest, take a look at the requirements and apply, because this evaluation or the selection of the evaluators, the panel, has been re-opened.

Objection and dispute resolution: Again, the foregrounds for objections are here, and the intent of each of them, why the GNSO (1:09:04 unintelligible) so string confusion, why did we have that? To avoid user confusion. The infringement of rights, why do we have that? To protect intellectual property and other pre-existing rights. Moral and public order, this was something that was asked to provide additional safeguard and protect interest of governments. Community objection to protect community interest, more specifically, the geographically based, indigenous and religious organizations. String contention, I explained that briefly, so have two or more strings. And here are the dispute resolution mechanisms, and it's quite a lot of material to read on the Applicant Guidebook and explanatory memoranda on those.

Then assuming everything goes through, so the evaluation process, there's no objection or this has been resolved, there's no string contention, or this has been resolved, then the applicant is going to go through what we call the delegation phase.

In this delegation phase, the applicant is expected to sign a base agreement. You find that in the Applicant Guidebook. The staff will recommend to the Board the approval of the application and then there's some technical checks. And IANA has also steps that they need to do in order to add this TLD to the root.

So once your TLD passes the evaluation process, you have to take into account some time for all of these delegation steps to take place.

So what is next for ICANN? We will continue to do outreach and education events. The next ICANN meeting is taking place in Seoul in October. We're looking at having events like that in Latin America, Africa. We just had one in Hong Kong. We had two consultation sessions, one in New York and in London. We're looking at doing more webinars, introducing webinars to ICANN actually. We're going to publish a summary of the consultation events that we had, analysis of the IRT proposal that has to do with the trademark protection issues, the Version 3 of the Applicant Guidebook, the Root Scaling Study. And then, if we don't have a Version 4, the final Applicant Guidebook more towards the end of the year.

And that's about it.

Male: (1:11:21 Unintelligible).

Karla Valente: I don't know how much in delays, but if you have – every time you have a new version, if you're counting the public comments period, if you're counting all of that, you're looking at 0 to 90 days increase in the timeline at least, right, if you have a new version.

You're going to do the speech about the timeline aren't you? Yes, go ahead.

Male: Sorry. I'm not going to sit here and tell ICANN to hurry up. I should but I won't. We've all been wanting new TLDs for some time. However, if you are talking about delaying the launch of the application process any length of time, can you please, on this occasion rather than as you have done at every ICANN meeting since – and I've been going to them since 2000 – since we've talked about new gTLDs (1:12:21 unintelligible). I would prefer, as a business owner and CEO, that you pick a date in the future and you stuck to it.

Reason being, I can then plan for it, and I'm sure that there are expected gTLD applicants in this audience that would like to be able to plan for that. And I'm not saying rush it and hurry it, or any (1:12:40 unintelligible) but if you decide that that's five years from now, then so be it, because what I'll do is Tony here will be out of a job and I'll sack him, and I'll sack all the other guys, and I'll go play golf for five years. And then I'll (1:12:52 unintelligible) Tony to come back, and we'll start the process again. But that gives me some certainty to the process.

So, I am implore ICANN that if they are looking at delaying the process to please pick a date that you are comfortable is going to give you another round of the Guidebook if that's required, five more rounds, I don't care. But give us some certainty as to the time so that we can support our clients that are going for new gTLDs and ensure that they can provide – get together their business plans and importantly, the funding. We're burning \$100,000 a month on this process at the moment, my organization, in supporting gTLD applicants. And they're burning money, because we're all waiting for this application process to start. We can stop that and pause that if we have some certainty.

Karla Valente: It's point well taken.

Male: (1:13:38 Unintelligible) into a number of applicants and there is a lot of frustration, because it's moving target. You are asking, and quite right, a lot of (1:13:49 unintelligible). We don't know when we can (1:13:57 unintelligible) so there is really a lot of frustration. I understand all the problem over (unintelligible). What I very much (1:14:06 unintelligible) is a date and so people can stop worrying (unintelligible).

Karla Valente: Point well taken.

Male: (1:14:14 Unintelligible). There is a lot of frustration.

Karla Valente: No, and I think this is a very valid point and is being stressed to the Board and to management, and yes, it's being stressed internally.

Male: Does anyone have a job if that (1:14:33 unintelligible) happen?

Male: I have a comment (1:14:36 unintelligible) and then a question. The first one is just a general comment for those that may be new to this process is that all of this about an IDN, International Domain Name, is that correct? So I could have a new gTLD in Arabic if I wish.

- Karla Valente: Yes.
- Male: Right. I don't think that was made clear, at least to me. (1:14:54 Unintelligible). I know you're going to talk about IDNs later on today, but...
- Karla Valente: Yes. So, IDNs, there are two ways that IDNs are being introduced into the marketplace. One is Fast Track, which has very specific rules that apply and you can read the Fast Track brochure and Behar is going to expand on IDNs after lunch and the new gTLD process. So there are two ways that IDNs are being introduced into the marketplace. You have to understand both programs to see what applies to you.
- Male: Thank you. The second one is a question. ICANN receives \$185,000 for each of these new applicants. This money goes into a pool and part of that pool, to my understanding, is to be used for public awareness of the gTLD program. Is that correct?
- Karla Valente: So, we're looking at – I don't think there is a final word on how this money is going to be allocated. It's cost recover and if there's excess, is that what you're taking about, excess?
- Male: (1:15:49 unintelligible) talking about the communications campaign and where the funding (unintelligible). So there is being referred to commonly in the Application Guidebook that there is a four-month education (1:16:01 unintelligible) on the process.
- Karla Valente: Yes, education notification, because communication is happening throughout the whole process. It's happening today. So during these four months is where we know the final rules of the game, we know the exact application dates, opening and closing, and we will go around the world and hopefully notify governments and trade associations, and posting in main communication venues. We didn't finalize the specifics of what this is, but the idea is that during the four months, we are going to intensively let organizations and governments around the world know this is taking place and is happening now for sure.
- Male: Right. So my question then is have (1:16:41 unintelligible) ICANN formalized the process on how this will occur? Is it another RFP on notifying people globally and you're doing it outsourced? Is it more and more of these meetings where we need to (1:16:52 unintelligible) our friends in the community (unintelligible).
- Karla Valente: There is no RFP. We are going to be doing that ourselves. We have a database of governments and we have a database of registries and

registrars around the world, and trade associations. We're going to be working through the databases that we have. We're going to be working through the main media outlets that we know to try to do the best possible to notify people that this is happening.

What we are doing now is to make people aware that this is taking place in the future. This four-month window is really concrete information about when the application happens and who applied. It's not only when the application is going to happen. We also later need to let the world know what was applied for and by whom and things like that. Right.

Male: (1:17:38 Unintelligible) once these TLDs go live that the end user knows that when I see .tree, I don't think the Internet broke, because in the past, they always assume that they have a com and .ae, and now I see .tree, and I think (1:17:53 unintelligible) and that can't be a domain name.

Karla Valente: And probably, that is going to be the most challenging part, which is the user education and the user education I think is more effective, and that's a personal option. It's going to be more effective when we actually know what the TLDs are that are going to be applied for. There are several levels of education and communication that we need to do now.

For instance, one of them has to do with the TLD acceptance. We need to make sure that applications around the world understand and when you, in the future, use your Tony@.tree, they accept your email as a valid email or something.idm, they accept. So, there are several levels of awareness that we need to do beyond just saying, "Hey, new gTLDs launch on that date."

Male: (1:18:41 Unintelligible) from you earlier comments about the four overarching issues, the ones dealing with the policy. (Unintelligible) do you expect (unintelligible) finished by Version 3? And the ones you were worried about were things like the implications of having so many IDN ccTLDs, maybe gTLDs (unintelligible) so many gTLDs in the root. Now, I would have expected that these things should have been handled before the call came out (1:19:11 unintelligible).

Karla Valente: We did preliminary studies on – I think you're talking about root scaling, right, the impact of all of those things on the root. We did some preliminary studies or some preliminary assessment to see whether or not any increased number of gTLDs would impact the root, and the preliminary assessment said it doesn't look like it. Now, what RSSAC and SSAC is doing is expanding that preliminary assessment to incorporate not only IDNs and gTLDs, but also DNS Sec and IPV 6. So it's a little bit more complex. And so far, I haven't heard anything that is an adverse impact on the root system.

But when you say all of the four issues be resolved by Applicant Guidebook Version 3, this is one that I don't think we're going to have the study before the Applicant Guidebook Version 3. I could be happily surprised by RSSAC and SSAC, but I don't think it's going to happen before hand.

Male: Just on the back of what Tony was talking about, while I'm imploring ICANN to do a number of things, could you please make it transparent that communications campaign to the industry, because I think it's important for us to run our activities. So whether that's to pass on to applicants that are applying for TLDs and supporting them, or just for ourselves to be able to position ourselves in line with that kind of communications campaign. Rather than ICANN going and do it independently, it would great if all of us, and the greater ICANN community understood where that was going to go...

Karla Valente: And were involved in that.

Male: Exactly. And, when you were going to forward. So, if we want to put an advertisement in a newspaper ourselves, it can be at the same time as your putting advertisements in the newspaper or whatever. So, the campaigns can be done in conjunction. If ICANN (1:21:01 unintelligible) and all of the sudden, I pick up the newspaper at home, that doesn't really help me in my business or the penetration of new gTLDs (1:21:12 unintelligible).

Karla Valente: And it's not the intent of ICANN. We want to work with the community to do that. We just need to be specific and outline this plan.

Male: Visibility and transparency in that process would be (1:21:22 unintelligible).

Karla Valente: Okay.

Male: Sorry, my last one. Sorry. The question about these gTLD (1:21:29 unintelligible) today is fantastic and great, particularly (1:21:31 unintelligible) new to the process. The meetings in New York and London were more detailed, talked about things like the IRT report, overarching issues, these sorts of things.

Karla Valente: They were different meetings. We have two kinds of meetings that are going on. One were the consultation meetings, and the consultation meetings took place in Sidney, New York, and London, and they were very specific to the overarching issues, actually more specific to trademark protection and malicious behavior discussions. Not as much on the demand and the root scaling, because we didn't have as much of the technical work really done to

discuss a concrete proposal or something with the community at this point. So, those three were really intentionally designed as consultation events.

What we have done in Hong Kong, here, and Latin America and Africa and so forth, they are more outreach and education events, because the goal is to not only expand the know how of people about the new gTLDs, but also to engage new people, new industries in understanding what is coming and how they are going to be directly or indirectly impacted by that. So you're going to see, in the future, more of the outreach/education sessions. The consultations are closed, for now at least.

What we're doing with those consultation sessions is we're looking at all of the verbal feedback, we're looking at transcripts, and we're looking at the feedback forms. And we're going to summarize that for the community and say, "This is the outcome of this consultation event. More importantly, this is what we're going to do with the proposals from the IRT moving forward."

So thank you very much for your time and your attention. This was a very long presentation and I'm going to be available here all afternoon if you need anything. If you have any question, I'll be happy to address your question.

Thank you for your time.

And, I think we have lunch now, and lunch is next door.

END TRANSCRIPT