

Attendance - 12 Members

Anne Aikman-Scalese
Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair)
Collin Kurre
Heath Dixon (Amazon)
Jamie Baxter | dotgay
Jeff Neuman (Overall Co-chair)
Jessica Hooper
Jim Prendergast
Justine Chew
Kathy Kleiman
Katrin Ohlmer
Michael Flemming

Apologies: Malgorzata Pek

Staff: Julie Hedlund, Steve Chan, Julie Bisland

AC Chat:

Julie Bisland:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Group C call on Thursday, 31 January 2019 at 15:00 UTC

Julie Bisland:Agenda wiki: <https://community.icann.org/x/2oIWBg>

Michael Flemming:Snarfing down dinner right now

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair)::-)

Michael Flemming:Lets get started

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Yup Good to go at top of the hr

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):we will be starting at the top of the new Tab 2.12.1 TLD Roll Out

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Looking for link to Google doc?

Michael Flemming:https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__docs.google.com_spreadsheets_d_1MQmo1B6zBqGXyFRF2pKZXPhGmz0JfZhlAMxKIdVsT1g_edit-23gid-3D330918767&d=DwlCaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=UDaH7sXt0KtCwTW3p16XvXj3R0RamcQaGo2j8YCh5cl&s=vUNY8QIY1fK_TATH7tOXBZN5Zj-vXV5GQ9BaxF81jbo&e=

Julie Hedlund:https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__docs.google.com_spreadsheets_d_1MQmo1B6zBqGXyFRF2pKZXPhGmz0JfZhlAMxKIdVsT1g_edit-23gid-3D330918767&d=DwlCaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=UDaH7sXt0KtCwTW3p16XvXj3R0RamcQaGo2j8YCh5cl&s=vUNY8QIY1fK_TATH7tOXBZN5Zj-vXV5GQ9BaxF81jbo&e=

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Thank you.

Julie Hedlund:The document is posted and unsynced.

Kathy Kleiman 2:Yes -- I'm now affiliated as a Visiting Fellow at the School of Communications of American University

Kathy Kleiman 2:Tx!

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Congrats Kathy!

Kathy Kleiman 2:??

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Noted Kathy and Congratulations

Collin Kurre - Guest:Yes hello! I'm joining from the Cross-Community Working Party on ICANN and Human Rights. We're conducting research on PDPs to develop mechanisms for implementing WS2 recommendations.

Jeff Neuman (Overall Co-chair):@Michael - Yes, we have allowed guests in the past from Colin's group

Collin Kurre - Guest:Here to learn, will chime in if I have anything to add. Thanks for the welcome!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):we welcomed our guests as of last week

Collin Kurre - Guest:Indeed, Cheryl :)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):-)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):line 6/7-9

Collin Kurre - Guest:We can hear you

Jeff Neuman (Overall Co-chair):Closing of Rounds is a discussion in the Main Working Group

Michael Flemming:Two thumbs up then

Michael Flemming:We have that being discussed under way

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair): indeed @Jeff as @Kathy is noting it has some complexities to discuss

Jeff Neuman (Overall Co-chair):Lets refer this to the main Working Group since this is where the discussion is taking place

Anne Aikman-Scalese:COMMENT -It looks as though they are saying that after delegation, they received a lot requests from the registries for changes in subcontractors and RSEP requests - ways to modify the contract AFTER it has been awarded. This is questionable in two ways - time-consuming and staff costs, as well as the fact that the public may not be tracking at that point. COMMENT

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Thanks Michael

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):lines 10/11-13

Kathy Kleiman 2:+1 Anne, and also before the delegation. I thought I've heard calls to "close the rounds" before the review processes are completed...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Line 14/15-17

Jim Prendergast:you know - thinking about this question now - do we really know this was the reason for the year deadline? as opposed to the ICANN fees kicking in sooner?

Jim Prendergast:more rhetorical - gues a finer point is - did ICANN tell us that the 1 year deadline is for the purpose of preventing warehousing? or as a group did we come to that determination?

Kathy Kleiman 2:Tx Michael !

Jim Prendergast:we essentially have hundreds of warehoused TLDs with 1 domain in the zone - see https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.ntldstats.com_tld&d=DwlCaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=UDaH7sXt0KtCwTW3p16XvXj3R0RamcQaGo2j8YCh5cl&s=PMXqIPxT0xIEZNIvIOhCtMhMOgTsTF4v6haCXzzCF9Q&e=

Kathy Kleiman 2:@Jim - that sounds like a problem based on Round 1 goals. What do you think?

Katrin Ohlmer:I don't necessarily think the registries see them as "warehousing", but rather due to a lack of "what to do with my TLD"

Katrin Ohlmer:this is especially an issue with .brands

Jim Prendergast:or grab it first, then figure out what to do.

Julie Hedlund:@Jeff: That has been changed in the spreadsheet

Justine Chew:@Katrin, that makes sense for .brands

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Line 18/19 General Comment

Katrin Ohlmer:correct, as the application typically has been filed by their legal team and now has to handed over to the marketing team

Jim Prendergast:yup - the free puppy problem

Katrin Ohlmer;-)

Anne Aikman-Scalese:QUESTION We are still waiting for the list of TLDs from the 2012 round that are "pending". Per Jeff, this list will be supplied - hopefully soon???

Justine Chew:+1 Anne

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Thank you Jeff.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair): We can but try @Jeff

Katrin Ohlmer:@Jeff: Agree, rather a question than divergence

Justine Chew:Line 19 Or even a concern rather than divergence

Julie Hedlund:@Jeff: Christopher's comment doesn't fit nicely into our 4 categories. We've put

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:But doesn't each application specify what they plan to do with the TLD? Does it seem fair that an applicant that plans to "sit" on a TLD get the right to operate it if they don't know what to do with it, with the contention options have a clear plan to use the TLD. Perhaps planned use and timeline to use should be a consideration, especially in contention sets.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Agree with Michael

Jeff Neuman (Overall Co-chair):I am good

Justine Chew:Yes, agree with Michael

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):New Tab 2.12.3 Contractual Compliance

Julie Hedlund:The document is posted and unsynced

Jeff Neuman (Overall Co-chair):The caveats from Registries and Registrars are important to highlight

Jeff Neuman (Overall Co-chair):I meant RySG and Neustar

Jeff Neuman (Overall Co-chair):not registrars

Steve Chan:The caveat from the IPC might be important as well.

Justine Chew:2.12.3. I don't see ALAC's response in spreadsheet. Am I missing something?

Steve Chan:@Justine, we will investigate

Justine Chew:2.12.3.c.1 Then again ALAC supports the preliminary recommendation

Steve Chan:@Michael, my audio dropped, so I might have missed that! Sorry!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):well noted @Justine ... Thanks

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Line 9/10-15

Justine Chew:@Steve, ALAC's response for 2.12.3.c.1 was "The ALAC strongly supports this preliminary recommendation."

Steve Chan:@Justine, it looks like all of the ALAC comments are missing! Quite glad you are on the call to flag.

Justine Chew:Thanks, Michael and Steve

Justine Chew:Yup, ALAC response for Q 2.12.3.e.1 is also missing from spreadsheet

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):we will fix that as well @Justine (at least it's consistent ;-)

Justine Chew:@Jeff, to group under "Changes" for discussion based on what grounds?

Steve Chan:@Justine, you may have already noticed, but the ALAC comments are now added. I would hypothesize that they may have been missed because these comments are otherwise in a sea of "no comment".

Jeff Neuman (Overall Co-chair):I didnt mean to group this UNDER changes....just grouping the discussion together

Jeff Neuman (Overall Co-chair):when we talk about it with the full group

Kathy Kleiman 2:@Jeff, can we include NCSG in the round of additional discussion - as NCSG's many discussions of comments show a real interest

Anne Aikman-Scalese:QUESTION If there are commitments made in the RSEP process, couldn't these be published and also included in the RA? (assume they are included if approved.) QUESTION

Justine Chew:@jeff, right okay, thanks.

Jeff Neuman (Overall Co-chair):Anyone will be invited to discuss of course.....

Kathy Kleiman 2:@Jeff - this specific follow-up...

Kathy Kleiman 2:@RSEP - that's an interesting question - can it be used for policy changes; should it be?

Michael Flemming:I think we are getting into content

Jeff Neuman (Overall Co-chair):There is no such thing as a fast track RSEP with ICANN

Michael Flemming:These discussions should be best reserved for when we discuss content

Steve Chan:@Anne, you can see the list of requests and outcomes for RSEP here:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_resources_pages_rsep-2D2014-2D02-2D19-2Den&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=UDaH7sXt0KtCwTW3p16XvXj3R0RamcQaGo2j8YCh5cl&s=GUjms6kpFdK0d77my8MVywwtVwtyeCnpM5GYjEOBY-o&e=

Kathy Kleiman 2:@Michael - Anne is right. It's procedural intersection of two different processes...

Kathy Kleiman 2:Huge loophole!

Kathy Kleiman 2:@Steve: the community expects RSEP to be technical changes -- can you use it for the types of changes that would in the public portion of the gTLD application?

Michael Flemming:Can anyone hear me?

Julie Hedlund:@Micheal -- we can't hear you.

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:@Jeff .. except possibly for community applications since question 18 is relevant

Kathy Kleiman 2:@Jamie, I think q18 is relevant for everyone!

Anne Aikman-Scalese:COMMENT I believe Question 18 required that all services proposed to be offered be disclosed in the application. There is pushback on this in this WG because some future applicants don't necessarily want to disclose business plans and innovations. They would rather get through the public scrutiny evaluation using a standard application and apply for changes later using RSEP. COMMENT

Kathy Kleiman 2:If it's fluff, the Community would be amazed...

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:+1 Anne

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Line 18/19-25 (and the end of our last TAB :-) for this review stage...

Jeff Neuman (Overall Co-chair):At the full group level we need to ask the right question and its all about balancing the different interests

Katrin Ohlmer:Since we specifically asked for "evidence", we should go back to lemarit asking for their specific strings.

Katrin Ohlmer:asked -> asked

Steve Chan:To be clear, the RSEP is its own Consensus Policy and is not included in the SubPro PDP Charter. If this PDP wants to discuss and potentially recommend changes, it would require a Charter change.

Jeff Neuman (Overall Co-chair):@Steve - Thanks. The RSEP will not become part of our recommendations other than to note that it is the current mechanism used to review changes to a Registry Agreement or changes to the services provided.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):AOB?

Jeff Neuman (Overall Co-chair):Congrats to this Subgroup!

Kathy Kleiman 2:Tx Michael and congrats All!

Jeff Neuman (Overall Co-chair):For now.....

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Indeed :-) but MORE to follow of course

Jeff Neuman (Overall Co-chair):We now have to summarize all of these discussions

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):INdeed @Jeff

Justine Chew:Thanks, all.

Justine Chew:It's more what to highlight

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Sorry I have to leave Thank you

Justine Chew:Thanks for clarifying @Cheryl

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):THANKS everyone for all your input on this less than exciting phase

Katrin Ohlmer:Thanks, all

Collin Kurre - Guest:Thanks for letting me shadow!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair)::-)

Julie Bisland:update: Collin Kurre was added as a member of Sub group C before the call ended and will be on attendance as such.