

Attendance - 12 Members

Akriti Bopanna
Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair)
Collin Kurre
Jamie Baxter | dotgay
Jeff Neuman (Subgroup A Co-Leader)
Jessica Hooper
Jim Prendergast
Justine Chew
Katrin Ohlmer
Martin Sutton
Phil Buckingham
Robin Gross

Apologies: Donna Austin, Matt Crossman

Staff: Julie Hedlund, Steve Chan, Julie Bisland

AC Chat:

Julie Bisland: Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP - Sub Group A call on Thursday, 07 February 2019 at 15:00 UTC

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

Jim Prendergast: link to google doc please?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair): https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__docs.google.com_spreadsheets_d_15zDdzlBwLCz5m2sNXui6N6pporbUq-2DIDFEwf4rKi4A_edit-23gid-3D124881164&d=DwlCaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=5Z_mPWBcH5zd9hW-OCci9KUCGG0f8PdHFsahQJE1o4M&s=xAE6Jz6VOR96i95R5FtwH5wb5Jhr_BSrVWPzEI0ipMQ&e=

Jim Prendergast: thanks

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair): sorry it took so long it takes ages to open on my PC

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair): Tab 2.3.2

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair): with one exception it is agreement or agreement with new ideas/modifications right throughout these Comments

Jeff Neuman (Subgroup A Co-Leader): re: IPC - I am not sure this is a new idea....really support for the predictability model

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair): yes @Jeff thus my use of the terms 'modifications' above

Steve Chan: I thought it might be an idea for a change process in PICs?

Jeff Neuman (Subgroup A Co-Leader): @Steve: I would group in with all changes

Jeff Neuman (Subgroup A Co-Leader): Re: ICANN Org: The last sentence is not a new idea, but a theme throughout to identify that everything applies forward, not retroactively

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair): Again this is to support predictability model

Jeff Neuman (Subgroup A Co-Leader): re: Public Interest Community - Seems to only diverge with respect to spec 11, 3(a). But what about all other PICs?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair): perhaps we need to ask

Katrin Ohlmer:And the USPS only supports the PICs as such, not making them a policy recommendation?!

Jim Prendergast:I believe Anne Aikman Scalise submitted those comments on behalf of the USPS so could ask her

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):G Doc line 13/14-25

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):to line 24 actually sorry got ahead on myself ;-)

Martin Sutton:still here :-)

Martin Sutton:I thought the last comment was really good.....

Collin Kurre:Maybe I'm missing something, but if mandatory PICs became a policy rec, wouldn't that make voluntary PICs superfluous?

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

Jeff Neuman (Subgroup A Co-Leader):re: ICANN Org comment, we should include this in with the changes section in Supplemental Initial Report

Collin Kurre:I'd speak up but don't have access to a mic at the moment. Sorry Robin :)

Jeff Neuman (Subgroup A Co-Leader):@Colin: There are only a few "Mandatory PICs". Voluntary PICs are usually in response to community members, GAC or others that may have concerns after the fact

Collin Kurre:Oh I see. Thanks Jeff

Steve Chan:Public Interest Community

Justine Chew:@Steve, just going back to 2.3.2.c.2 Line 14, I noticed that staff have taken the ALAC's comment under the Exec Summary. But there is also a (not inconsistent) comment to PR 2.3.2.c.2 itself: "The ALAC strongly agrees. Voluntary PICs have proved instrumental in ensuring that some TLDs are operated responsibly". Could that comment be added please?

Steve Chan:@Justine, looking now

Justine Chew:@Jeff, thanks

Steve Chan:@Justine, added. And apologies that staff missed the comment.

Justine Chew:@steve, thanks

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):G Doc line 25/26-34

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):This sec is all agreement or new idea/clarification point with 1 exception of divergence

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):G Doc line 36/37-45

Phil Buckingham:Good point Jamie

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):and again This sec is all agreement or new idea/clarification point with 1 exception of divergence

Jeff Neuman (Subgroup A Co-Leader):nope...lets go to line 44

Steve Chan:@Jamie, I don't think ICANN org is necessarily proposing anything. Rather, they are putting considerations out for the WG to possibly take into account. I'd also note that the question you posed is support for Jeff's suggestion - the idea should/could be considered in the context of Change Requests from the Supplemental Initial Report.

Justine Chew:@Jamie, while I don't object to your request for clarification from ICANN Org, I rather think your point is something that the WG should address in its recommendation.

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:@Steve .. I understand it was a request for consideration, but it is important to ensure everyone understands how ICANN handled Community Applicants in the 2012 round so that they have the full picture in their discussions about creating deadlines for Voluntary PICs.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):Line 46/47-55

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:@Steve .. if this group was to make a recommendation without considering that ICANN allowed comments/opposition to be accepted well after Objections completed, the group would possibly be agreeing to something that they haven't explored the full impact it will have all ALL application types

Katrin Ohlmer:The first paragraph of the NGPC seems to be either divergence or new idea?!

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:@Justine .. i ask for clarification simply because I would like to know if ICANN org actually understands this implication or not

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):tending a tad to divergence I think

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):3 for 1 sale ;-)

Steve Chan:We can copy over the comments to the (c) section for NGPC. Seems like they support mandatory PICs and oppose voluntary PICs.

Justine Chew:@Jamie, sure, as I said, clarification can be sought, but ultimately if the WG sets the policy intention, then ICANN Org implementation should incorporate it :)

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:@Justine ..an as you may be aware in the additional questions that were sent out related to public comment, there is a tremendous push from some stakeholders to keep the unlimited public comment period open for Community Applicants that ICANN org allowed in the 2012 round

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):Line 56/57-62

Justine Chew:@Jamie, uh huh, again, that's something for the WG to deal with.

Justine Chew:@Robin, ALAC too!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):sea of green with a touch of blue

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):Line 63/64-69

Katrin Ohlmer:RySG comment includes also a new idea: "waivers could be possibly"

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):another all green with a dash of blue

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):take the whole lot as a block and note Valideus idea

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:@Justine .. i understand, and I'll look forward to additional voices speaking up on the topic issues that seem to commonly exclude or seemingly overlook the community applicant perspective

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):Line 70/71-78 where we see the same agrees with a few new ideas/modifications

Martin Sutton:agree

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):May as well wrap here Robin TIME CHECK...

Jim Prendergast:agreement with new idea but with limits

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):the next section has more divergence

Martin Sutton:The BRG comment should be just agreement, not new idea

Justine Chew:+1 Martin

Steve Chan:@Martin, all, we can switch a bunch of those to agreement with limits

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):Great progress through a lot of comments though people ...

THANKS

Julie Bisland:The next Sub Group A call: Thursday, 14 February 2019 at 20:00 UTC for 60 minutes.

Collin Kurre:Thanks Robin! Bye everyone

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):Bye for now then

Katrin Ohlmer:Thanks all

Martin Sutton:Thx Robin

Phil Buckingham:thanks Robin