

**Attendance:**

Anne Aikman-Scalese  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr  
Christa Taylor  
Drew Wilson  
Jeff Neuman  
Jessica Hooper  
Jim Prendergast  
Justine Chew  
Phil Buckingham  
Rubens Kuhl

Apologies:

Katrin Ohlmer  
Kristine Dorrain  
Vanda Scartezini  
Donna Austin

Staff:

Julie Hedlund  
Steve Chan  
Michelle DeSmyter

**AC chat:**

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear all, welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Group B call on Tuesday, 19 February 2019 at 17:00 UTC.

Michelle DeSmyter:Agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/kpsWBg>

Michelle DeSmyter:The Google document can be found at: [Jim Prendergast:apologies in advance but need to leave about 30 min in.](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_docs.google.com_spreadsheets_d_133WbhWYB4M4kT6DqSfiCR2-2Dij7jxNkLj5EWZL-2DNA95M_edit-3Fusp-3Dsharing&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3Pjp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWI PqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGIBLwwwFbfjrsjWv9&m=msuhzVgh_fRTrdN3byXiW9Bd-0fFdDKvVaVQkjCN7ek&s=Gcxri9At1MNWvrNOT5Qh5xkH2UVpN3qDsFvHBChqw8&e=[docs.google.com]</a></p></div><div data-bbox=)

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

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

Julie Hedlund:Starting at line 31, 2.7.5.c.5

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

Christa Taylor:+1

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):No thanks

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):full WG is fine ;-)

Steve Chan:Note, there is a preliminary recommendation related to 2.7.5.e.1 (2.7.5.c.3). Since we broke up this comment review into two separate meetings, just thought it might be helpful to keep that in mind (that those comments are relevant).

Anne Aikman-Scalese:QUESTION: Is that an official request that ALAC reconsider a contradictory position? QUESTION

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):Noted @Rubens. perhaps @Justine can follow up on that

Justine Chew:Noting down

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

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

Rubens Kuhl:Anne, I believe it's more of an alert than a request. They couldn't know at the time when they responded it was going to be contradictory; now it is, so if they want to state a position, they would need to remove the contradiction and pick one position.

Rubens Kuhl:(It was an answer to Anne's point on IDNs)

Justine Chew:@Christa: it relates to something that I have to follow up for ALAC

Justine Chew:Could that 24 Jan 2018 letter be tabled for the full WG's consideration when it reviewing 2.7.6.c.2 please? Thanks.

Justine Chew:\*reviews

Steve Chan:Here is 2.5.1.e.6: Are we acknowledging and accepting of ICANN being a so-called "registry of registries" (i.e., does the community envision ICANN approving a few thousand / hundreds of thousands / millions of gTLDs to be added to the root? Should there be a cap? )

Steve Chan:Since I'm guessing like me, you all do not have these questions memorized :)

Anne Aikman-Scalese:I see that Alexander Schubert comment is marked "take to larger group for discussion". Did we mark the comments in 2.7.6 at lines 3-6 in Security and Stability for "take to full WG for discussion"? QUESTION

Steve Chan:@Christa, was just providing a reference to the question mentioned in the SSAC question - sorry for the confusion.

Rubens Kuhl:The description of 2.5.1.e.6 is for understanding the SSAC comment on 2.7.6.c.2

Steve Chan:@Anne, as I think we've said a few times, the "taking to the full WG" has created a bit of confusion. All sub group discussions, albeit in a summarized fashion and emphasizing new ideas (as it relates to agreement, new ideas, concerns, divergence), will be sent to the full WG.

Steve Chan:So to your question, yes, those elements will be provided to the main group.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:@Steve - yes - it's a bit unclear since all along we have talked about flagging issues for discussion in the full WG.

Rubens Kuhl:We are just pre-cooking food so the full WG can finish the cooking and serve the dish.

Justine Chew:Line 23 - 2.7.6.e.2 ... just to digress a little I just saw today a VICE News report about an American domain investor "reselling" emojis under the .ws ccTLD. Out of scope for us but interesting to note in context of SSAC's position on emojis.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:It seems the difficulty will be the "summarized fashion" and determining whether all of the issues the SubGroups have flagged appear in that summary- Good luck to Leadership and staff on that point!

Rubens Kuhl:I believe the SSAC position on full security policy is also a divergence, not an agreement.

Rubens Kuhl:Last phrase of line 9.

Steve Chan:I think you are correct Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl:The second part of highlighted ICANN Org looks like a concern to me.

Rubens Kuhl:Line 12

Justine Chew:Line 12 - why is ICANN Org's request to clarify what is meant by "during the procedure" as an agreement? Even though tagged as "clarification" also.

Justine Chew:\*marked as an agreement

Julie Hedlund:@Justine: It is marked as agreement because the comment says it is feasible, "From a program operations perspective, it is feasible to publish clarifying questions and responses to public questions of the applications. "

Julie Hedlund:So it doesn't seem to disagree, but asks for clarification.

Julie Hedlund:\*disagree

Steve Chan:I changed it to New Idea, if that's helpful?

Rubens Kuhl:I also see the first highlight as an agreement. The second part is what is more of a concern.

Justine Chew:It's now changed to a new idea?

Steve Chan:Yes, unless there are objections to that approach

Steve Chan:Just want to make sure it gets flagged for full WG consideration.

Justine Chew:Better than agreement with clarification. @Rubens?

Rubens Kuhl:Justine, exactly. The 2nd part was not an agreement but it is no longer indicated this way, so I'm fine with how it is now.

Justine Chew:Goodo

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (@CLO PDP Co-Chair):Apologies I will need to leave audio (not AC though\_ shortly for my next call

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro Co-chair):I dont see those as necessarily divergent

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro Co-chair):These things can be assessed without the full plan

Anne Aikman-Scalese:What is DAAR?

Rubens Kuhl:[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_www.icann.org octo-2Dssr daar&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4l5cM&r=8\\_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe\\_5iHWGIBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=msuhzVghfRTrdN3byXiW9Bd-0fFdDKvVaVQkjCN7ek&s=rUWym8E0qqPdIM\\_TB30lF2ADBQhfHSFH9iTgETn5fU4&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_octo-2Dssr_daar&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4l5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGIBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=msuhzVghfRTrdN3byXiW9Bd-0fFdDKvVaVQkjCN7ek&s=rUWym8E0qqPdIM_TB30lF2ADBQhfHSFH9iTgETn5fU4&e=)

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro Co-chair):Its ICANNs tool to measure domain abuse

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro Co-chair):"Domain Abuse Activity Report"

Justine Chew:DAAR - Domain Abuse Activity Reporting

Anne Aikman-Scalese:@Jeff - How would DAAR apply in the application phase??

Rubens Kuhl:@Anne, perhaps GAC could clarify that... it looks out of context to me.

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro Co-chair):Good question. I suppose it could be used as evidence of past history for those registries that apply again.

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro Co-chair):But I would think that would be a stretch

Julie Hedlund:Next meeting is 26 February at 20:00 UTC

Justine Chew:"Domain abuser"?

Rubens Kuhl:And it would be more of something related to RO than RSP.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:So registries with history of lots of reports of abuse via DAAR would be subject to scoring in terms of application technical evaluation?

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro Co-chair):Right...if there is a Registry Operator that is known for supporting abuse, should you allow them to have additional new gTLDs?

Anne Aikman-Scalese:I wonder if that might satisfy SSAC and ALAC comments that abuse should be studied more carefully?

Rubens Kuhl:Thanks staff and participants!

Justine Chew:Blackmarked perhaps

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Thank you Rubens, Christa et al!