

### **Attendance - 9 Members**

Anne Aikman-Scalese  
Christa Taylor  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr  
Drew Wilson  
Juan Manuel Rojas  
Kristine Dorrain  
Phil Buckingham  
Rubens Kuhl

**Apologies:** Donna Austin

**On audio only:** Jim Prendergast

**Staff:** Julie Hedlund, Steve Chan, Julie Bisland

### **AC Chat:**

Julie Bisland:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP - Sub Group B call on Tuesday, 26 February 2019 at 20:00 UTC

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

Juan Manuel Rojas:Good morning/afternoon/night to everyone!

CLO::-) @CHrista

Anne Aikman-Scalese:low attendance today

CLO:buy our own bar food?

CLO:offer gifst to attend

CLO:L-)

CLO:SOrry being flipant

Rubens Kuhl:We will have draw of priority numbers for the next procedure in our calls. That might improve attendance...

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Ha Ha Rubens - LOL!

Steve Chan:Would it make sense to change the ICANN org inputs to New Idea to make sure they get picked up in the full WG review?

Steve Chan:Or Concerns?

Anne Aikman-Scalese:AGree wtih Steve on this. Also think Valideus comment re (c) as to brands is a New Idea -

Rubens Kuhl:In line 75 or a previous one ?

Steve Chan:Probably both 65 and 72 Rubens?

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Line 75 in the first sentence - reference to (c) is a New Idea

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Sorry I did not understand the logic on that - should we cross-reference?

Rubens Kuhl:It's 2.7.7.c.12 in the initial report.

Steve Chan:This line seems directed towards that idea: "However, there should also be a recognition that there will be proposed applications that will not be reliant on the sale of third party registrations and thus should not be subject to the same type of evaluation criteria."

Steve Chan:Here's the entire bullet if that helps: The goals of a financial evaluation are for the applicant to demonstrate financial wherewithal and assure long-term survivability of the registry. Therefore, the evaluation should look at whether an applicant could withstand not achieving revenue goals, exceeding

expenses, funding shortfalls, or inability to manage multiple TLDs in the case of registries that are dependent upon the sale of registrations. However, there should also be a recognition that there will be proposed applications that will not be reliant on the sale of third party registrations and thus should not be subject to the same type of evaluation criteria. In other words, although the goals of the financial evaluation are to determine the financial wherewithal of an applicant to sustain the maintenance of a TLD, the criteria may be different for different types of registries. Criteria should not be established in a "one-size-fits-all" manner.

Rubens Kuhl:New Idea in our analysis refer to ideas differing from the initial report.

Steve Chan:haha, you didn't have to read it Christa :)

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Did the Initial Report recommend that brands be evaluated differently?

Steve Chan:And +1 Rubens, New is in respect of the Initial Report (and therefore something New or the WG to consider)

Anne Aikman-Scalese:I don't think that recommendation is a firm recommendation that the financial evaluation should be different

Rubens Kuhl:Anne, in a generalized form, yes. That encompass Spec 13, code of conduct exempted and closed TLDs.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Right but it does not specifically identify the financial evaluation process as being different for .brands.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Thanks Christa.

Rubens Kuhl:In general, if we don't agree on classification, we should default to the more different view. In this case, that it is a New Idea.

Phil Buckingham:sorry I am late .

Steve Chan:Staff already marked line 88 in the Google doc as New Idea, but can of course revert if you all disagree,

Rubens Kuhl:On line 91, we need an action item to respond to NCSG that no content policing was buried by SubPro WG in this recommendation. GPML was used in order to not individualize to DPML, a service by a specific registry, and it refers to services already under assessment by ICANN Org in RSEPs. An action item for SubPro Leadership.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Agree that ICANN request for clarification on qualification to render a pre-approved service is an idea to be discussed at full WG level.

Rubens Kuhl:Also applies to line 103.

Steve Chan:Preemptively marked the ICANN org comment on line 94 as New Idea as well.

Rubens Kuhl:Steve, line 94 is more of a new idea indeed.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Agree Steve and Rubens re line 94 text now marked blue is a New Idea. Thank you.

Kristine Dorrain:Apologies for being late, I had a conflict during the first half of this call.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Steve marked it as new and I was just agreeing.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Hi Kristine - glad you are here - we have been a bit light on attendance.

Rubens Kuhl:101 looks more of an agreement / divergence schizophrenic pair.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:hand up

Kristine Dorrain:+1Rubens, all of that is not agreement.

Kristine Dorrain:)

Kristine Dorrain:At a minimum there are concerns.

Rubens Kuhl:Would you say that as a divergence or concerns ?

Rubens Kuhl:Yeap, 101 is already changed.

Kristine Dorrain:I think it's ok either way, so long as it gets discussed later. :)

Rubens Kuhl:Possibly one to add to the NCSG action item.

Steve Chan:Confirmed, moved the Public Interest Community comment to line 104. This will move all of the comments down by one numeral now of course.

Rubens Kuhl:It seems both are divergences, although of a different nature and intensity... (line 106)

Rubens Kuhl:Same applies to line 111.

Kristine Dorrain:I would characterize the RySG position as having a concern (for liability)\

Rubens Kuhl:+1 Kristine. In general, the two concerns among respondents are liability and mission creep.

Kristine Dorrain:Both Ry and Rr SGs seem concerned about liability... :)

Steve Chan:Update RySG comment to have an element of Concerns

Steve Chan:Yes, line 113. Sorry, will be more specific.

Rubens Kuhl:In line 122, the Y in Yes is black instead of green.

CLO:minutae @Rubens ;-)

Anne Aikman-Scalese:THanks to staff for noting IPC divergence on 125

Steve Chan:line 22 is fixed :)

Kristine Dorrain:@CLO. I love that you are so well-known you can just have a first name/initials. Like Cher. CLO needs no other descriptor. <3

CLO::-) all about branding @Kristine

CLO:Beat me to it @Steve

Anne Aikman-Scalese:I thought CLO stood for Chief co-Leading Officer. ;-)

CLO:I can see that title working @Anne

CLO:That will happen Yes @Kristine

Rubens Kuhl:Also of notice is that no content from the WG will ever disappear... so if something is unadvertedly left behind, it can be rescued.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Agree with Kristine re 132 and 133 - mark for full discussion.

CLO:indeed Rubens

Anne Aikman-Scalese:NO - CANNOT EXTEND THIS CALL

CLO:I would wrap up at the end of this Tab

Kristine Dorrain:I have a tight day and can't extend this call either, I'm sorry.

Steve Chan:Which is ok, since this call is not actually extended to 90 minutes :)

CLO:your time in joining us is appreciated indeed especially before any travel blocks coming u for ICANN 64

CLO:we can get through this tab whcih is terrific effort :-)

Steve Chan:If I recall, Rubens and Christa discussed extending but decided against doing so.

Rubens Kuhl:But we asked for some minutes lenience if I recall correctly...

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Thanks Steve et al. I have to drop for another call. When is the next call?

Julie Hedlund:The next call is Tuesday, 05 March at 17:00 UTC

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Thank you Julie.

CLO:Great Thanks @CHrista and Team

CLO:Bye

Kristine Dorrain:Lovely job and thanks for letting me join late.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Bye all

Rubens Kuhl:Bye all, thanks for joining!

Christa Taylor:Thanks all

Phil Buckingham:thnks , Christa for doing a great job ....

Phil Buckingham:thanks - even