

Attendance:

Alberto Soto
Anne Aikman-Scalese
Bruna Martins dos Santos
Cheryl Langdon-Orr
Christa Taylor
Christopher Niemi
Dietmar Lenden
Donna Austin
Elsa Saade
Flip Petillion
Gg Levine
Greg Shatan
Jamie Baxter
Jan Janssen
Jean Guillon
Jeff Neuman
Jessica Hooper
Jose Alberto Barrueto Rodriguez
Justine Chew

Karen Bernstein
Kathy Kleiman
Kristina Rosette
Kristine Dorrain
Liz Brodzinski
Luisa Paez
Marcelo Eid
Martin Sutton
Maxim Alzoba
Nick Wenben-Smith
Olga Kyrlyiuk
Phil Buckingham
Sarah Langstone
Sophie Hey
Susan Payne
Vaibhav Aggerwal
Vivek Goyal
Nathalie Coupet
Annebeth Lange

Apologies:

Katrin Ohlmer
Heath Dixon
Vanda Scartezini
Sara Bockey
Kavouss Arasteh
Pek Malgorzata

Staff:

Steve Chan
Julie Hedlund
Berry Cobb
Antonietta Mangiacotti
Julia Charvolen
Trang Nguyen
Michelle DeSmyter

AC chat:

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear all, welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on Monday, 25 March 2019 at 15:00 UTC.

Michelle DeSmyter:Agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/VIs2Bg>

Gg Levine (NABP):Does anyone else have trouble reading the light green text indicating agreement in the comments document?

Jeff Neuman:Gg - Its not the easiest on the eyes, that is true

Jeff Neuman:We are going to start in 1 minute

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):and into Weekly calls

Steve Chan:Proposed work plan here: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_docs.google.com_document_d_119pIXkiu-5Fd5zPVqTM09Z5Bij1Y3-2DmhnwaZLPfDDcnI4_edit&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3Pjp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWGIbLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=Ad92gTvieCVzzVCiws3307HSo8B-SYXjlbKWoRxq6Rk&s=Y6vT6FmU34FiUf_Bc4gC0DgvX1cRunIbalTuAWKDwa&e=

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

Donna Austin, Neustar:No plans for meetings in Marrakech because we'll be done?

Martin Sutton:that's the spirit Donna :-)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):more fantastical thinking than wishful however ;-)

Donna Austin, Neustar:don't break my spirit Cheryl....

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Never DONna!

Maxim Alzoba:Hi All , sorry for being bit late

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

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Yes I agree = thanks Jeff

Sarah I Verisign. 2:I think I used the term new idea - only because I thought that was the terminology we were using when we needed to have a future discussion about it as it hadn't been substantively discussed by the WG - sorry if that caused any unanticipated issues

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):such anidea might also be a 'refinement' suggested by a Commenter as well

Anne Aikman-Scalese - screen 2:COMMENT: Re Work Plan - June 17 listed as date we determine whether additional public comment is needed - for limited topics. It seems quite clear that it will be needed - for example, the discussion of "when a round closes" raised a lot of questions which should be put out for public comment. In addition, the Neustar proposal re "windows" also would need to go out for public comment.COMMENT

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Thanks @Donna that is my understanding

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):I agree with Donna - the topics will be limited. The WG has the responsibility to make determinations on existing work.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):thus our frequent refrain of 'everything going back to the plenary/full WG in the Sub Team reviews of the PC's received

Phil Buckingham:Jeff , Cheryl , Question: How do you propose to get to consensus (on each recommendation) . Would you consider a private vote (as was done on the Vertical Integration WG)

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):COMMENT: At this point, CCT-RT is not a "discussion", there are actual Resolutions by the Board. We should take a look at the references to Sub Pro. COMMENT

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Thank you Jeff

Julie Hedlund:Start on line 37 -- 2.3.e.2

Steve Chan:Link to the document again

here: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_docs.google.com_spreadsheets_d_1Ea-2DCjtL-2DheQjEwTsr7MYC-5F8gFEvmhY8XBCWTvoan6g_edit-23gid-3D2003620097&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGIBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=Ad92gTvieCVzzVCiws3307HS08B-SYXjlbKWoRxq6Rk&s=Hy02U6JMBhmsnZcdGGMqkDvbEVkD07as8S_2LpypY-8&e=

Anne Aikman-Scalese - screen 2: What line are we on in the google doc?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):37 - 44

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):ref now to line 43

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):line 44 is the last comment in from ALAC

Anne Aikman-Scalese - screen 2:Thanks

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):I don't have scroll control in the AC room doc

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

Steve Chan:Sorry Cheryl, doc now unsynced

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):SO now at bottom of page 7 in the AC Doc

Anne Aikman-Scalese - screen 2:QUESTION: How will CPE evaluation proceed with further exchanges of public comment? (which is a good idea) QUESTION

Justine Chew:+1 Jamie. IMO what Jamie has raised is a good example of a "New Idea".

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:@Jeff - I think you have interpreted that correctly

Maxim Alzoba:what to do if the particular comment is not relevant to the application?

Justine Chew:@jeff, I'm sure I got what you said entirely. ALAC supported the additional time period, I think we suggested 7 days, for applicants to respond to late comments/CQs.

Justine Chew:@Jeff, sorry that should be I'm NOT sure ...

Jeff Neuman:@justine - Got it

Maxim Alzoba:not necessary last minute comments are done on purpose (sometimes it is a nature of the processes , when everybody does not have time), but having a lot of work in last minute does not work

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Next top of page 8 in AC and at line 45 in the GDoc with lines 46-53 as comments rec'd and the end of this tab 2.3

Justine Chew:@Maxim, I agree with you, but still should be afforded time to respond to by applicant.

Donna Austin, Neustar:Applicants should have adequate opportunity to respond to comments.

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:@Maxim - in our case, there was over 2 years to comment, including the ICANN public comment period and the objection process, so it's highly unlikely it was by chance.

Maxim Alzoba:I did not mean that an applicant has to suffer from huge load of last minute comments

Donna Austin, Neustar:Put a clock on the complete comment process.

Susan Payne:then you have to go back to the applicant again - where does it end:)

Gg Levine (NABP):+1 Susan

Kathy Kleiman:Agree with Donna -- we need a clock. But we also need a complete round... tx!

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Susan, I agree and that's why I suggest that we put a clock on it.

Julie Hedlund:Up and unsynced

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:@Donna .. I fully agree - as was intended in the AGB of the 2012 round, yet it was not fulfilled by ICANN. And again, opposition needs to be registered in that comment period, or raised in the objection period

Aggarwal, Vaibhav, IN:Appologies for dropping out early, Have a TV interview at 10pm. I will follow up on the meeting on the recordings.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Thank you for joining

Martin Sutton:NCSG comments are included in the specific questions further on

Martin Sutton:can we cover when we reach each comment?

Susan Payne:to be fair if we in SubPro make a rule that allows for this string change then this wouldn't be a "breach of the rules" as the NCSG states

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Kathy, what's the basis of your claim of 20,000 applications? I don't dispute that there is demand, but I'd be interested to know what you're basing the 20,000 number on.

Kristine Dorrain:@Susan, yes, we're discussing changing the rules.

Kathy Kleiman:@Donna - gut sense. Also that we expected 500 in the first round and received 4 times that. I'm hearing 5000 projected by many people for the next round and, based on the past, I would predict 5000*4. What's your expectation?

Maxim Alzoba:I am not sure we need to use it as a fact based input

Jean Guillon - Jovenet Consulting:@Donna: Law firms talk a lot here in France. Most have no knowledge about new gTLDs but the number that I received twice was 200 (all kind of TLDs included).

Steve Chan:The beginning of Question 2.4.d.1 reads: One of the types of changes that some members of the Working Group believe should be allowed are certain application changes intended to resolve string contention. For example, if there is string contention and each of the applicants in a contention set agree, then applicants should be allowed to 1) create joint ventures or 2) have a limited ability to select a different string, which must be closely related to the original string.

Flip Petillion GNSO Council Liaison:OK Thanks Jeff.

Elsa Saade (GNSO Council Liaison):noted!

Donna Austin, Neustar:The AGB was developed by staff with many iterations as a result of public comment.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):*MANY* iterations indeed!

Maxim Alzoba:and AGB Registry Agreement was amended after the application frame without multistakeholder approach (Spec 11)

Anne Aikman-Scalese - screen 2:COMMENT: I would assume that IRT will have input on the final draft of the AGB. That was my question. Naturally, the AGB will go out for public comment either way. COMMENT

Steve Chan:@Anne, recent IRTs have a role in developing and agreeing to proposed policy language so one could assume that the IRT would provide input to the AGB?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):@Donna correct me if I am wrong here but we did in the development of IRT Guidelines make specific points on when an IRT is expected to 'go back' to a PDP process/ out for more public input did we not???

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

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

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:I would hope that the IRT will also have oversight to ensure language of final the AGB is implement as stated - for example from 2012 round - prevent ICANN from keeping the public comment period open as long as they did despite the language contained in the AGB that clearly indicated it had an end date.

Donna Austin, Neustar:I believe so Cheryl, the challenge is with interpretation and staff manage the IRT not the community. So things can get tricky.

Maxim Alzoba:implementation is what ICANN staff does the way they see fit

Steve Chan:FWIW, the standing IRT proposed by this Working Group would only be in effect AFTER program launch. There was no overlap envisioned with the standard IRT.

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Steve, maybe I'm getting my IRTs mixed up.

Phil Buckingham:Re Implementation Guidance. Surely the Sub Pro needs to indicate various demand levels and the impact it will have on costs . Research needs to be done beforehand .By whom though ?

Steve Chan:@Donna, that was actually context in response to Anne's verbal comment

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:@Phil .. and impact on transparency & predictability for applicants

Maxim Alzoba:ICANN Staff is directed by the organization management, not by IRT

Elsa Saade (GNSO Council Liaison):we're on it

Anne Aikman-Scalese - screen 2:COMMENT: IRT should be involved in Implementation Guidance all the way. COMMENT

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:+1 Anne .. we should not allow the language of the AGB to say one thing in the next round based on policy recommendations, and then allow ICANN to change or ignore that language on the fly without IRT being involved. Again, the example I provide from the 2012 round is the issue with public comments and the deadline clearly documented in the AGB

Anne Aikman-Scalese - screen 2:COMMENT: The key to this is having broad recommendation on the IRT as specified in the GNSO Operating Procedures, including appropriate technical expertise. COMMENT

Maxim Alzoba:Implementation Guidance hopefully is before the Implementation ... so the Implementation itself happens later, without involvement of IRT

Anne Aikman-Scalese - screen 2:*broad representation on the IRT

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):psge 5 in AC

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):should read 4

Kathy Kleiman:@Jeff: did you mention GAC?

Donna Austin, Neustar:I think Jeff said ALAC

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Page 6 in the AC line 23 in the GDoc

Justine Chew:@Kathy, it's all there. --- Line 13

Anne Aikman-Scalese - screen 2:Where in the Google doc?

Justine Chew:@Jeff, Line 13

Steve Chan:2 minute warning...

Maxim Alzoba:Backend operator does not have an agreement with ICANN (if does not act as a Registry the same time)

Anne Aikman-Scalese - screen 2:Okay so it's line 13 i Google doc but supposedly we were on line 23? JEFF - Could we please be very clear as to which line we are on?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Start at 2.4.d.1

Maxim Alzoba:bye all

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Thanks everyone ... Bye for now then.