

**Members: 13**

Anne Aikman-Scalese

Avri Doria

Cheryl Langdon-Orr

Christopher Wilkinson

Elsa Saade (GNSO Council Liaison)

Gemma Keegan - Neustar

Jeff Neuman (Co-Chair)

Jim Prendergast

Justine Chew

Kathy Kleiman

Maxim Alzoba

Raymond Zylstra - Neustar

Tom Dale

**on audio only:** none

**Apologies:**

Flip Petillion

Annebeth Lange

Michael Flemming

Donna Austin

Martin Sutton

Emily Barabas (staff)

Julie Hedlund (staff)

**Staff:**

Trang Nguyen

Steve Chan

Berry Cobb

Terri Agnew

00:29:07 Steve Chan: Jeff, you sound good to me

00:29:07 Anne Aikman-Scalese: You are welcome. thanks Jeff for leading.

00:29:07 Terri Agnew: @Jeff, currently your audio is perfect

00:32:12 Steve Chan: Doc here:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1R4zXTH3hlgfbqoxyqsSp19BI6J96NNeV7oCgxsXKD-w/edit#>

00:34:58 christopher wilkinson: For IDNs categories, the first requirement would be that the evaluators would have to be able to read them.

00:34:58 Justine Chew: +1 to adding IDNs

00:35:25 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: SO were are discussing 'observed' 'catagorisations'made in previous treatments as well as "catagories"as listed in the AGB as 'write'...

00:36:18 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: and yes all through the later AGP development ALAC Comments spoke in support of IDN's being a çatagory'to be treated as priority over other catagories for example...

00:36:41 Justine Chew: Objections

00:37:12 Anne Aikman-Scalese: I could raise Applicant Support applications again but not sure where we went with that one.

00:37:13 Justine Chew: Erm ... which DRSP it goes to

00:37:35 Kathy Kleiman: Tx Cheryl. With its support of Global South applications, NCSG (perhaps indirectly) would support.

00:37:56 Tom Dale: Presumably "governmental entity" includes IGOs?

00:38:10 Justine Chew: Just as a bookmark at least, thanks!

00:38:35 Anne Aikman-Scalese: Relates to possible diferential treatment

00:39:14 Justine Chew: Application evaluation process/requirements -- including Applicant Support

00:39:34 Terri Agnew: Reminder to mute when not speaking

00:40:27 Maxim Alzoba: it was called Generic

00:41:02 Kathy Kleiman: Can someone explain "government entities"?

00:41:09 Maxim Alzoba: it looks more like tags

00:41:16 Kathy Kleiman: What are we thinking of here? GEO gTLDs?

00:42:18 Justine Chew: just delete "should be the exception, but"

00:42:53 Steve Chan: Jeff, hand raised for a quick comment

00:43:00 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good point on the need to clarity in terminology in all this @Jim agree!

00:44:09 Kathy Kleiman: hand up

00:44:12 Anne Aikman-Scalese: Agree with Justine re delete "should be the exception".

00:44:21 christopher wilkinson: The current definition of Geo-Names in WT5 is VERY restrictive. Accordingly there may be many geo-applications that will be differentiated that may not fall into the 'type' as defined.

00:45:58 Jim Prendergast: CW raises a very important point - the impact of the parallel track 5 on 1-4. at somepoint we need to merge these for consistency sake.

00:46:50 Maxim Alzoba: so no interstellar TLDs then

00:48:04 Maxim Alzoba: any. but most probably geo

00:48:08 Justine Chew: @Steve: can we have as a footnote the clarification between "categories" versus "type" please? Just for internal reference.

00:50:11 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: sorry I double tapped

00:51:18 christopher wilkinson: @CLO Predictability would require much clearer and all-encompassing definitions of the types, notably within WT5.

00:51:52 Terri Agnew: reminder to mute when not speaking

00:52:36 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: clarity in terminology and nomenclature is indeed a highly desirable

00:53:01 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed @Jeff we can't éxclude'absolutly

00:53:30 Justine Chew: @Steve, categories?

00:53:41 Maxim Alzoba: in the registry agreement words are :intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities (so not limited to IGO's), and applicable, for example, to GEOs ,which are municipal entities of the city itself

00:54:10 Steve Chan: @Justine, I might have missed that. We are switching types to categories?

00:54:37 Steve Chan: There is a placeholder footnote that I will need to review the transcript to complete on categories versus types

00:55:43 Justine Chew: @Steve, sure, please do review - because the words "categories" and "types" are present in that bullet, so I'm getting a little fuzzy between the two. Thanks!

00:56:09 Anne Aikman-Scalese: e.g. consider the Global South in relation to Applicant Support and goals of the program

00:56:44 Maxim Alzoba: Note: the idea about variants is still not implemented by GNSO so far, so it is bit early to talk about it

00:56:45 christopher wilkinson: The matrix: Applicant support AND Community based.

00:56:51 Kathy Kleiman: Should Global South applications be added to this list -- in light of discussion above?

00:57:04 Kathy Kleiman: It may be more than applicant support.

00:58:28 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: thx @Steve

00:59:34 Jim Prendergast: @Steve - there is also the distinction between Application types (standard vs community) and TLD types (generic, brands, geos, etc)

01:01:21 christopher wilkinson: Global South +1

01:02:18 Kathy Kleiman: I think Global South are a possible priority set - whether or not they need applicant support.

01:02:24 Kathy Kleiman: (many will be IDN, but not all)

01:02:28 Kathy Kleiman: So a new set...

01:02:55 Steve Chan: @Kathy, all, it's probably helpful to think what differential treatment is needed beyond applicant support?

01:03:04 Kathy Kleiman: Diversity, Steve

01:03:17 Kathy Kleiman: We're completely dominated by Western Europe and North America

01:03:28 Steve Chan: But what would be the difference in the gTLD program? Is the process different?

01:03:52 Kathy Kleiman: perhaps as easy as prioritization in processing -- just like IDNs.

01:07:04 Anne Aikman-Scalese: @Kathy - That could mean that if I form an applicant entity that hails from the Global South then it doesn't matter how much Western control/money is behind it, it would get preferential treatment. Not sure the goal would accomplished that way, although it could have beneficial effect anyway I suppose.

01:07:42 Justine Chew: @Anne, I have the same misgivings

01:09:11 Justine Chew: Besides, in respect of Applicant Support, ALAC supported applications which might benefit end-users in the Global South or similar areas.

01:09:31 Kathy Kleiman: where would the registry be?

01:13:07 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Argh my zoomdropped ... back in now ... have lost the prior chat though :-(

01:13:12 Tom Dale: Is there a definition of the Global South that would be accepted by all stakeholders? It seems to be disputed in some academic circles.

01:13:48 Steve Chan: Hi Jeff, quick comment

01:14:06 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Jump in @Steve

01:14:12 Steve Chan: Thanks :)

01:18:14 Kathy Kleiman: CW -- makes sense. Leaving room for new future types

01:19:26 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: DON't think we close the door on that in this type of planning but any expectations of differential treatments need to be exceptional

01:19:55 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: nothing wrong I trust with still having ones application treated as 'Standard

01:22:06 Justine Chew: Also with TLD types, isn't it how/what type the applicant sees its application as falling within?

01:22:55 Justine Chew: \*isn't it

01:23:20 Justine Chew: Right, thanks @Jeff

01:25:26 Steve Chan: @Jeff, all, there is a substantial amount of overlap here with other topics. You'll see a long list of suggested referrals to other topics.

01:25:39 Anne Aikman-Scalese: GAC consensus advice calls a "verified TLD" a TLD that should be subject to "safeguards". Is that therefore a type?

01:27:29 Justine Chew: But that's not exact-match with TMCH records re RPM

01:27:50 Steve Chan: Ahhh, right, sorry confusing references...I think you're right.

01:28:08 Justine Chew: Might it fall in with Change Request?

01:28:17 Jim Prendergast: maybe you can find someone while at INTA to clarify ;)

01:28:32 Kathy Kleiman: I think the SubPro referral may have been misunderstood by the RPM WG. Would help to clarify...

01:28:43 Justine Chew: Category I

01:29:08 Kathy Kleiman: new hand

01:32:52 Justine Chew: Hmm. Even ICANN Org asks if applicants must declare the TLD type.

01:34:40 Kathy Kleiman: @Steve, with acronyms, can we spell them out?

01:34:51 Kathy Kleiman: Things like COI have a million meanings :-)

01:35:03 Anne Aikman-Scalese: RE: Council of Europe comment in relation to differential treatment for non-profits, I have some concern that a non-profit applicant could be formed solely for the purpose of the differential treatment.

01:35:38 Tom Dale: Apologies, I have to leave for another commitment.

01:35:58 Anne Aikman-Scalese: Bye Tom - thanks for participating.

01:36:01 Kathy Kleiman: @Anne - handle like trademarks in round one - make them a certain age...

01:37:36 Anne Aikman-Scalese: @Kathy - that could work. Does that mean "non-profit" should be a type? (lots of checks on bona fides needed)

01:37:58 Kathy Kleiman: "Limit Applications - In a similar vein, applications by a single company, partnership or venture must be limited. There are incumbents in this community who have the time, resources and interest to submit thousands of new gTLD applications. Such unlimited applications are not fair to the rest of the world (still learning about the New gTLD process) or to the Community which needs to comment on them. Strict limits on the number of applications per company and in cooperation with other companies is both fair and allows for adequate oversight and public review. We recommend that ICANN allow no more than 2 dozen applications for each company, including its parent company, subsidiaries, and affiliates. The few gTLD companies of today must not be allowed to dominate the DNS resources of tomorrow."

01:38:10 Kathy Kleiman: From Electronic Frontier Foundation and the Public Interest Community

01:39:25 Maxim Alzoba: do we really believe that big companies are not capable of creating large number of legal bodies to apply via those?

01:39:57 Jim Prendergast: @Kathy - wouldn't that then provide a barrier to any newcomer from challenging Donuts dominant position in new gTLDs? I forget how many they have but its north of 250

01:41:48 Maxim Alzoba: but there is no way to predict how the ownership is to be changed

01:42:14 Justine Chew: But we are not excluding references to new ideas/concerns/divergence vis a vis high-level agreement in moving forward, are we?

01:43:01 Kathy Kleiman: INTA represents many TLD applicants too.

01:44:16 Kathy Kleiman: @Jim, I don't think so...

01:45:18 Kathy Kleiman: It's a very standard telecommunications application process to a) have limits and b) show ownership via parents, subsidiaries, overlapping officers, etc.

01:46:37 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It would make an effect one assumes @Jim good observation... Then we thought (or at least I did at the time) was the large(ish) costs of application would also have a control point effect

01:47:05 Anne Aikman-Scalese: It seems it would be very difficult to determine what entity has control in relation to limiting applications. Folks could get quite creative in forming "different applicants" for the purpose of avoiding the limit.

01:48:05 Maxim Alzoba: we should not conflate corrections and particular ideas, which are not supported in the community

01:49:21 Maxim Alzoba: it seems to be 10 years now, definitely not a few years between rounds

01:49:25 Kathy Kleiman: +1, 2, 3 CW

01:50:06 Anne Aikman-Scalese: This topic seems ripe for a Minority Statement.

01:50:41 Kathy Kleiman: My prediction is 20,000 applications in the next round.  
01:51:13 Maxim Alzoba: applications are paid and it allows for scaling  
01:52:46 Kathy Kleiman: Enjoy INTA and Boston!  
01:54:49 Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks Kathy... equally as overbooked as ICANN meetings!  
01:54:52 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good interaction on complex issues today Team, Thanks everyone, we are making progress.... Bye for now... safe travels for those doing so between conferences...  
01:55:10 Maxim Alzoba: bye all  
01:55:26 Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you.