[Gnso-newgtld-wg] ALAC position on newgTLD subpro

John Laprise <jlaprise@gmail.com>   12 July 2019 at 00:16
To: Jeff Neuman <jeff.neuman@comlaude.com>
Cc: CPWG <cpwg@icann.org>, ALAC Members <ALAC-members@icann.org>, gnso-newgtld-wg@icann.org, ICANN At-Large Staff
<staff@atlarge.icann.org>, At-Large Worldwide <at-large@atlarge-lists.icann.org>

Thanks Jeff,

We've been following the discussion and are in the process of producing more detailed advice which will be forthcoming. However I can
respond to points 1 & 4 now.

It is our view that the subpro work is akin to refining the machinery while initiating a round is using the machinery. One necessarily precedes
the other and we support the subpro work. We want it completed before we start using it in the future.

On point 4: this is documented in ALACs #ICANN65 talking points document as well as recordings and transcripts of ALAC's session with
GDD. We've also communicated this to the board with regularity and the other ACs. At Large's Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG)
will be providing further detail as you requested.

Sent from my Pixel 3XL

John Laprise, Ph.D.

> [Quoted text hidden]
>> [Quoted text hidden]
>> ---------- Forwarded message ----------
>> From: Justine Chew <justine.chew@gmail.com>
>> To: Jeff Neuman <jeff.neuman@comlaude.com>
>> Cc: "gnso-newgtld-wg-sgb@icann.org" <gnso-newgtld-wg-sgb@icann.org>, Olivier MJ Crepin-Leblond <ocl@gih.com>, Jonathan Zuck
>> <JZuck@innovatorsnetwork.org>
>> Bcc:
>> Date: Mon, 1 Apr 2019 14:18:28 +0000
>> Subject: Re: [GNSO-NewGTLD-WG-SGB] ALAC responses to Sub-group B triage exercise on Topics 2.7.5 IDNs and 2.7.8 Name
>> Collisions
>> Hi Jeff,
>>
>> In reply to your request for further clarification, the ALAC is saying:
>>
>> The Subsequent Procedures WG can conclude its work, and implementation may proceed, BUT EITHER ICANN may not launch the
>> application window until the NCAP study(ies) are completed and any recommendations resulting from those study(ies) are addressed in
>> implementation OR ICANN may launch the application window and start the evaluation process, but no TLD may be delegated until the
>> NCAP Study(ies) is/are completed and any recommendations resulting from those study(ies) are retroactively incorporated.
>>
>> Kind regards,
>>
>> Justine Chew
>> ALAC liaison for Subsequent Procedures
>> -----
>>
>>
>> On Mon, 25 Mar 2019 at 22:10, Jeff Neuman <jeff.neuman@comlaude.com> wrote:
>>> Thanks Justine and thanks to the ALAC. I have one further clarification question on Name Collisions:
>>>
>>>
>>> Below it states: "**Based on recent developments to the SSAC NCAP, the ALAC advocates for any implementation, if not
>>> development, of policy with respect to dealing with Names Collision, be subject to informed guidance from the SSAC NCAP
>>> Study 1, at the minimum, as well as Study 2 and Study 3 (if Studies 2 and 3 were to proceed), and that the policy allow for the
>>> implementation to take any NCAP recommendations into full account."**
>>>
>>>
>>> This can be interpreted in a number of different ways. Is the ALAC saying:
>>>
>>>
>>> 1. SubPro should include a reference to the NCAP study(ies) in its Final Report and state that the implementation of the Next Round
>>>   include recommendations (if any) from the that study (those studies) if and when those are made available. The New TLD
>>>   Program can continue and launch, but just have a process to allow for changes due too the results of the NCAP Study(ies); or
>>> 2. SubPro should not complete its work in producing a final report until NCAP Study(ies) is/are completed; or
>>> 3. SubPro can conclude its work, but implementation cannot begin until the NCAP Study(ies) is/are completed; or
>>> 4. SubPro can conclude its work, implementation can continue, but ICANN may not launch the application window until the NCAP
>>>   study(ies) are completed; or
>>> 5. SubPro can continue its work, implementation can complete, ICANN can launch the application window and go through the
>>>   evaluation process, but the TLD may not be delegated until the NCAP Study(ies) is/are completed;
>>> 6. None of the above?

As we get down to the wire it is going to be incredibly important to make sure that we are precise. All 5 options above could be consistent with the statement above.

Thanks!

Jeff Neuman

Senior Vice President

Com Laude | Valideus
1751 Pinnacle Drive

Suite 600, McLean

VA 22102, USA

M: +1.202.549.5079

D: +1.703.635.7514

E: jeff.neuman@comlaude.com
www.comlaude.com

Liability cannot be accepted for statements made which are clearly the sender's own and not made on behalf of Com Laude USA or Valideus USA. This message is intended solely for the addressee and may contain confidential information. If you have received this message in error, please send it back to us, and immediately and permanently delete it. Do not use, copy or disclose the information contained in this message or in any attachment.Com Laude USA and Valideus are trading names of Consonum, Inc.

From: GNSO-NewGTLD-WG-SGB <gnso-newgtld-wg-sgb-bounces@icann.org> **On Behalf Of** Justine Chew
Sent: Sunday, March 24, 2019 10:05 PM
To: gnso-newgtld-wg-sgb@icann.org
Cc: Olivier MJ Crepin-Leblond <ocl@gih.com>; Jonathan Zuck <JZuck@innovatorsnetwork.org>
Subject: [GNSO-NewGTLD-WG-SGB] ALAC responses to Sub-group B triage exercise on Topics 2.7.5 IDNs and 2.7.8 Name Collisions

Dear all,

Thank you for allowing the ALAC the opportunity and time to respond to the following alert and request for clarification on the topics of (I) 2.7..5 IDNs and (II) 2.7.8 Name Collisions, respectively. I thankfully had the opportunity to properly consult my colleagues during ICANN64 on the same and am now pleased to provide the following ALAC responses.

I would be most grateful for an acknowledgment of receipt of this email, by leadership and/or staff, noting that Sub-group B has completed its work on 5 March, so that the ALAC can be assured these feedback will be taken into account accordingly in the upcoming deliberations of the Subsequent Procedures WG at the plenary level.

(I) 2.7.5 IDNs
At the Sub-group B's call of 20 February, Rubens Kuhl very kindly alerted us to a contradiction in ALAC's comment to Q 2.7.5.e.2 and afforded an opportunity to remove the contradiction. The ALAC gratefully accepts the opportunity and wishes to re-state its comment as follows:-

The ALAC suggests that the "Same Entity Constraint" is enforced for all variants, ie all variants are either allocated to the same registrant as the primary label, or blocked. This would require registries (and possibly registrars) to implement the necessary checks during the registration process. Further, registrants may need to be educated about the reasons why such a constraint exists.

(II) 2.7.8 Name Collisions
At the Sub-group B's call of 5 March, there was a request/action item for me to clarify the ALAC comment of "Wait on SSAC recommendations" to all preliminary recommendations and questions in section 2.7.8, except for 2.7.8.c.1. In response, the ALAC wishes to re-state its comment for clarity, and which is in line with its comment to preliminary recommendation 2.7.8.c.1, as follows:-

Based on recent developments to the SSAC NCAP, the ALAC advocates for any implementation, if not development, of policy with respect to dealing with Names Collision, be subject to informed guidance from the SSAC NCAP Study 1, at the minimum, as well as Study 2 and Study 3 (if Studies 2 and 3 were to proceed), and that the policy allow for the implementation to take any NCAP recommendations into full account.

FYI, I have copied Olivier Crepin-Leblond and Jonathan Zuck for their information, in their capacity as Co-Chairs of the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG).

Many thanks and kind regards,

Justine Chew

ALAC liaison for Subsequent Procedures

CPWG mailing list
CPWG@icann.org
https://mm.icann.org/mailman/listinfo/cpwg