Michelle DeSmyter:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call held on Monday, 28 March 2016.

Michelle DeSmyter:If you do wish to speak during the call, please either dial into the audio bridge and give the operator the password NEW gTLD, OR click on the telephone icon at the top of the AC room to activate your AC mics. Please remember to mute your phone and mics when not talking.

Harold Arcos:Hi Jeff, everyone

Michelle DeSmyter:Welcome Harold!

Kavouss Arasteh:Hi Julie

Kavouss Arasteh:Hi everybody

Harold Arcos:Thanks Michelle, My apologies in advance because I have very slow bandwidth in my job.

Jeff Neuman:Hello

Theo Geurts:hello all

Jeff Neuman:We will get started in a few minutes. Thanks to all for joining

Julie Hedlund:Hi Kavouss and everyone!

Klaus Stoll:Hi All

Greg Shatan:Hello, all.

Katrin Ohlmer| DOTZON:Hi ALl

Khaled Koubaa:Hi everyone

Julie Hedlund:@Avri: It is in the Adobe Connect room.

Julie Hedlund:The agenda

Michael Flemming:Good evening

Khaled Koubaa:re-agenda : I think the letter is more important to begin with

Steve Coates (Twitter):I'm on audio now. Apologies for running late.

Julie Hedlund:@Avri: Kavouss has his hand up -- re: the agenda.

Rubens Kuhl:Hearing echo

Vanda Scartezini:sorry to be late.

Freida Tallon:hello everyone

Paul McGrady:Tracks+1

Rubens Kuhl:Jeff, your Portuguese pronunciation of .hoteis failed evaluation. Sorry. ;-)

Phil Buckingham:Welcome Kavouss

Avri Doria:i do recommend the recording for all who missed the first meeting. worth listening to the exlpanation of tracks 1 & 2.

Rubens Kuhl:One area of overlap between evaluations and objections is string similarity. There were both string similarity evaluations (like .unicom / .unicorn, .hotels/.hoteis) and string confusion objections (.com / .ecom, .kid / .kids).

Steve Coates (Twitter):Good point, Rubens.

Steve Chan:@Kavouss - the FInal Issue Report would have a non-

exhaustive list of issues around string similarity. So that might be able to act as a starting point for the list you've asked about.

   Paul McGrady:Agree that both the substance and the procedure need to be fixed.

   Katrin Ohlmer| DOTZON:+1, Rubens. Also, the results for those two different mechanisms were not in-sync.

   Paul McGrady:+1Jeff Thanks!

   Phil Buckingham:Good point Alan .

   Greg Shatan:An application would seem to indicate an "intent to use," even if it doesn't constitute use at the time of the application.

   Rubens Kuhl:The risk already exists, since some string confusion objects on singular x plural already prevailed in the 2012-round.

   Vanda Scartezini:good suggestion ALAN

   Donna Austin, Neustar:I thought it was a principle raised in the discussion group.

   Avri Doria:we are still in clarification and have not decided anything

   Kevin Kreuser:What if those that hold singular want plural, or what if a brand wants the plural of its own name? Absolute bar, or exceptions permitted? Thinking out loud.

   Avri Doria:are we gettign lose to dicussing the solution space at the moment?

   Alan Greenberg:@Avri, yup

   Kevin Kreuser:@Avri, yes.

   Jeff Neuman:thanks avri

   Mary Wong:Note that the charter for the RPM PDP does not include evaluation/string confusion/objection topics.

   Khaled Koubaa:With all respect for all members we better go ahead with the list of subjects/issues and not spend the time in discussing only one

   Steve Coates (Twitter):Thx, Mary. Great point.

   Khaled Koubaa:This actually will be the role of each sub-group

   Greg Shatan:Thanks, Mary. That's interesting....

   Vanda Scartezini:khaled, in alrge group like this one youa re right

   Mike Rodenbaugh:IGO Names also in SCO

   Rubens Kuhl:Kevin, one similar issue is IDN x ASCII. Some IDNs were blocked in 2012 like québec due to .quebec application. So those are also waiting for a policy allowing them to apply at a further procedure.

   Mary Wong:@SteveC, @Greg - it did not seem appropriate to carve out a single type of objection procedure from this PDP to go to the RPM one, even if the phrase "rights protection mechanism" can

generally be applied to some of these processes. That's one reason why the RPM PDP charter is very explicit as to what is meant by "RPM" for purposes of that PDP.

  Greg Shatan:Thanks, Mary. I see the point. At least we know that we are dealing with all objection procedures in this group.

  Rubens Kuhl:@Mike, you are right that IGO Names were foreseen in SCO, but I believe none triggered that rule, even ECO x .eco which was a possible SCO.

  Steve Coates (Twitter):I agree with that, Mary. Let's figure out how to address that, and sync with the RPM PDP closely.

  ken stubbs:We need to find a more effective methodology for reducing the time frames for the objection processes

  Mike Rodenbaugh:@ Rubens, sorry I misspoke, IGO Names specifically address in in LRO, not SCO, and there was at least one LRO case

  Amr Elsadr:Yes..., the two objection mechanisms via the IO in the last AG were the limited public interest objection and the community objection.

  Akin-Awokoya Emmanuel:I would be interested in the data on the objections. And I think it would really help our projection and help us know what it is now

  Mary Wong:@Greg, @SteveC, yes, thanks. Having the liaison (as foreseen by the Charters for these two PDPs) betweeen the two WGs will help coordinate the discussions. Of course, if at the appropriate time either WG sees the need to refer a topic to the other, that's always a possibility (to be coordinated with the GNSO Council as manager of the PDP).

  Amr Elsadr:Both objection types had pretty specific criteria on why they could use the two objection mechamisms.

  Amr Elsadr:Terrible typing. Sorry.

  Gangesh Varma:Does the applicant guidebook prescribe the limited parameters for a public interest objection?

  Steve Coates (Twitter):Thanks, Mary. I think this ties in with the Crocker letter, and time permitting, we will discuss on this call.

  Amr Elsadr:@Gangesh: If I recall correctly, yes.

  Gangesh Varma:@Amr: Thanks. Since that is the case then we might want to distinguish ihis debate from the larger public interest/GPI discussions witihn icann.

  Amr Elsadr:AG downloadable here:
https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb

  Amr Elsadr:@Gangesh: Very much agree.

  Kevin Kreuser:https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/program-status/odr

  Amr Elsadr:The objection mechanisms are details (as Jeff mentioned) in module 3 of the AG.

  Amr Elsadr:details = detailed.

Rubens Kuhl:It's also of notice that the language of the Limited Public Interest Objections is very different from the Public Interest Committments in the registry agreement, so the term "Public Intest" is a bit overloaded in the 2012-round. LPIs were born out of the public order / morality idea, while PICs out of the public safety / security idea.

Khaled Koubaa:@Jeff @Avria @Steve : we are getting lost in discussion outside the agenda. Is it possible to focus on the adopted agenda

Avri Doria:indeed. was just thinking the same thing. we are going down the issues.

Amr Elsadr:@Rubens: Absolutely right. It may be worthwhile to consider changing the names of the limited public interest objection and PICS to avoid confusion with PI issues within broader ICANN contexts.

Kavouss Arasteh:Ken +1

Gangesh Varma:+1 Rubens

Gangesh Varma:Agree with you Amr.

Greg Shatan:Woo hoo. I clarified something.

Greg Shatan:We have a general "timing" issue that we are repairing an airplane that is still flying.

Paul McGrady:Good analogy Greg!

Steve Coates (Twitter):We are R2D2, fixing the X-Wing, in flight.

Avri Doria:shirft

Avri Doria:i mean shrift

Amr Elsadr:@Greg: Are we? I thought we were looking at the last plane to figure out how to build a better one this time around, as opposed to repairing the one that is already flying? I may be wrong.

Steve Chan:@Jay, some aspects of the 2012 round are complete. For aspects that are not complete, it might be worth building in dependencies into the Work Plan.

Gangesh Varma:Important aspect raised by Jay. We must be careful with possibility of retrospectively affecting/applying policy.

Avri Doria:for those who do not kow the expression short shrift:

Avri Doria:short shriftn.Summary, careless treatment; scant attention:

Amr Elsadr:translation/transliteration is an RDS issue, correct. Is there anything specific to gTLd strings in that regard?

Mary Wong:The GNSO receives a regular update from Sarmad Hussain, who leads ICANN's IDN Variant Program, at each ICANN meeting. If this WG has any particular topics or questions, they

can be referred to Sarmad for further discussion/elaboration.
   Jim Prendergast:UASG is at
https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=47255444
   Avri Doria:Mary, might be useful when get to those topics in
detail during the track work.
   Steve Coates (Twitter):+1
   Rubens Kuhl:Internationalized Domain Names also include IDN
ccTLDs, BTW...
   Mary Wong:On translation and transliteration - while the GNSO's
PDP on the specific charter questions it had is completed, the
subsequent Final Report of the Expert Working Group on
Internationalized Registration Data has just been referred by the
ICANN Board to the GNSO Council for consideration as to any
potential policy work it may need to do in that regard. The
Council will likely discuss this issue in April.
   Jim Prendergast:IDNs did have a proritization in the draw
   Paul McGrady:Thanks Jeff!
   Rubens Kuhl:@Jim, and that prioritization worked against them,
since they had no registrar channels... "be careful what you wish
for"
   Amr Elsadr:@Rubens: If I recall correctly, the first IDN TLD
was the Egyptian IDN ccTLD مصر.
   Phil Buckingham:IDN - yes to subsidies and give them priority (
again)
   Avri Doria:Note: while doing the bit of chairing at the top i
forgot to mention:
   Avri Doria:Everyone should update their SOIs and should let the
group know of any changes they have made.
   Steve Coates (Twitter):I think there is only 1 outstanding SOI,
but Steve Chan can correct me.
   Steve Chan:@Steve Coates, confirmed, just a single missing SOI
   Katrin Ohlmer| DOTZON:Revisitng the process for letter of
credits might be agood idea.
   Rubens Kuhl:This report already exists, new gTLD Implementation
Report.
   Christa Taylor:+1 Alan
   Vanda Scartezini:+ 1 alan + Kavouss
   Rubens Kuhl:ICANN staff report (errousnely credited as
community report):
https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/reviews/implementation/program-
review-29jan16-en.pdf
   Alan Greenberg:That part of the AG was largely written by
Staff, and then used by them, so we really need their input..
   Steve Chan:@Jeff, the folks you mentioend are following along
on the mailing list and staff coordinates on a regular basis to
ensure they are informed on the progress of this group

Rubens Kuhl:Link to comments:
http://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-new-gtld-draft-review-23sep15/
    Phil Buckingham:+ 1 kavouss - a report / feedback from the evaluators
    Christa Taylor:Its only 215 pages! Thanks for the link
    Alan Greenberg:That being said, much of this issue could really be considered implementation.
    Mary Wong:@Jeff, given the volume of emails and the number of mailing lists some of them are on, it would additionally be helpful - if the WG has specific questions - for us to reach out to the relevant staff members directly as well, to ensure timely and targeted responses.
    Steve Coates (Twitter):+1 Mary
    Avri Doria:hard to hear
    Kiran Malancharuvil 2:Please speak up but that's better
    Christa Taylor:Better now
    Cecilia Smith:better
    Amr Elsadr:@Steve: Volume a little low. Better now.
    Christa Taylor:yes
    Amr Elsadr:yes. thanks.
    Robin Gross:PICS are the AC's competing policy platform for gtld policy.
    Amr Elsadr:These questions also came up during the GNSO closing session in Marrakech (also at the request of the ALAC/GAC), but in the context of the current round.
    Vanda Scartezini:yes- a good letter.
    Avri Doria:+1 Jeff
    Paul McGrady:+1 Jeff. We can fix the next round without opining on specific fact patterns coming out of the last round.
    Amr Elsadr:Also agree with Jeff.
    Amr Elsadr:@Alan: Appreciate the clarification. Thanks.
    Vanda Scartezini:guess the points were more about GAC formal aprticipants
    Mary Wong:On intra-GNSO coordination, I think my earlier point was about this WG and the RPM PDP group appointing a liaison between them.
    Steve Coates (Twitter):Thx, Mary.
    Rubens Kuhl:We should note that there are already liasons between GNSO and ACs, and unless we find an specific scaling need to have more than one, I don't see the need for specific WGs to have them.
    Steve Coates (Twitter):Vanda, great point, and we would like to have GAC participation, directly.
    Mary Wong:There is a formal GAC-GNSO liaison that is appointed by selection of the GNSO Council.

Amr Elsadr:@Rubens: Also, the GAC/GNSO consultative group has forseen the possiblity of having some sort of liaising between GNSO PDPs and the GAC, but the group hasn't gotten around to the specifics of that just yet.

Amr Elsadr:@Julie: +1

Avri Doria:Except for the GNSO Liaison

Avri Doria:who has other possible roles.

Julie Hedlund:@Avri -- correct!

ken stubbs:makes this process more inclusive & provides for enhanced communications

Mary Wong:As Julie noted, it would be up to each SO/AC if they wished to appoint a specific person to report back to them.

Amr Elsadr:The thinking for having liaisons with the GAC is because individual GAC members cannot represent their AC. In the event of a liaison with the GAC, there should be some sort of process within the GAC to ensure that the person appointed can represent the GAC effectively.

Robert Burlingame (Pillsbury):Thank you everyone!

Christa Taylor:Thanks!

Amr Elsadr:Thanks all. Bye.

Kiran Malancharuvil 2:Thanks!

Sara Bockey:thank you all

Vanda Scartezini:good call. thank you !!

Julie Hedlund:Thanks everyone!

Gangesh Varma:Thanks all

Rubens Kuhl:Bye all, thanks!

Alan Greenberg:Good call.

Yoshi Murakami(JPRS):thank you

Khaled Koubaa:thanks

Greg Shatan:Bye all!

Christopher Niemi:Thanks.