

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear All, Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures call on 25 April 2016 at 16:00 UTC.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Hi all... Ready for dial -out any time

Michelle DeSmyter:perfect -thanks Cheryl - I will let the operator know

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO)::-

Jeff Neuman:hello all

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Hi Jeff

Jeff Neuman:hi Cheryl. What time is it on your side of the world now?

Iliya Bazlyankov:Hello all

Jeff Neuman:Hello. This is the official 5 minute warning (We will start in 5 minutes) :)

Tom Dale (ACIG GAC Secretariat):2.00am in Australia.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:we are warned.....

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:waht about the time shifts we want to introduce?

Jeff Neuman:We are still analyzing. Last week the call was 6 hours later which was more convenient for Asia, less so for Europe

Jeff Neuman:3 minutes until we start

Jeff Neuman:2 minutes

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Hi Tom yes lucky we Aussies are a resilient lot even after a NATIONAL Day Public HOLIDAY >>>Did you attend a dawn Service BTW?

Jeff Neuman:1 minute until we start

Tom Dale (ACIG GAC Secretariat):Cheryl, not this year.

Richard Padilla:Hi all managed to make in early after all

Carlton Samuels:Howdy all

Carlton Samuels:The audio coming in kinda low. Barely hearing Avri

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:Avri has a low voice allways on Mondays.....

Richard Padilla:Yes Steve

Avri Doria:i adjusted my volume up a bit for the next time i talk.

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland):we hear you

Martin Sutton:we hear you

Christopher Niemi:Sounds good

Karen Day (SAS):Hearing you fine

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:todays is much better

Carlton Samuels:Yessir Steve, it is low

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:hmmmm

Rudi Vansnick:sorry for being late, had another call

Carlton Samuels:I can hear Carlos very well!

Carlton Samuels:@Carlos: Re the Analysis survey, we expect interim results before the June CCT RT f2f, no?

Michael Flemming:I am sorry, I can't hear him. Is he saying spotting issues?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:@Carlton yes

Carlton Samuels:Thks

Michael Flemming:I can now, thank you!

Julie Hedlund:@All: The PDP Topics Mapping document in the Adobe Connect room is unsynced so you can scroll through it yourself.

Michelle DeSmyter:try now

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:Good point, we should number this list

Rubens Kuhl:It's also possible to download the PDF at the upper right corner icon.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):yup

Rubens Kuhl:Actually, it was possible, not anymore...

Jeff Neuman:Thanks Rubens

Jeff Neuman:The document was attached to the e-mail with the agenda

Jeff Neuman:Where there is a high interest FYI, that does not mean that they want exclusive jurisdiction over any of these items. They just want to make sure that we are closely coordinated

Jeff Neuman:So, if we do a survey or focus groups, for example, they would like to participate (and vice versa)

Alan Greenberg:I would assume that these are areas where they MAY have something significant to say, and presumably we will have to pay attention.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):understood Jeff

Donna Austin, Neustar:Good to know that co-ordination is going on between the two efforts.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:I would only add Avri's general principle that real time policy development would wait for the recommendations

Brian Aitchison:RE name collision: the safeguards sub-team will have a call on Thursday discussing this issue, so may be more interest in this. Thanks.

Steve Coates (Twitter):Thanks, Brian. Good to know

Brian Aitchison:I'll keep it on my radar Steve and update here as needed

Steve Coates (Twitter):FABulous

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:Thank you Avri, I think is very clear framework.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez::)

Carlton Samuels:Ooops. Some things going on in the background somewhere

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland):I guess that the understanding period will require that we also listen and digest the pending findings and recommendations from the ongoing review teams

Greg Shatan:Grace Mutung'u needs to mute

grace mutung'u:muted. sorry

Steve Coates (Twitter):Jorge - I think that's right, to the extent that there is overlap.

Marilia Maciel:Apologies for joining late. Got caught in another meeting

Kiran Malancharuvil:sorry to join late

Kurt Pritz:Is "should there be subsequent procedures" ICANN-speak for "should there be additional new domain name registries"?

Steve Coates (Twitter):Great to see you, Kiran.

Jeff Neuman:@ Kurt "subsequent Procedures" is being used instead of using the term "rounds"

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:@Kurt or "should procdures be improved" if there are goin to be more resgitries

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland):process seems sensible at first sight

Christa Taylor:Support driving to the goal

Jeff Neuman:We will need some volunteers for this drafting team, so please volunteer :)

Gangesh Varma:seems reasonable

Jeff Neuman:Would be ideal to have diverse representation on that team

Christa Taylor:Happy to volunteer in drafting

Tom Dale (ACIG GAC Secretariat):I would like to volunteer.

Katrin Ohlmer:I can volunteer, too

Gangesh Varma:I'd be happy to help

Jay Westerdal:I volunteer

Cecilia Smith:Count me in

Iliya Bazlyankov:I volunteer as well

grace mutung'u:Would like to volunteer

Rubens Kuhl:Besides noting whether doing rounds or not as a steady state procedure, there is a different question of whether the next instance should be a round even being the last round.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:@SteveChan why does the paper assume that rounds are cheaper?

Kiran Malancharuvil:it seems like it's the nature of commerce that someone might get there first. pressure and urgency will exist in rounds or in the alternative structure.

vanda Scartezini:sorry to be late

Rubens Kuhl:@Carlos, rounds are cheapear if the evaluation procedures are extensive and repetitive. We can achieve those cost efficiencies by other means, but rounds have that property.

Steve Chan:@Carlos, I don't recall that it makes that assumption. I think it's noting that it MAY be more extensive to have continual retainers for providers (evaluators, pre-delegation providers, etc.)

Kurt Pritz:I agree with martin

Karen Day:+1 Martin

Nathaniel Edwards:Pro: Rights holders (including registries) do not have to be on their toes continuously, watching for new TLD applications

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Predictability of Cycles (well the potential for tt ;-) is a Pro I would assume

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:@Martin.Sutton ¿predictable mini-rounds?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Yes Carlo Predictability of any level of rounds mini or otherwise can be a Pro

Greg Shatan:Number 4 is incorrect -- should say "Identical applications -- content sets, not first come, first served"

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:@Jeff good point <competing interest in string> as a parameter to consider

Klaus Stoll:Predictable cycles that have short time periods between them to introduce lessons learned

Julie Hedlund:@Greg: Please see rewrite for 6 (combining yours and Jeff's comments).

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland):Rounds allow for subsequent reviews and a cycle of improvement

Rubens Kuhl:One con of the round system is adding latency, increasing time to the market.

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Steve, I think it depends on how often rounds were opened up. Would it be once every year or one every three years.

Martin Sutton:There could be fast track processing

Martin Sutton:e.g. accredited back-end provider + accept standard agreement

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:I lost avri

Jay Westerdal:Pro: Global rules and board actions can address all new applicants prior to a round. So rounds allow for consistency in rules.

Cecilia Smith:+1 to Martin to have a pre-determined fast tracking process for certain applications, while keeping the controlled rounds for others.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:CONS rounds are not an optimal process for solving competing interest. Auctions do solve them. IP rules also do solve them.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:@Greg agree that in the case of brands/communities it creates artificial barriers. Maybe only in the case of "pure"generics it does not, but then we can go for auctions

Greg Shatan:I think the rounds tee up the applications for auctions better than a continuing open application window.

Rubens Kuhl:We had some auctions between brands and open TLDs, with both types winning some.

Carlton Samuels:@Avri: If demand is going to be indicator for booting a round, we must have a definition..and it is about what exist at the point

Kiran Malancharuvil:good point, may be difficult o

Kurt Pritz:@ Greg. If we do not have rounds, contention is resolved by first-come-first served. Correct?

Greg Shatan:PLEASE ADD to CONS: Creates artificial demand and artificial scarcity.

Kiran Malancharuvil:sorry... difficult to establish the difference between existing demand and created demand

Jeff Neuman:Even with trademarks there are competing interests

Jeff Neuman:Several entities can share the use of a particular mark

Carlton Samuels:@Carlos: I read a 'round' to mean a set of structured activities geared towards introducing a set of TLDs into the root.

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland):Pro: Rounds allow for subsequent reviews and a cycle of improvement

Jay Westerdal:Pro: Trademarks can be gamed. \$2K for a trademark in Europe. So Trademarks bypassing rounds is bad. Generic words will apply as trademarks.

Kurt Pritz:Good point by Jorge Cancio

Tom Dale (ACIG GAC Secretariat):Does this list of pros and cons logically mean cons and pros of a perpetual application process? Or is that a separate analysis?

Greg Shatan:@Kurt -- that's not really contention -- that's sidestepping contention. Think about a group of siblings dividing up their parents' belongings. Do you want first-come, first-served or a round where everyone has an opportunity to make a claim and then those claims responsiveness.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Specific rounds have a sub set of Pros and Cons I guess

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:I do understand @Greg artifical demand point

Martin Sutton:An open-ended round can create artificial demand, for instance

Rubens Kuhl:On trademark gaming, some legal right objections were already filed in the 2012 round based on that tactic, so it's more than theoretical.

Donna Austin, Neustar:Timing between rounds may lead to pent up demand.

Carlton Samuels:@artifical demand? Why does that sound so much

like 'gaming mechanisms" expressed another way?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):up

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):that should be @Donnas Yup not up

Kiran Malancharuvil:I don't see how the discussion about market demand implicates gaming the system. can you clarify Carlton?

Marc Trachtenberg:How is having rounds like digital archery?

Rubens Kuhl:Having many rounds as we have ICANN meetings, 3x / year, might ease up artificial effects.

Jim Prendergast:might be good to know the impact on ICANN staff/budgets on having a standing army of reviewers for an ongoing application process vs ramp up and ramp down for rounds.

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Rubens, agreed.

Jay Westerdal:Pro: Standard contracts can be applied as a base

Julie Hedlund:@Marc: I had misplaced the digital archery comment as a con.

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland):a factor that may affect our opinion on pros or cons to rounds: unpredictable timing for rounds speaks against them; but in a framework of organized, periodic, predictable rounds, rounds become much more attractive

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:We should have new {pure, non-generic} TLD for sure, I'm not sure in the case of "generic" TLDs.

Jannik Skou Thomsen Trampedach:to Mark : first come first served - once the window opens...(Dig Arch)

Marc Trachtenberg:@Julie - thanks - that makes more sense

Greg Shatan:I think standard contracts could be used in an "open window" system just as well as in rounds.

Harold Arcos:sound goes and comes

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Carlos, I think it would be difficult to define what a [pure, non-generic] TLD was or is.

Harold Arcos:@Jay But all rounds will be by trademarks? so what will happen with generics? Not all will be trademarks, I think.

Katrin Ohlmer:revisions are easier and more fair if done after rounds

Jay Westerdal:My Pro above was not added

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland):Another general thought: rounds may be tied to categories

Jeff Neuman:thats noty you

Philip Corwin:My view is that discrete rounds arecreate unnatural boom and bust cycles for application processing, consulting services, etc. -- and that a permanent open window would be prefereable (adjusting various aspects to accommodate should not be that difficult).

Jay Westerdal:Pro: Standard contracts can be applied as a base

Julie Hedlund:@Jay: Sorry to miss it. Could your repeat in chat?

Tom Dale (ACIG GAC Secretariat):There are also differing cost

impacts on SOs and ACs.

Kurt Pritz:@ Jim: Good point. I think the costs can be managed. ICANN has a "standing army of reviewers" now for registrars. After a round or two, the cost of evaluating will be driven down by streamlining process and decreased demand so that cost will not be high.

Julie Hedlund:@Jay: I think I got it.

Jay Westerdal:@julie thanks

Christa Taylor:Rounds allow the application for predictable methodology

Julie Hedlund:@Christa: Got it!

Jeff Neuman:sorry Avri to steal your thunder

Rubens Kuhl:I think we have most of what we need to bring it for applicants what's already in for registries: if it's a security issue, board can define provisional mechanisms; otherwise, agreement by ICANN and the affect group is required.

Rubens Kuhl:(affected group)

Martin Sutton:Rounds: Cycles of rounds can overlap as the process is refined. So if you have 4 distinct stages (1)application window (2) Reviews/objections(3)contracting (4) test/delegate - then the next round could begin as soon as stage 2 is passed, thus shortening the time to next rounds. So Ruben can have 3 rounds per yr....

Rubens Kuhl:@Martin, and (4) is possibly going to get expedited by accrediting RSPs...

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Martin, would need to be careful that it is only the process that is refined and not substantive policy elements that would lead to, or have the unintended consequences, of manipulating the playing field.

Jay Westerdal:Pro with Rounds. Watchdogs and others don't need to be on gaurd 24/7, they can tune in at planned reveal dates

Steve Coates (Twitter):I think the issue with having rounds is we can shorten the lenght of time between rounds, but similarly, they can also be lengthened. If the process is ongoing, they could still be processed in batches every few months, or immediately.

Julie Hedlund:@Jay: I got your additional pro.

Julie Hedlund:@Steve Coates: Also captured your pro.

Jeff Neuman:I think one thing that led to unpredictability was a lack of ICANN's decisive action

Jeff Neuman:and sticking to what was in the guidebook

Katrin Ohlmer:+1 Jeff

Jeff Neuman:it keps leaving the door open

Jannik Skou Thomsen Trampedach:Predictability: I suggest ICANN Board analyses and makes decisions on GACs input to final AGB principles AND agree with GAC not to change rules for applicants

AFTER applications have been submitted - in this way we would not experience such things as "sensitive strings" , "closed generics" Two letter release applications etc etc....

Donna Austin, Neustar:Another reason for unpredictability was GAC advice and the NGPC response.

Steve Coates (Twitter):+1 Jannik

Jay Westerdal:Legal and application processes are still being worked out and argued. So it is nice to have predictability by having those issued worked out ahead of time.

Kiran Malancharuvil:+1 Jannik

Donna Austin, Neustar:New CEO created some unpredictability as well.

Katrin Ohlmer:pro: predictability offers the chance to improve the communication of the introduction process of new gtlds

Steve Chan:@Jeff, and the way those issues of compelling interest are resolved should hopefully be predictable as well.

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland):I feel a strong element to enhance predictability is to develop adaptations to policy based on a cross-community effort from the start. We have learned a lot since the last AGB, and work in silos is slowly being superseded by cross-community work

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Jorge, CCWG efforts are distinct from policy development efforts.

Rubens Kuhl:As mitigation, we might have approval - with the same mechanism already in place in registry agreements - for changes to the process that are not security/stability-related.

Kurt Pritz:Should we list / catalogue the changes that occurred post application-window opening to get an idea of issues to be addressed?

Jay Westerdal:String confusion was not something that could be tested or judged before applying

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland):@Donna: sure, but cross-community dialogue would certainly help in avoiding adverse effects on predictability

Alan Greenberg:@Donna, I read Jorge's comment as being a lower-case cross-community effort and not a CCWG.

Cecilia Smith:Standards: predictability on deadlines both from applicant and ICANN such as response times for application review, negotiation process, etc

Amr Elsadr:@Donna: +1. Also, membership to GNSO WGs is open to anyone. This group is chartered by the GNSO Council, we're actually having a cross-community discussion right now, aren't we? :)

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland):Alan is right, sorry if I wasn't clear

Jannik Skou Thomsen Trampedach:Predictability suggestion:

Publish "perfect applications" for new applicants to read and give better guidelines for each answer/requirement

Donna Austin, Neustar:@jorge, PDPs are cross-community efforts, there are no restrictions on how can participate.

Amr Elsadr:*Although* this group is chartered by the GNSO Council, we're having a cross-community discussion right now.

Katrin Ohlmer:Lack of predictability causes applicants to loose faith+trust in process

Tom Dale (ACIG GAC Secretariat):I note there are proposals for PDPs to be the subject of cross-community discussions in the afternoon sessions at Helsinki.

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Jeff, I agree on the statements you made about results of lack of predictability, but I think the larger failing was the time it took to iron out the kinks. It's four years since the 2012 application round opened and ICANN is still signing contracts and delegating TLDs.

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland):right, Tom - good opportunity to bring a wider cross-section of the community into this debate

Jay Westerdal:Pro: A definitive list of names banned should be shown to applicates ahead of applying. Such as .home, .corp, etc.

Carlton Samuels:Can't hear Jeff at all!

Steve Coates (Twitter):I can hear Jeffff.

Dietmar Lenden - Valideus Ltd:We can hear you

Carlton Samuels:He's fading away.>>> I hear Avri perfectly

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:@Carlton suffers from selective hearing Avri

Doria:<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/e.+Action+Items>

Harold Arcos:sound goes and comes

Alan Greenberg:Worth noting that PDPs are now FAR more cross community than they were in years past and certainly mre than when the last new gTLD policy was created. There was always an opportunity to input, but not to cooperatively develop the policy.

Carlton Samuels:@Carlos. I wish it were the case! :-)

Carlos Raul Gutierrez:)

Dietmar Lenden - Valideus Ltd:thanks Jeff ;)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Thanks Everyone good cll, we continue to make progress, talkagain soon then... Bye for now

Carlton Samuels:Thanks all!

Tom Dale (ACIG GAC Secretariat):Thank you.

Martin Sutton:Thx all

Rubens Kuhl:Thanks @ll, bye!

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland):Agree with Alan - and as Tom Dale mentioned, Helsinki would be a good opportunity for a good f2f

Christa Taylor:Thanks Avri and Jeff

Katrin Ohlmer:thanks Jeff, thanks Avri
jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland):thanks
Gangesh Varma:thanks everyone
Rudi Vansnick:bye
Christopher Niemi:Thanks
Richard Padilla:thanks
Harold Arcos:thanks all
Iliya Bazlyankov:thank you all and bye
grace mutung'u:bye
vanda Scartezini:thanks Adri good explanation