

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear All, Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WG call on Monday, 09 May 2016 at 16:00 UTC.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Hi Tom, Great time of day for us in AU ;-)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):and he dropped off..

Steve Coates (Twitter):We are working on it Cheryl!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):I HAVE NO PROBLEM SHARING THE PAIN>>>

Alan Greenberg:Long delay in getting on bridge

Richard Padilla:Hello All

Tom Dale (ACIG GAC Secretariat):Cheryl, nowhere else I'd rather be.

Greg Shatan:I got in the bridge almost immediately....

Susan Payne:hi I don't have sound - is it me?

Jeff Neuman (Valideus):Steve Coates....are we ready?

Susan Payne:ah, thanks!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):argh sorry CAPS

Steve Coates (Twitter):Can you hear, Susan?

vanda SCARTEZINI:hi all

Martin Sutton:Hi everyone, sorry for my late arrival.

Susan Payne:@Steve - yes, now I can hear thanks

vanda SCARTEZINI:i am in a noise room, so I am mute.

Steve Coates (Twitter):<https://community.icann.org/x/A0WAAw>

Avri Doria:would like to get it out by the end of the week.

Avri Doria:We have one for the CCT

Tom Dale (ACIG GAC Secretariat):What deadline would be envisaged for the SOs/ACs to respond?

Steve Coates (Twitter):My apologies, you are correct Avri.

Robin Gross:Agree with Susan about the need to understand the level of consensus of GAC "advice"

Tom Dale (ACIG GAC Secretariat):The GAC response will make clear the status of the advice referred to.

Alan Greenberg:Lost all sound. Just me?

Guillemaut Frederic (SafeBrands):i lost audio

Susan Payne:I have too

Julie Hedlund:I lost sound too.

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON:same here

Amr Elsadr:I lost sound as well.

Christa Taylor:Very light in the sound

Julie Hedlund:Steve Coates is very faint.

Christa Taylor:better

Marc Trachtenberg:Now its intermittent

Robin Gross:sound going in and out

Amr Elsadr:@Steve: You're breaking up.

vanda SCARTEZINI:sound is going and come back

Amr Elsadr:Better now.

Christa Taylor:yes

Christopher Niemi:Yes  
Susan Payne:yes  
vanda SCARTEZINI:yes  
Julie Hedlund:Loud and clear Steve.  
Gangesh Varma:much better now  
Steve Chan:@Susan, noted. I can prepare a draft unless you've like to provide updated text.  
Christa Taylor:good in the volume  
Richard Padilla:Loud enough thanks  
vanda SCARTEZINI:13 UTC looks ok  
Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON:dito  
Avri Doria:35 days sounds good, but the sooner the better  
Steve Chan:@Avri, that's actually driven by the PDP manual  
vanda SCARTEZINI:yes. 25 will be too close to Helsinki. would be good to have it early.  
vanda SCARTEZINI:i beleive we need to have a stronger engagement from regions like LAC for instance.. I have done first round a huge effort but still llack of knowledge about new gTLDs in this region. depspite all efforts from all groups here.  
Jeff Neuman (Valideus):@vanda - are you referring to more outreach to LAC region, input from the LAC regision, or both?  
Paul McGrady:I'm always amazed by Avri's mastery of all of this ICANN procedure. Thanks Avri!! Very helpful.  
Robin Gross:I agree these issues need to be decided by the community and not the board-staff.  
Harold Arcos:my apologies for late connection  
Amr Elsadr:Wouldn't the standard be something that was within the scope of this PDP, but not addressed? That is my understanding of something that would warrant an expedited PDP.  
Harold Arcos:@Vanda +1  
Amr Elsadr:Expedited PDPs cannot be used to revisit issues that were already settled.  
Jeff Neuman (Valideus):or to invent theoretical, but not necessarily real issues  
Gangesh Varma:I'm not sure if this is the right point of time to raise this, but when do we flag potential human rights concerns?  
Avri Doria:Ganesh are you suggesting that HR should be one of the overarching issues?  
Avri Doria:Amr, I beleive it can also be used with there is substantive new information on a previously scoped aand discussed issue.  
Jeff Neuman (Valideus):I know HR is referenced with some of the specific issues (when we get into tracks), but how would it apply as an overarching issue?  
Gangesh Varma:no Avril, I was thinking hr implications in

particular issues we are looking at . foreexampl e related to sensitive strings restrictions on freedom of expression etc.

Avri Doria:and a GGP can be used for clarifying policy that was not clear enough - explanation not new policy

Amr Elsadr:@Avri: Yes..., exactly. But Jeff does raise an interesting point on what may be "theoretical issues". I suspect it would be up to a Council vote on whether or not to launch an EPDP.

Gangesh Varma:Avri\* sorry about the typo

Kurt Pritz:While one can form an opinion on this issue without data, this discussion should have been prefaced by a brief illustration of statistics: how many applied for how many?

Avri Doria:no worries - i am the queen of typos

Phil Buckingham:Rightside ????

Avri Doria:Ganesh, in that case I think it would come in during the specific these discussion that we will ask about in CC2, a project for after Helsinki

vanda SCARTEZINI: I beleive this is a client's decision -

Avri Doria:I must say, I do not rember the discussion of limits or the numbers of application \_evver\_ being an item of discussion in the policy of 2007

vanda SCARTEZINI:no limit in my opinion

vanda SCARTEZINI:in a noise environment . just able to write

Robin Gross:I agree, Avri, that was never an issue.

Avri Doria:If we put a limit, one can create several applicants and get around the limits.

Donna Austin, Neustar:any limit seems to be anti-competitive

Robin Gross:Right - easy to create a "new" and "different" legal entity.

Donna Austin, Neustar:the application fee may have an impact on numbers

Danny Glix:demonstrated usage of gtld within specified timeframe (more than landing page)

Christa Taylor:Pro: Reduces the risk of gaming applications

Christa Taylor:Con: Reduces competition

Avri Doria:In fact it was rumored that limits was one of the ingredient causes of a 6 figure application fee.

Christa Taylor:Con: Always a way around it and reduces transparency on applicants

vanda SCARTEZINI:i am against limit client applicications

Amr Elsadr:I'm concerned that limits in the number of applications, or time to apply may favour those who are closely following the process, as opposed to others who may require outreach.

Robin Gross:Yes, Amr. I don't think limits are a good idea.

vanda SCARTEZINI:for me no limit to application

Avri Doria:so a pro, where it possible, might be that limits might keep the application fee down.

Amr Elsadr:Also..., I wonder if setting any sort of limits will affect how and when applicant support is implemented, assuming any form of applicant support is actually implemented.

Steve Coates (Twitter):I see fees as being a more complicated issue, where higher fees creates separate benefits and drawbacks.

Christa Taylor:Con: Could stifle competition, which is an AoC principle

Laura Hutchison:+1 Samantha on limits adding complexity and uncertainty to the process

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON:Limits can easily be gamed

Amr Elsadr:I think I was confused on what was being suggested as limiting the number. Are talking about limiting the number of applications per applicant, or the total number of applications?

VAIBHAV AGGARWAL:Hi Guys Got late. :-(

Avri Doria:the same caveat about just through out ideas applies to the things i threw out in the chat just as issues we may want to ask about in CC1

Martin Sutton:If the application fee is reduced (which is likely based on the surplus derived from the latest round), then multiple applications are more likely from a single applicant

Greg Shatan:Jeff -- understood you were just putting that out for discussion, but thanks for clarifying. Nothing should be beyond discussion....

Amr Elsadr:@Jeff: Fair enough Thanks. :)

Kurt Pritz:@We all know the top 5 or so. We should look at the long tail too. How many applied for one, two, or three. What were the auction results, who were the general victor? The we could actually confirm that the round did encourage wider involvement in the DNS and the application process followed economic rules that operate in free markets. These would be good results that would support an open, unlimited round.

Tom Dale (ACIG GAC Secretariat):Agree with Kurt. Should not the starting point for any policy discussion be whether specific problems have been identified from the data for the current round with regard to who applied for how many?

Phil Buckingham:It is much more cost effective to apply for multiple applications

vanda SCARTEZINI:agree with PHIL here

vanda SCARTEZINI:susan arguments looks great

Robin Gross:I don't think there should be a "Penalty" for applying for multiple applicants.

Donna Austin, Neustar:Not sure I agree with Susan, I think there were some significant events that slowed things down: pural

v single and name collision

Robin Gross:applications, rather

vanda SCARTEZINI: time I beleive for application

Susan Payne:but to be clear, I do see the cons to limits, and I do thinkif the expectations were different at the outset then the outcome could have been different

vanda SCARTEZINI:will limit normally

Laura Hutchison:Agreed To - what problem are we trying to fix?  
IIIs there a problem?

Laura Hutchison:sorry - that was meant to say "ageeed Tom"

Kurt Pritz:If rounds were held frequently, the volume problem would be reduced.

Susan Payne:@Donna - I agree with you - I didn't say it was the only delaying factor but I do think it was a significant factor

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):good point Alan

Christa Taylor:~\$20k per app

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON:Agree with Alan

Christa Taylor:In reality: Multiple apps is economies of scale, are further supported by the fact that biggest volume and successful TLDs (generally) are portfolio applicants

Amr Elsadr:@Susan: You raised a valid concern. I don't know if the number of applications contributed to delays, but one way or another, there should be some sort of predictable deadline for gTLDs to go live. Not sure if limiting the number of applications is the solution though.

Jim Prendergast:\$100k for eval, \$25k for progam development and \$60k for legal fund

Steve Coates (Twitter):From 2013: ICANN has provided the components and associated costs relating to the \$185,000 application fee as follows: Development costs of \$26,950. A recovery of costs associated with the launch of the gTLD application program. Application processing costs - Fixed of \$24,800 relating to set-up, integration and one-time communication costs. Application processing costs - Variable of \$73,000 for labour in relation to evaluating each application. Risk costs of \$60,000 for unanticipated costs and variances between estimates and actual costs.

vanda SCARTEZINI:last round time was the limit.

Phil Buckingham:Thought 185K fee was based on 500 original budget ( back in 2010) as full cost recovery .

Christa Taylor:How about some method to try and reduce or implement a ceiling on the number of applicantions an applicant can have in contention to reduce gaming in the next round?

Steve Chan:@Jeff, the DG noted that reducing the number of applications from applicants could conceivably reduce demand for a scarce resource

Phil Buckingham:+ 1 Christa  
Amr Elsadr:Cool. Thanks all. Bye.  
Guillemaut Frederic (SafeBrands):thank you  
Cecilia Smith:ha!  
Susan Payne:thanks  
Christa Taylor:woo hoo! thx!  
Robin Gross:wow - thanks, bye  
Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON:Thanks all!  
Tom Dale (ACIG GAC Secretariat):Bye  
Martin Sutton:thx