

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear All, Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WG held on Monday, 18 July 2016 at 22:00 UTC

Rubens Kuhl:Good <time of day> everyone!

Greg Shatan:x = evening

Guillemaut Frederic SafeBrands:Good evening

Carlos:Hello

Freida Tallon (.Sky):Good Evening All

Paul McGrady:Howdee!

Robin Gross:Good afternoon from foggy San Francisco!

Vanda Scartezini:hi all

Carlos:Thanks jeff, there is a LACRALO call in one hour and will have to move

Vanda Scartezini:me too already informed and apologized

Carlos:@Vanda +1 :)

Paul McGrady:+1 Jeff. Agree with that approach.

Rubens Kuhl:Fine by me.

Vanda Scartezini:ok

Justine Chew:Yes, agreed

Martin Sutton:me too

Samantha Demetriou:+1

Klaus Stoll:Fine

Robin Gross:I agree also.

Paul McGrady:Hi Cheryl!

Phil Buckingham:good evening

Steve Coates:Sorry for running late.

Rubens Kuhl:Guilty of signing-up for all 4.

Carlos:Zika is well represented then....

Sara Bockey:I'm I the only one that has lost audio?

Paul McGrady:@Jeff, it will be important that the meeting times don't overlap

Rubens Kuhl:Sara, audio is OK here.

Carlos:uxio ok

Carlos:audio ok

Robin Gross:a - ok

Christa Taylor:yes we can hear you

Vanda Scartezini:i have sent to Julie today my preference

Rodolfo Mesa:Audio Ok

Steve Chan:<https://community.icann.org/x/FT2AAw>

Steve Chan:<https://community.icann.org/x/7AObAw>

Carlton Samuels:Howdy all

Carlton Samuels:Apologies for late joining

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Finally i the AC room... No more 'judt verbl' interventions from me now Jeff ;-)

Steve Chan:Example for Work Track Scheduling: Week 1 - WT 1, 2; Week 2 - WT 3, 4, Full Group; Week 3 - WT 1, 2; Week 4 - WT 3, 4, Full Group

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):makes sence Steve

Susan Payne:My mike isn't working. I will type

Susan Payne:but carry on

Richard Padilla:Hi all

Carlton Samuels:For the record, Carlton Samuels is volunteering for Track 1 - Overall Process/Support/Outreach Issues

Steve Coates:As an FYI, I have stepped down from the BC due to my employment change that will go into effect next month.

Susan Payne:It was justb a point on the new item for WT3 - PICDRP/RRDRP. I think they may be more suitable to WT2. WT3 seems to be top level issues, whereas compliance and other issues at 2nd level have been allocated to WT2

Rubens Kuhl:Agree with Susan regarding PICDRP/RRDRP.

Carlton Samuels:I Will Observe on Track 3.

Steve Chan:FYI, responses for outreach are being tracked here: <https://community.icann.org/x/2R6OAw>

Karen Day (SAS):Also agree with Susan re: PICDRP & RRDRP

Steve Chan:And for CC1: <https://community.icann.org/x/3B6OAw>

Cecilia Smith:I have sent a follow-up to the BC and will provide an update.

Tom Dale (ACIG GAC Secretariat):The GAC is aiming to finalise its response to CC1 by the deadline next week, or close to it.

Vanda Scartezini:may be one week

Samantha Demetriou:The Registries could probably use an additional week

Steve Chan:@Susan, Rubens, Karen - I can move to track 2

Susan Payne:Thanks Steve

Robin Gross:I suspect NCSG could use the extra time.

Greg Shatan:Please sir, may I have some more (time)?

Greg Shatan:Thank you, sire!

Tom Dale (ACIG GAC Secretariat):Having great expectations.

Greg Shatan:(IPC = poor downtrodden urchins)

Robin Gross:Better than "Les Miserables"

Avri Doria:and waht was the answer Oliver got when he asked for more?

Jeff Neuman:You know I am a sucker for musical references

Jeff Neuman:Avri - the response was utter amazement that he asked for more

Richard Padilla:I will like to volunteer as an observer on track 4

Tom Dale (ACIG GAC Secretariat):Of course Oliver was a literary character before he sang. Just like Alexander Hamilton was a Treasury Secretary before he was a musical.

Carlos:would be nice to have the full doc as a pdf (and I´m not Dr. Liese by any way)

Steve Chan:@Jeff, I tried to make that point as well :)

Carlos::)

Steve Coates:+1

Carlos:txs

Steve Chan:@ Carlos, Steve Coates, sure thing

Greg Shatan:What the Dickens, Jeff?

Carlos:in the mailing list please Steve Ch.

Steve Chan:@ Carlos, I will add to the Wiki and share with the mailing list as well

Carlos:@Steve Danke!

Rubens Kuhl:I would just add that back-end accreditation allows for not only have a pre-defined set of approved back-ends, but also the possibility of choosing a back-end only at contract signing time, provide applicant agrees to only use accredited providers.

Rubens Kuhl:So the reference to sets is defining an outcome yet to be chosen by the WG.

Donna Austin, Neustar:so perhaps we should do that analysis

Greg Shatan:"Please, sir, I want some more." The master was a fat, healthy man; but he turned very pale. He gazed in stupefied astonishment on the small rebel for some seconds, and then clung for support to the copper. The assistants were paralysed with wonder; the boys with fear. "What!" said the master at length, in a faint voice. "Please, sir," replied Oliver, "I want some more." The master aimed a blow at Oliver's head with the ladle; pinioned him in his arms; and shrieked aloud for the

beadle.

Donna Austin, Neustar:I feel it's implementation associated with some of the challenges associated with technical questions.

Rubens Kuhl:The policy issue is whether one is required to show the technical capacity beforehand, at application time, or after.

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Rubens, but there may be other possibilities to solve the problem. I don't see accreditation as the only answer.

Rubens Kuhl:Donna, it doesn't need to be. Accreditation is just an option, but the same process can be used to have a greenfield operator start from zero.

Heather Forrest:Picking up on @Rubens' point, would it encourage applicants (particularly in underserved areas/communities/interests) to apply if satisfying tech requirements was a separate step that came after the application submission?

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Rubens, I think that's a good point, we're largely talking about greenfield operators. those that have passed necessary test and are in compliance with registry agreements probably don't need accreditation.

Rubens Kuhl:If accreditation doesn't work, then registrars are already an issue for ICANN...

Carlos:agree with heather

Paul McGrady:+1 Heather. Agree that this is important for geo diversity.

Carlos:sorry, Dr. H. Forrest

Karen Day (SAS):As an applicant involved in a contention, it would have been preferable to pick a back end after the contention was resolved

Paul McGrady:HRH Dr. H. Forrest...

Martin Sutton:could simplify, reduce costs and create predictability

Carlos:In which WGroup would this issues be dealt with?

Carlos:@Paul :)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Makes sense to me Heather

Christa Taylor:Good idea and it makes a lot of sense

Heather Forrest:I thought I killed it

Susan Payne:I like that idea - would be a strong argument for an accreditation

Vanda Scartezini:to me too. in del=veloping areas mostly are under back end aalready known services..

Carlos:<Question> which WS or WG would deal with this issue?

Donna Austin, Neustar:Wouldn't ICANN need assurances that the applicant has technical capability before they approve and application?

Heather Forrest:Seems like it would encourage some of the types of applicants that we struggled to get in 2012

Karen Day (SAS):I think I just lost audio...

Karen Day (SAS):will dial back in

Steve Chan:@Carlos, it's currently in Track 1

Robin Gross:I hear

Christa Taylor:works here

Vanda Scartezini:no problems here

Carlos:@Steve leave it there

Rubens Kuhl:Looks fine in both. Which is why I'm glad tracks 1 and 4 wont' have conflicting schedules...

Karen Day (SAS):im back

Donna Austin, Neustar:I would hope that there is no PDT if there is an accreditation process.

Greg Shatan:Now the Sprint Guy.

Rubens Kuhl:ICANN does a lot of work before signing the agreement, like background checking... adding the back-end at this point would be a very small addition to the sign-up process.

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Karen, in that context it makes sense.

Karen Day (SAS):@Greg - true

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Jeff, if this is in work track 1, wouldn't the discussion happen in that work team?

Paul McGrady:@Jeff, funny that we think it is the flip now!

Steve Chan:@Jeff, I was just taking a note to dig around in ICANN

Justine Chew:Donna +1

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Jeff, agree on the reasons for trying to do it this way, just trying to find a way to make it efficient.

Rubens Kuhl:Accreditation is an implementation that can affect already established registries.

Phil Marano (Mayer Brown):Regarding backend accreditation, it looks like certain technical Application Questions shared a nexus between the envisaged Registry Services and "business components of each proposed service." In particular, Question 23 asked applicants to "describe whether any of [the customary services] are intended to be offered in a manner unique to the TLD" and advised that "additional proposed registry services

that are unique to the registry must also be described.” It may be worthwhile to explore how that nexus could / should be addressed through a backend accreditation program. Perhaps accreditation would apply only to customary services, e.g. dissemination of zone files, registration data, IDNs and DNSSEC, and not any unique or unforeseen services... Just flagging the issue for consideration.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):you men provide the Board with a package that includes "some implementation guidelines" Jeff??

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):and Sorry my AC keeps dropping

Vanda Scartezini:unhappily LACRALO is starting and I need to close this session and enter into LACRALO. apologize to all

Greg Shatan:@CLO, it's not just men....

Rubens Kuhl:@Phil Marano: most of the services you described could be added via an RSEP process, so the what's not common ground can be added after contract signing thru RSEP without having it specified at application time.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):OK Jeff that is clear, because I too am concerned about seeming to be putting 'cart before horse' here and overstepping our Charter

Heather Forrest:@Phil - good points! This highlights Jeff's comment much earlier that we would have to have something in place of PDT to essentially sign off on the package of standard and non-standard services

Rubens Kuhl:@Phil Marano: application time is needed when it might be decided who gets a string, or when the applicant wants assurance some usage model would be approved.

Phil Buckingham:@ Phil - yes agreed it is a question of which questions can be standardised

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Yes Alan +++

Avri Doria:We had thought about them and discussed them with staff. We just never wrote down what we believed had been agreed to on implementation.

Christa Taylor:Agreed on implementation vs recommendation

Justine Chew:Agree with Alan's point.

Carlos:Sorry Folks, have to move to a LACRALO call.

Alan Greenberg:@avri, yes, we talked about some of them, and others were just omitted.

Alan Greenberg:I have to leave now as well. Thanks for interesting call.

Heather Forrest:Thanks Jeff, great call with very interesting discussion
Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Bye for now then... talk again soon
Paul McGrady:Thanks Jeff! Thanks Avri!
Christa Taylor:Enjoy your vacation!!
Sara Bockey 2:thanks all
Rubens Kuhl:Bye all!
Phil Marano (Mayer Brown):Thanks all!
Alexander Schubert:bye
Tom Dale (ACIG GAC Secretariat):Thank you
Christa Taylor:bye
Guillemaut Frederic SafeBrands:bye
Phil Buckingham:LOL
Cecilia Smith:Thanks!
Greg Shatan:Bye all!
Richard Padilla:Bye all have a good vacation for those going on such later
Freida Tallon (.Sky):Bye Bye All
Susan Payne:thanks all
Phil Buckingham:thanks .