

Michelle DeSmyter: Dear All, Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on Monday, 03 October 2016 at 20:00 UTC.

Michelle DeSmyter: Agenda page: https://community.icann.org/x/_we4Aw

Michelle DeSmyter: Member page: <https://community.icann.org/x/Ogp1Aw>

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: please mute the mics

Jeff Neuman: we will kick off in a few minutes

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: CLO: the new Room has not recognized you VIP status yet.....

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: :)

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: yes

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: echo is clear and loud

Jeff Neuman: I am waiting for an operator at the moment

Michelle DeSmyter: thanks Jeff - I just gave them the heads up also

Karen Day: terrible echo on staff

Phil Buckingham: +++++1 Kavouss and all other CCWG participants

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): we are wildly in agreement :-)

Steve Coates: I have an updated SOI -
<https://community.icann.org/display/gnsosoi/Stephen+Jadie+Coates+SOI>

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): yes doing work tht wuld be good

kavouss arasteh: Secretariat,

kavouss arasteh: Pls correct I did refer to CWG AND NOT CCWG

avri: Yes CCWG goes on and one

Sara Bockey: CCT

avri: ... and on

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): So true Avri :-)

Mary Wong: 13 October

Mary Wong: (next Council meeting)

Mary Wong: @Jeff, that is correct.

Philip Corwin: That is correct, Jeff. Council established a small subgroup of which I am one member.

Steve Chan: @ Carlos, full disclosure: Emily prepared it.

Philip Corwin: As is Carlos

Steve Chan: <https://community.icann.org/x/owu4Aw>

Donna Austin: I think its just a compilation

Mary Wong: Synthesize, is the word used during the Council meeting.

Steve Chan: You can find all responses that the GNSO Council received, plus the draft staff/compilation summary.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: exactly

Rubens Kuhl: Draft is the operative word here...

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: I recommend looking at staffs compilation

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: o comments

Philip Corwin: We shall try to synthesize some widely divergent views, but it shall be a challenge.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: including the ones by this PDPs leadership

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: @Phil just emphasize divergence

Emily Barabas: Avri -- we finished 2a in the previous call, so we still need to cover 2b today

Jeff Neuman: Together makes sense

Donna Austin: I think that's critical to understand. What's the consequence of defining categories.

Jeff Neuman: There was an IGO category as well

Rubens Kuhl: Jeff, it applied to both governmental and intergovernmental organizations. As long as it's governmental, they would have a different contract.

Jeff Neuman: right....so in the last round we had generic, geographic, brand, community, governmental

Rubens Kuhl: What had an specific IGO angle were LROs (Legal Right Objections), where IGOs got automatic eligibility for filing a objection when though not having a trademark

Rubens Kuhl: And the governmental could be generic, geographic, brand or exclusive use... it's a matrix.

Rubens Kuhl: (even though not having a TM)

kavouss arasteh: Jeff+1

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): I'm losing time and again my connection

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): But just to recall the GAC input where the usefulness of categories was stressed

kavouss arasteh: Jorge1+1

Martin Sutton: With the process and agreement modeled around traditional open registry, selling domains, this causes barriers to new entrants. It also causes extreme issues in the post-application process for those that have ventured forth.

Rubens Kuhl: Categories and multiple agreements are indeed connected.

Jeff Neuman: Its also connected to application criteria

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): perhaps we should look at the different elements a category may mean: 1) a specific purpose; 2) a set of specific requirements for the applicant; 3) specific procedures to go through; 4) specific conditions in the registry agreement; etc.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): yes

Jeff Neuman: And connected to objections, etc.

Jeff Neuman: That is why it is an overarching issue :)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): indeed

Donna Austin: geographic had a specific definition in the guidebook

Jeff Neuman: @Donna - that definition came after it was decided to create that category

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): @staff: my audio is so bad that I cannot intervene, but please take up my points in the notes - thanks!

Jeff Neuman: which is sort of what we are doing now. Should we formally recognize other categories

Rubens Kuhl: One curious thing is that Geographic contracts have not carried the part of terms and conditions where ICANN was allowed to redelegate the contract due to opposition from the government that authorized it at application time.

Rubens Kuhl: So it's yet to be seen what happens in a Geo TLD redelegation.

Phil Buckingham: dont think we should categorise for profit and not for profit . this distinction should be dealt thro/ in the financial model / evaluation /application / capability tests and fee charged

Martin Sutton: The latest round experiences should be used to improve the process and encourage competition. Lessons learnt would indicate that ignoring some of the complex issues could continue to create more protracted problems post application.

Steve Chan: @Jorge, we will make sure your comment is raised

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): @Steve: thanks!

vanda: makes sense Avri.

Rubens Kuhl: Or even if those PICs actually address GAC advice or not...

Donna Austin: @Rubens, and what if they don't?

Rubens Kuhl: @Donna, we either decide that GAC Policy Advice is not to be accepted, and maintain status quo, or decide to accept that advice, and make the changes required to actually fulfil that advice.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): exactly Tom e need ot address

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): to address

Rubens Kuhl: PICs were forced down people's throats.

Phil Buckingham: @ Tom PICs currently in WT2

Tom Dale (ACIG GAC Secretariat): @Phil Indeed, thanks.

kavouss arasteh: We certainly need to maintain the notion of category but not having an extended list of categories

kavouss arasteh: In any terms, we have highly sensitive and sensitive strings which we need to maintain the notion of category

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): makes sense to me Avri

Rubens Kuhl: Category, type, group, class... pick a word on move on.

Donna Austin: Isn't that the PIC DDDRP?

Rubens Kuhl: There is the PIC DRP and there is the PDDRP.

Rubens Kuhl: PDDRP is oriented towards TM RPMs, PIC DRP is generic of PICs.

Jeff Neuman: @Avri - Should get Becky Burr's view of PICs in relation to the Bylaws as she definitely addressed them

Donna Austin: and the PIC DRP is being discussed by the RPM WG isn't it?

Susan Payne: hi donna, no, RPMs are dealing with PDDRP but not PICDRP

Donna Austin: thanks Susan

Steve Chan: @Donna, this WG will also cover RRDRP

Donna Austin: the validation is more a business model decision rather than a category, or is it?

Jeff Neuman: @Donna - perhaps

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry): Business model decision, in our view.

Jeff Neuman: BUT, we could discuss whether they should have preference over non-validated in contention

Tom Dale (ACIG GAC Secretariat): Just to add on PICs, it would be useful to check what the CCT Review Team has looked at in terms of consumer protection/safeguards.

Phil Buckingham: + 1 Donna + Kristina

Jeff Neuman: Sort of like community

Gg Levine (NABP): Any thoughts on what if an applicant fits into more than one category?

Donna Austin: 7 it's a smaller number

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): I would just refer to the types of names mentioned in the GAC input

Rubens Kuhl: @Donna, that depends if such classification gets any kind of priority, like community TLDs. If it doesn't translate into different agreement or different contention set resolution, that it's definitely not to be looked at.

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry): If we're going to start focusing on categories, can we please define each category so we're all using the same language and references?

Donna Austin: @ Rubens and its a highly regulated string

Philip Corwin: Confirming that RPM WG is only looking at PDDRP, not PICDRD

Donna Austin: @Kristina, defining the each category will be the challenge

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): and defining what the effect of being categorized...

Karen Day: Agree start to look at 10

Christa Taylor: 10 and moving downwards makes the most sense

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): May as well

Martin Sutton: Agree start with 10 then remove if necessary

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry): @ Donna: That's my point. But I don't see the value in using each category as a framework if we can't define them in a way that is clear, certain, and predictable

Rubens Kuhl: Highly regulated gets different agreement, like what happened in 2012 having different PICs than other TLDs... possibly.

Kevin Kreuser: agree w/ Kristina

Donna Austin: I agree with you Kristina.

Berry Cobb: The group may wish to consider assigning "meta-tags" to strings as opposed to calling them categories. As Kristina points out it may be difficult to properly define a category and even more difficult to assign a string to one category especially since it could be assigned to more than one. For example a generic string might also be a sensitive string or perhaps a closed TLD. This aligns with the frameworking of building a matrix.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): good point Berry

Karen Day: Wouldn't step 1 of the Matrix by necessity be the definition?

Rubens Kuhl: Berry, attributes would be a word for it, perhaps ?

Rubens Kuhl: Non-mutually exclusive comes to mind in such definitions.

Phil Buckingham: so the questions asked on application are by each TLDs "attributes" ?

kavouss arasteh: The use of or reference to category seems fundamental

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): some "categories" may indeed add up: a string could be a generic term, that describes a highly regulated industry and be presented as a community string...

Rubens Kuhl: A TLD can be governmental, geographic and community, like .barcelona. Or non-governmental, geographic and community like .osaka, or governmental and geographic but not community like .rio.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Like the "tags" idea. Makes the new gTLD searchable

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): right - there may be multiple combinations...

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: multiple tags

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): yes

vanda: yes clear

kavouss arasteh: Jorge, yes to what ? to multiple tag?

kavouss arasteh: yes, tks

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): As said in the GAC comments to 2 d) I feel some categories may benefit/merit a specific window, while others may go in parallel, although with different conditions attached etc. In any case, one issue to consider is that whatever method is employed applicants and interest-holders of different

categories need to be given the chance to be heard due to the uniqueness of the string in question, once delegated...

vanda: from mround y study from lac region with mostly brands interested in next round i do believe it will be positive a separate

Rubens Kuhl: Most strings can have multiple meanings like brand and generic. Apple is both a fruit and a computer company... any limited application on one type excludes the other types.

Martin Sutton: Given the unpredictable length of time before new applications may be opened, it could be an opportunity for ICANN to consider maintaining some momentum by looking at low-risk options, by opening up applications to those with less contention experienced in 2012 round, such as brands.

Martin Sutton: It would be important to have a well-defined category.

Donna Austin: sorry Avri, we seem to have some time delay

Donna Austin: @Martin, brands needs to be defined

Rubens Kuhl: To quote an example of the type of gaming that can occur, the dubious trademarks registered for the .eu sunrise is still a good example.

Susan Payne: Will the WTs also have sessions?

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry): Staff: Does this morning's announcement about the damaged equipment affect the ability of folks to participate remotely (not in hubs)?

Phil Buckingham: Isnt there a problem with RP ? Fire on ship

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry): thank you.

Rubens Kuhl: @Kristina: more of a guess, but it looks to affect more the Public Forum type of activity.

Mary Wong: From what we hear, it seems tht remote participation via Adobe Connect should not be affected.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): Thanks Everyone...bye for now

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry): Thanks!

Christa Taylor: Thank-you!

Robert Burlingame (Pillsbury): Thank you everyone.

Susan Payne: bye

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): talk soon

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): thanks to all and bye!

Alexander Schubert: bye

Phil Buckingham: Thanks Avri , Jeff