

Adobe Connect chat transcript for 18 October 2016

Terri Agnew:Dear all, Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 1 - Overall Process/Support/Outreach Issue call on Tuesday, 18 October 2016 at 15:00 UTC.

Terri Agnew:agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_x_ShW4Aw&d=DQIFaQ&c=FmY1u3Pj6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpCigmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIn-H4xR2EBk&m=K4cZcaMghTFZ1-cRdMwOalWDtIeqG1QGzIqvqN-nKpA&s=m6QGzG6B6MK1OAnvLeH_91qL-hxcY4ISGroA1d1Je0U&e=

Jeff Neuman:Hello all....i am in a noisy place so will mostly participate via chat:)

Terri Agnew:thanks for this information Jeff

Carlton Samuels:Hi everybody

Christa Taylor:go ahead one min

Steve Chan:@Christa, if you can dial-in, it's more reliable than the AC room

Vanda 2:i am listen only - noise room

Donna Austin, RySG:I'm sorry I didn't get the input to the list earlier than I did.

Emily Barabas:wip

Emily Barabas:sorry for the delay

Emily Barabas:everyone can now scroll themselves as needed

Donna Austin, RySG:I think so Sara

Vanda 2:from this region a list of accredited service providers was the general answer I got in all interviews i have done in LAC region

Jeff Neuman:thanks to Donna for providing her power point slides....i think it is a good basis for a proposal going forward.

Donna Austin, RySG:What's the community input model?

Steve Chan:@Donna, that's what the GDD is seeking input on - how to define it

Donna Austin, RySG:thanks Steve

Carlton Samuels:Quick question. For problem resolution, is this WS looking at making a recommendation for a Certification Scheme or an Accreditation Scheme?

Jeff Neuman:Carlton - to level set, what is your definition of each

Jeff Neuman:definition

Carlton Samuels:Certification = testing against a set of outcomes from a defined criteria

Carlton Samuels:Accreditation = Ceding authority to an outside group to validate competence against a defined set of requirements

Carlton Samuels:@Avri: +1

Justine Chew:s not a good guidance parameter on issue of demand because in this case demand isl agree with Avri

Vanda 2:we have jsut finished an study from LAC region and the feedback can be useful. I have interviewd many potential new gTLDs in several countries in LAC region and will add some coments on the lsit

Carlton Samuels:Unfortunately can't talk. In a room with pothers

Vanda 2:i can't talk either

Vanda 2:could be a good idea

Carlton Samuels:@Avri: Again, +1 for reading the AS WG report.

Carlton Samuels:A survey of new gTLD prospects being prepared for the CCT RT that might be useful as input to this aspect of the discussion

avri doria:Carlton weren't you the co-chair with Rafik of the JAS-

Carlton Samuels:@Avri: Yes ma'am!

avri doria:so sometime when you can speak, would be helpful for you to add a bunch.

Carlton Samuels:@Christa: Will be happy to do that.

Justine Chew 2:Sorry, my earlier comment got garbled. I meant to say I agree with Avri on the issue of demand because in this case demand is not a good guidance parameter.

avri doria:a bit more on the Applicant Support program, the GAC had several recommendation on applicant support at the time, with specific recommendations that we need to include in the next pass at this discussion.

Carlton Samuels:@Application Process: The timeline for changes in application content was an issue. Several applicants say that the process of making admissible changes, especially the time line, needed clarity

Carlton Samuels:@AVri: +1. Those were also acknowledged in the JAS Report

Vanda 2:@ avri - on organization that had tried to apply first round called ICANN several times for support during the application period and never got feedback..

Jeff Neuman:A couple of questions: Is this the right format for applications for new TLDs? Should there be additional topics to be included in the AG? Was there too much information in the AG (background)? Was there not enough information on certain topics?

Carlton Samuels:@Registry Service Reviews: This is where the idea of a set of accredited RSPs would be useful; that process would be a black box to the application process with just a on-ramp to the Application process. Declare you will use an accredited RSP and thats it.

Vanda 2:@ Carlton agree this shall be simplified

Steve Chan:@Carlton, unless the WG were to mandate the usage of a certified RSP, you would still need to have those technical reviews available in the event the applicant wants to supply their own registry services

Carlton Samuels:@Donna: +1 One authoritative document is desirable! Sub-processes should be described elsewhere in companion productions

Mary Wong:Whatever vehicle is used ultimately, it will need to be accessible and available to all interested potential applicants.

Jeff Neuman:What was discussed was potentially have an AG for RSPs, one for Escrow Providers, a separate document that discusses the RPMs, etc.

Jeff Neuman:This is an area we need to coordinate with the other work tracks

Jeff Neuman:I think this topic was more for overall format.....the rest will have to wait until the very end

Jim Prendergast:its not specific to these particular sections but the translations into other languages need to be available much sooner.

Vanda 2:TIME was the main issue related to first round in this region, information came too late on the timeline

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):true Vanda

Michael Flemming (GMO):exciting

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):happy to end now at 0250 local time for me ;-)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Thx all bye for now then

Jeff Neuman:thanks!

Carlton Samuels:Jeez CLO, what a trooper!

Justine Chew 2:Nope, thanks.

Carlton Samuels:Thanks all