

Adobe Connect chat transcript for 10 January 2017

Terri Agnew:Welcome to the the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 1 - Overall Process/Support/Outreach Issue on Tuesday, 10 January 2017 at 15:00 UTC

Terri Agnew:agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_XbHDAw&d=DglFaQ&c=FmY1u3Pjp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=7aFaMQdirLYmizSehlcCwCIGGn0mYDtWndD1oWKOQ5M&s=ueqaz5DVKE_H0QoBCUgFrL4-pceYfxvU9-z3mMvEqkg&e=

Alan Greenberg:Number ending in 9001 is me.

Terri Agnew:@Alan, I have renamed the line

Rubens Kuhl:As long as we are doing rounds, it is not relevant.

Rubens Kuhl:Changes are required at least to reflect what has already been done.

Alexander Schubert:1stcome1stserve would only benefit the portfolio guys with their unlimited resources!

Alexander Schubert:In a gTLD round!

Jeff Neuman:So, is everyone comfortable with the randomization/lottery that ICANN held

Steve Chan:The current guidance should be viewed in contrast with the prioritization.

Jeff Neuman:(assuming ICANN can maintain the license to run lotteries)?

Michael Flemming:once again are we talking about rounds?

Rubens Kuhl:Not comfortable with Bingo, Jeff...

Michael Flemming:Firstly in rounds, then yes as long as we have objections of course :)

Jeff Neuman:If we do rounds, I would not be comfortable with first come first served. I think the lottery was the only fair way to go

Jeff Neuman:I think a question needs to go to staff (legal) to see whether they can maintain their license to run the lottery

Alexander Schubert:+1 Jeff - two scenarios: Round and ongoing application period

Michael Flemming:secondly, if a long term period, then first come first serve as long as we have objections of course :)

Rubens Kuhl:ZZzzzzZZzz... ;-)

Ashley Roberts:Agree some kind of randomised assignment of priority numbers is preferable to FCFS

Laura Watkins (Nominet):+1 Ashley

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):thx Jeff

Alexander Schubert:How about prioritizing GGeo's - as they are usually clear cut cases with no contention (as they usually require the OK of the Government)

Rubens Kuhl:FCFS is an invitation to dropcatch-like practices where people will bomb the application system to hell so their TLDs go first in application processing.

Michael Flemming:I'm with Jeff

Trang Nguyen:In the current round, the priority numbers were used to release IE results.

Alexander Schubert:Another idea: Have 10% of slots being prioritized by the Internet Community! So the 10% strings the Internet Users in the world value as potentially most impacting would be awarded the top 10% slots? Negative: Potential gaming.

Rubens Kuhl:We can let every applicant point one other string as their main competitor, and the process would honor those requests so the results would be released in the same time.

Steve Chan:The priority numbers were also used for contracting, PDT, and transition to delegation, if I'm not mistaken.

Jeff Neuman:So again, we need to ask ICANN legal whether they could maintain the license to run the "lotteries" and what they need to do to maintain that license.

Rubens Kuhl:But if not in the policy, it should be written that processing would always favor and only be based on process efficiencies. Queueing would be only applied, if applied, to release of results.

Alexander Schubert:+1 Rubens: We should NOT honor drop-catchers!

Trang Nguyen:Perhaps one question that the group could consider is what was the intent behind the GNSO policy recommendation of first come first served, and given objections/string contention, whether the intent could be achieved.

Jeff Neuman:@Steve - that was the theory, but not sure how much that was honored given all of the interruptions in the application processing

Trang Nguyen:There is a negative aspect to using priority numbers... the ability to normalize priori to releasing IE results.

Alexander Schubert:Lottery and some system whereby e.g. GEO applications (with no contention) get priority as they serve communities?

Michael Flemming:I'd prefer the lottery

Jeff Neuman:I think for now, we need to just consider the main method for queing before determining whether certain types of applications should get priority in the lottery

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):yes Alan agree

Justine Chew:Agree with Alan

Rubens Kuhl:We will make Digital Archery Great Again.

Alexander Schubert:+1 Alan

Laura Watkins (Nominet):Agree Alexander. It makes sense that applications less likely to have contention gets priority

Justine Chew:If FCFS caused issues, then keeping the lottery system makes sense

Alan Greenberg:I think we should appoint Rubens President!

Laura Watkins (Nominet):Eeek! I can't figure out how to vote!

Michael Flemming:consensus reached?

Rubens Kuhl:Laura, it's the same button to raise hand.

Jeff Neuman:9 approvals

Alexander Schubert:9 approvals?

Laura Watkins (Nominet):Aaah got it - thanks Rubens. done it now

Alexander Schubert:Alan disappeared again :-)

Jeff Neuman:10 now

Terri Agnew:@Laura, top tool bar, select icon that has person with raised hand.

Rubens Kuhl:Steve has his hand up.

Rubens Kuhl:And Jeff too.

Rubens Kuhl:Just an implementation note: bundle the lottery ticket with the application fee so there is need for a separate payment.

Christa Taylor:Just like we did with IDNs in the last round

Christa Taylor:agreed

Alexander Schubert:+1 Jeff

Christa Taylor:draw

Rubens Kuhl:Bingo

Justine Chew:Random picking

Christopher Niemi:'priority draw'

Jeff Neuman:"Game of chance"

Michael Flemming:draw straws

Trang Nguyen:@Rubens, I believe a nominal fee must be collected for the priority draw for legal reasons.

Alexander Schubert:Well, the application system could assign a random number when you apply - the number is stored (and nobody can see it) - and it is later used to avoid a lottery!

Trang Nguyen:We can look into whether that can be collected with the application fee, or has to be separate.

Jeff Neuman:Thanks Trang

Rubens Kuhl:@Trang, yes, but it can be bundled. US\$85,000 - application fee ; US\$85 - draw ticket. Deposit of US\$ 85085 to clear both.

Phil Buckingham:@ Trang - that's my understanding .

Phil Buckingham:I thought I was \$100 per lottery ticket

Jeff Neuman:I think this is a good question for CC2

Sara Bockey:I agree Jeff

Rubens Kuhl:Shorter is better. Longer periods invite events of chance.

Justine Chew:Assuming there is enough support to assist applicants in preparing and submitting their applications?

Trang Nguyen:@Phil, yes, each draw ticket was \$100 USD

Michael Flemming:Forgot about the Applicant Guidebook for a minute.

Jeff Neuman:So again my proposal would be a three month submission period for the first application window, but to have a shorter 60 day application window for subsequent application windows

Rubens Kuhl:Preparing can be done before application window. If the community needs time, postpone the beginning of the application period.

Michael Flemming:Sorry my question has relevance now.

Justine Chew:Yes, hence my question before!

Rubens Kuhl:Until we know how Applicant Support would play out, it's premature to determine something to support it.

Steve Chan:Policy recommendations could potentially be less specific than an actual number of months.

Laura Watkins (Nominet):If applications are to be batched anyway should the submission period(s) relate to number of applications received rather than running for a set time?

Justine Chew:I abstain. Not comfortable with questions surrounding the AGB.

Jeff Neuman:@Alan - Agree we need to sync with other recommendations

Justine Chew:+1 Alan

Alexander Schubert:The fees should NOT be lowered in the next round. We are inviting speculators otherwise. A good .com is much more expensive than the gTLD application fee.

Rubens Kuhl:If we are arbitrating fees, then it's not cost-recovery.

Phil Buckingham:+ 1 Alan . should Applicant support applications to go through a separate process channel

Alexander Schubert:Actually 500k USD would be more appropriate.

Michael Flemming:I disagree. I think costs need to be lowered to a more realistic cost. More substance would help to determine a realistic fee.

Jeff Neuman:existing policy is cost recovery at this point.

Phil Buckingham:Should be free . Fund it from auction funds and Round 1 "profit excess ",.

Michael Flemming:I think you need to set a cost analysis per TLD category.

Rubens Kuhl:Arbitrating fees to market value could put ICANN non-profit status in jeopardy.

Trang Nguyen:One thing to note is that we have much more information based on this round than we did when we estimated the cost of the program (from a cost recovery perspective). The learnings from this round can be used to better estimate the actual cost for next round.

Alexander Schubert:ICANN could do it at a cost of \$US 15k probably - we would have 25,000 applications then.....

Michael Flemming:Some TLD types require much less check and the process can. e much more streamlined to be cost effective.

Justine Chew:Having a surplus is a good problem to have. For starters can use some of this to fund application support, no?

Phil Buckingham:Dont need a legal contingency fund (1/3) anymore for a Round 2 ??

Alexander Schubert:If it is "free" we have ".xyz"-times :-)

Rubens Kuhl:Phil, .africa and .merck are showing that legal contingencies could be needed... and we don't yet if .amazon will turn into another legal battle.

Jeff Neuman:I agree with Trang. I also believe that having such a large contingency fund (legal fund) for future rounds would be unnecessary

Rubens Kuhl:Size of the fund can be argued, though.

Alan Greenberg:I think we should say we will determine the cost only after we know how many applications there are. That way we can predict costs more accurately. And limit applications to only those with near infinite money.

Alan Greenberg:(That was a joke)

Michael Flemming:haha

Rubens Kuhl:Alan, although a joke, it's an alert that some organizations are not that price-sensitive as others.

Michael Flemming:I'm surprised no one came up with a Trump joke

Phil Buckingham:Rubens - I m just lobbing out the Q - I agree with you actually . ICANN will need all of it going forward

Alan Greenberg:@Rubens. Indeed. When you look at profit made by some in the self-auctions, the cost from ICANN was never meant to indicate the VALUE of the TLD.

Michael Flemming:I thought this meeting runs for another half hour

Julie Hedlund:@Michael: That was an error. The meeting is for 60 minutes.

Michael Flemming:Thank you.

Michael Flemming:I would like to revisit

Rubens Kuhl:I have to drop at the hour anyways...

Laura Watkins (Nominet):Agree fixed fee - except in the situation of applicant support - those fees could effectively be discounted in some way maybe

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):indeed Alan good points

Trang Nguyen:There was no difference in application processing costs for applications this round.

Trang Nguyen:Except for CPE.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):thx everyone... bye for now... good progress

Justine Chew:Thanks, Christa, Sara for leading the discussions on calls and looking forward to the email list discussions.

avri doria:bye

Alexander Schubert:Bye!

Ashley Roberts:thanks

Michael Flemming:great meeting

Katrin Ohlmer, DOTZON:thanks and bye , everyone.

Phil Buckingham:Great job , Christa and Sara