Adobe Connect chat transcript for 31 January 2017

  Terri Agnew:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 1 - Overall Process/Support/Outreach Issue call on Tuesday, 31 January 2017 at 20:00 UTC.
  Terri Agnew:wiki agenda page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_x_SbPDAw&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpCIgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIgn-H4xR2EBk&m=c_pDZyAeBhAPJgAZAcBoWpAtMU0PNiGObWx1b7l87H8&s=j94kSGThskTNFTXyuO5LUAHU3fHhQRd36JDgoUykQBs&e=
  Emily Barabas:at the moment everyone can scroll for themselves
  Emily Barabas:but we can control the slides if you prefer
  Jeff Neuman:@Steve - We will come up with something to call it other than "lottery"
  Jeff Neuman:We can call it "Randomization Process" for now
  Steve Chan:Thanks. I have an open request to ICANN legal for input on the viability of the prioritization draw, or similar, in the future.
  Donna Austin, Neustar:Hi All, sorry for the delay in joining.
  Kurt Pritz:ICANN called it a "raffle" for important reasons. I thin we should adopt that wording if we are indicating that we want to recommend the same process
  Sara Bockey:Thank you, Kurt. We will note that.
  Jeff Neuman:it is a good question to ask the community, but it would be helpful for this group to discuss as well
  Julie Hedlund:@Jeff has his hand up.
  Donna Austin, Neustar:Agree with Jeff, that there is a distinction in communication between the first v subsequent window application/
  Jim Prendergast:yes - agreed
  Jon Nevett:No weight?
  Jim Prendergast:When does cost recovery from previous round stop and cost recovery for this next procedure/round start?
  Phil Buckingham:+1 Donna ,   so we have two application fee elements ? a fixed price + variable cost plus   ?
  Jeff Neuman:Correct, I dont think what groups paid in the first round should have any weight
  Jeff Neuman:It didnt have any weight in the 2005 round or the 2012 round
  Jon Nevett:cause it went up
  Donna Austin, Neustar:I think the same applies with regard to what financial information is required, ie. if there is no requirement for a COI.
  Jeff Neuman:Technically the first TLDs paid nothing.......but the 2000 round did not argue for parity
  Jim Prendergast:I think we need to ask ICANN why they insisted on evaluating RSP over and over and see if those reasons still stand. We can make all the arguments we want but if ICANN legal says that we did it for liablity prevention reasons, I don tthink our outcome whill change that
  Jeff Neuman:@Jim - if you read the implementation plan, they did not indicate that they did that for any liability reasons
  Jon Nevett:Agree with Donna that the $185K should have some weight
  Jeff Neuman:In fact, I believe their input was the opposite.....
  Jeff Neuman:sorry I meant the ICANN Implementation review
  Kurt Pritz:One way to think about it: if the cost is $20K, do we agree with cost recovery; if the cost is $50K do we agree with cost recovery; if the cost is $100K do we agree with cost recovery?
  Jon Nevett:needs more explanation

Jeff Neuman:you may need to repeat

Donna Austin, Neustar:What invoicing are we reffering to?

Jim Prendergast:application fee invoicing

Jon Nevett:invoicing the $185K?

Jeff Neuman:I think all we are saying is that we agree that there should be an invoicing process when applying for TLDs

Donna Austin, Neustar:Wasn't there an initial $5k fee to sign up and then the remainder was due on completion?

Jeff Neuman:As opposed to having to get in the money a few weeks before or whatever the process was

Jeff Neuman:Many big companies have rules that they can only pay after receiving a valid invoice

Steve Chan:Or make it available on request? I recall, maybe incorrectly, someone saying that having an invoice is actually problematic?

Yasmin Omer - Amazon Registry Services:Applicants that needed a statement/invoice (generally larger companies and governments) had to request such from ICANN for the 185k and ICANN eventually provided something

Jim Prendergast:Xavier has a few years to figure that out

Jon Nevett:ahh -- ok -- seems like an implementation issue not a policy one

Yasmin Omer - Amazon Registry Services:perhaps refer to what ICANN provided last time and make it available upon request

Donna Austin, Neustar:Agree Jon

Trang Nguyen:@Jon, agree. We can figure that out in implementation.

Yasmin Omer - Amazon Registry Services:correct Jon, this is very much an implementation issue

Emily Barabas:staff is prepared to do a topic summary if you would like

Emily Barabas:yes

Phil Buckingham:Exactly Jim .

Jeff Neuman:all of these topics were referred to us by the GNSO whether considered policy or implementation. IF we want to provide guidance, we should.....if not, that is fine too

Jeff Neuman:The systems issue is not really policy either, but more implementation...but it is part of the subsequent procedures

Jon Nevett:if get into that level of detail on every issue, 2020 will be optimistic

Jeff Neuman:I am not sure we are getting too deep. We are just recommending that an invoicing process be made available.

Jon Nevett:Systems should be safe and secure -- avoiding glitches and data breaches that we have had in the past

Jeff Neuman:For systems, we may recommend better usability........ability to copy applications....ability to do non-ASCII

Jon Nevett:ok and better user experience

Emily Barabas:https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.icann.org_en_system_files_files_program-2Dreview-2D29jan16-2Den.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpCIgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIgn-H4xR2EBk&m=c_pDZyAeBhAPJgAZAcBoWpAtMU0PNiGObWx1b7l87H8&s=BOI2FGTt9aGdRTuJJNsOhLCxZCcRW_s7eeBpgHVbciA&e=

Jeff Neuman:Perhaps for the next call, we can summarize the ICANN staff recommendations...and if they make sense, just sign off on them

Donna Austin, Neustar 2:The recommendations on this should be high level and not in the weeds.

Emily Barabas:@jeff, staff can do this

Phil Buckingham:we require changes to the CZDS . For starters - not to have toreapply every 90 days to every single Registry !

Jeff Neuman:@Phil...I am not sure that CZDS falls within our mandate

Jeff Neuman:The requirement to provide a zone file as a requirement would be, but not sure that that system is for us

Emily Barabas:https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__newgtlds.icann.org_en_about_historical-2D&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpCIgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIgn-H4xR2EBk&m=c_pDZyAeBhAPJgAZAcBoWpAtMU0PNiGObWx1b7l87H8&s=kg_hwuKqbmoU3yiS69d62rxctgGzbDEnsWtEVayZlqQ&e= documentation/matrix-plans

Emily Barabas:The program implementation review document discusses Communications on pg 189

Emily Barabas:https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.icann.org_en_system_files_files_program-2Dreview-2D29jan16-2Den.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpCIgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIgn-H4xR2EBk&m=c_pDZyAeBhAPJgAZAcBoWpAtMU0PNiGObWx1b7l87H8&s=BOI2FGTt9aGdRTuJJNsOhLCxZCcRW_s7eeBpgHVbciA&e=

Jeff Neuman:Agree with Donna on communications after applications were submitted. But someone needs to go through the application knowledge database and clean that up.

Emily Barabas:staff can provide a summary of these recommendations as well on the next call

Christa Taylor:Perhaps we can pull some metrics out of there

Jeff Neuman:Because communications during the application phase was not the greatest

Phil Buckingham:@ jeff , I agree CZDS is outside our mandate , but Registry reporting of their zone file data is ?

Terri Agnew:New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 1 - Overall Process/Support/Outreach Issue will take place on Tuesday, 14 February 2017 at 3:00 UTC.

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

Donna Austin, Neustar 2:Thanks Sara and Christa

Trang Nguyen:Thank you! Bye!