

## **Adobe Connect chat transcript for 19 January 2017**

Terri Agnew: Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 4 – IDNs/Technical & Operations on Thursday, 19 January 2017 at 15:00 UTC.

Terri Agnew: agenda wiki page: [https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_\\_community.icann.org\\_x\\_wLPDAw&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=iGt6RqY5\\_BnkQ3kyCICg3Sly3p6PtF9rUbfNHZt1bNc&s=j-r-o0X14-F4zrnABqfuZ0\\_QVZ189dQGaoxQISXjrqU&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_x_wLPDAw&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=iGt6RqY5_BnkQ3kyCICg3Sly3p6PtF9rUbfNHZt1bNc&s=j-r-o0X14-F4zrnABqfuZ0_QVZ189dQGaoxQISXjrqU&e=)

Dietmar Lenden - Valideus Ltd: Thanks Terri

Terri Agnew: @Jeff audio quality is good at this time

Terri Agnew: 30 January New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group 15:00 UTC

Terri Agnew: All hands have been cleared

Jeff Neuman: Not sure how to phrase this, but I would love to hear about experiences from those that have launched IDN TLDs

Jeff Neuman: What challenges they have had

Jeff Neuman: what can be done for improvement

Alan Greenberg: I am not seeing anything in the centre pod.

Alan Greenberg: oops - now back!

Martin Sutton: need to amend the financial question to quote financial

Martin Sutton: its done

Martin Sutton: thx

Jeff Neuman: For technical evaluation: Should the number of TLDs applied for, plus ones they currently run, be taken into consideration in the evaluation. If so, how

Trang Nguyen: @Jeff, you are correct. Applications were evaluated on a standalone basis in the 2012 round.

Jeff Neuman: Question for ICANN/Evaluators: Did the evaluators/panelists submit performance improvement reports or other comments on what improvements could be made for subsequent procedures?

Jeff Neuman: Was there any post morden process?

Jeff Neuman: If so, can we see those?

Trang Nguyen: We had debriefs with the evaluation panels and they provided comments and suggestions, which we took into account when drafting the PIRR.

Jeff Neuman: PIRR?

Trang Nguyen: Program Implementation Review Report

Jeff Neuman: Is it possible to see the original comments?

Trang Nguyen: They were provided to ICANN as confidential documents, not for external consumption.

Jeff Neuman: Why confidential?

Trang Nguyen: We could check with them to see if they would have any issues with releasing them.

Jeff Neuman: I can understand redacted portions related to individual applications.....but it would be great to see their comments. It may help us to revise questions that were asked of applicants

Trang Nguyen: Their comments/suggestions were largely consistent with ICANN's observations as reflected in the PIRR, but we could take an action to ask them whether we can share their reports.

avri doria: Trang, that would be good to check if you could. Thanks

Phil Buckingham: which bullets points do you wish to discuss .

Phil Buckingham: Q should there be a separate financial template for each "type" of business model .

Jeff Neuman: @Trang. That makes total sense.....We should document that formally and put it into the guidebook

Martin Sutton: That would be helpful to have more detail Trang - can that be shared?

Martin Sutton:Should there also be some differentiation between self-funded registries where they are the only registrant, i.e. impact on registrants is not relevant?

Phil Buckingham:@Trang , does ICANN have the points scored for each question by application by type of business model ( ie closed / open / IDNs ) . Then possibly we can start to identify the problem questions

Martin Sutton:@Trang - good point, but that could be built in to a transition process where checks have to be completed before they switch over

Phil Buckingham:@trang- when an applicant reaches a set number of DUMs ? I thought it was 50K that would trigger a change from closed model to an open one ?

Jeff Neuman:@Trang - good questions

Jeff Neuman:@Avri - correct. That is being implemented by some TLDs now

Jeff Neuman:@Avri - Changes are right now through RSEP process and that is currently beyond the scope of this PDP

Phil Buckingham:Exactly Avri - does a change of application status mean new financial evaluation / due diligence

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):I am not aware of any of our WT s looking at that either Avri so yes we need to catch them

Jeff Neuman:Other than accounting for changes in the contracting process, I am not sure we should be delving into how future changes are done. We can recommend a separate PDP for that, but if we go down that path now, we will never finish.

Steve Chan:I think it has been discussed in the context of other topics (e.g., different TLD types), but there is not a dedicated topic related to the subject.

Jeff Neuman:Plus, that has applicability to existing registries as well as for those for future ones

Phil Buckingham:+1 Steve

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):re change of mode

Phil Buckingham:Agree Jeff- cant backtrack .

Martin Sutton:Agree with Jeff - recommendation for separate PDP to progress this, as it is a post-application change

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):mode=model yes Jeff agree

Terri Agnew:next call: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 4 – IDNs/Technical & Operations will take place on Thursday, 09 February 2017 at 20:00 UTC.

Trang Nguyen:Sorry, i will try to provide answers to questions asked in the chat via the mail list.

Dietmar Lenden - Valideus Ltd:thanks Ruben and the rest

avri doria:thanks

Trang Nguyen:Thanks, all!