```
Michelle DeSmyter:Dear all, Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent
Procedures Sub Team - Track 2 - call on Thursday, 20 October
2016 at 20:00 UTC.
  Phil Buckingham: Hi Michelle , Steve , Im in !
 Phil Buckingham: thanks . Should be an "interesting " next hour
ļ
  Jeff Neuman:Hello all
  Jeff Neuman:vtLD (Validated top Level domains)
  Gg Levine (NABP):NABP is participating
  Gg Levine (NABP):Absolutely!
  Jeff Neuman:.bank yes
  Jeff Neuman:.pharmacy, .ngo / .ong
  Jeff Neuman:.law
  Gg Levine (NABP):TLD in which regigrants must meet registry
standards prior to use of the domain
  Alexander Schubert:.gay :-)
  Jim Prendergast:Jeff has them allmemorized
  Paul McGrady: On a flight now, so only able to contribute via
chat today.
 Alexander Schubert:Not yet delegated
  Jim Prendergast:still in contention, isnt it?
 Alexander Schubert:Still in contention
  Steve Chan:CTAG
  Alexander Schubert:CTAG!
 Steve Chan: Community TLD Applicant Group
  Paul McGrady:@Jeff Neuman - I have missed a call or two due to
a family issue. DId we decide to include the Terms & Conditions
from the Guidebook into this group or will they be looked at in
another group? Thanks!
  Jeff Neuman: We consider feedback from everyone
  Jeff Neuman:@Paul - Yes.....but have not looked at them yet
  Paul McGrady:Perfect! Thanks @Jeff.
  Phil Buckingham:kurt - can you speak up a little
 Kurt Pritz:pretty close
 Kurt Pritz:I am in a crowded spot. sorry
  Kevin Kreuser: justification is the right term, IMO, but I think
it should be a high bar
  Jeff Neuman:@kevin - Why a high bar?
  Alexander Schubert:Do we talk Spec 5?
  Phil Buckingham:alexander - spec 5 later
  Alexander Schubert: So is this top level or second level?
  Jeff Neuman:@Alexander - both
 Alexander Schubert: Seemingly 2nd....
 Alexander Schubert:BOTH?
 Alexander Schubert: Apples & Oranges?
  Jeff Neuman: We will need to consider both reserved names at the
```

top level as well as those at the second level

Kevin Kreuser:bc the justification for most changes requested to the RA in this round were not due to something special in the applicant or the category that the applicant lived, but instead were based on the business' own limitations. TM rights and for protections I think are an exception. Multiple agreements for registrars can also be difficult to implement

Jeff Neuman: How are multiple registry agreements difficult for registrars? (I am not disagreeing, but want to flush this out)

Jeff Neuman:@Kevin - If one registry agreement has a different indemnity provision than another....how would that affect registrars

Jeff Neuman:(as an example)

Kevin Kreuser:depends on what changes are permitted by category. if technical, which I hope would not be the case, could cause difficulties

Kevin Kreuser:nevermind us, we're just chatting

Jeff Neuman: Not sure why that is..... I will call in.

Kurt Pritz:one part of the COI question might be whether the
COI is stiil

Kurt Pritz:required

Kevin Kreuser:@Kurt, ICANN would welcome eliminating the COI itself, but is still going to want a way to fund EBERO

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): Finally into the AC Been on the audio bridge only until now

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):Someone should take a look at the transcript of the new gTLD session in Toronto. Many participants raised complaints and concerns about the

COI. ICANN's responses seem unlikely to be different now, IMHO.

Kurt Pritz:@Kevin. there are a lot of ways to skin that cat. For later substantive discussion

Kevin Kreuser:absolutely

Alexander Schubert: With reserved names we have to strictly distinguish between top and second level!

Alexander Schubert:CWG

Jeff Neuman: that was in 2006

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry): Are you talking about the 2006 WG?

Kevin Kreuser:@Kristina, ICANN is holding and managing LOIs and Data Escrow agreements for all of these TLDs. It's an administrative nightmare. I cannot imagine they wouldn't love to be rid of them, perhaps by way of insurance of some manner, taking a portion of the applicant fee and dumping into a pool, etc as an alternatives

Steve Chan: FYI, the document is un-synced...as Michael just noted.

Paul McGrady: Kevin, we went down the "insurance" path in Round 1 and it was rejected. Start ups are not the same risk footprint as .Brands.

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):@Kevin: I think Paul McGrady has some views on ICANN as an insurer (although I was super sick in Dakar and could be misremembering).

Kevin Kreuser: Understand re insurance, point was more I believe they would be open to exploring better alternatives

Jeff Neuman:https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https3A gnso.icann.org en issues\_new-2Dgtlds\_final-2Dreport-2Drn2Dwg-

2D23may07.htm&d=DQIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl13mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xc14I 5cM&r=8\_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe\_5iHWG1BLwwwehFBfjr sjWv9&m=1DrkjUSWxiH6YXRdYjYR6YTk35JT1AwGgRzdinv\_7gU&s=zTew0mJ0smz Hg hkXualbyHbXDHJr1sSScf4k50bE-k&e=

Michael Flemming:Staff, could we make a note in the Notes to capture the discussion on COIs that is taking place in the chat so that we may use this as feedback and come back to this when we are ready to have more detailed discussion?

Michael Flemming:please\*

Michael Flemming: A lot of constructive discussion. Thank you, everyone.

Michael Flemming: Thanks!

Jeff Neuman: We should also split the top level from second level

Alexander Schubert:+1

Annebeth Lange:+ 1

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):+1

Julie Hedlund:@Michael: I have copied it, but I'll note that it is redundant. The chat notes are captured separately by the Secretariat staff and is posted to the wiki.

Alexander Schubert:And it Is split in the AG!

Paul McGrady:@Kevin, lots can be done with the EBERO issue to drive out costs and uncertainty, thus reducing ICANN's involvement/risk.

Alexander Schubert: Spec 5 is 2nd level, right?

Michael Flemming:Yes

Michael Flemming: Anything in the RA would refer to second level reservations

Michael Flemming:...I believe

Kevin Kreuser:some restrictions are at "all levels"

Kevin Kreuser:country and territory, for exampel

Jeff Neuman: I think we should take one by one

Jeff Neuman: See what the policy recomendation was and then compare with what was done

Steve Chan: Phil is discussing the existing Reserved Name

Requirements (at that time)

Annebeth Lange: And the Reserved Names report came in 2006 - not completely consistent with the AG

Steve Chan: What is in the AC room is the recommendation table recommended for new gTLDs

Michael Flemming: Yes, Phil is looking at the Roles of Reserved Names Table

Jeff Neuman: The applicant Guidebook in Section 2.2.1.2.1 has the initial list of top-level reserved names

Jeff Neuman: Then this section was added: 2.2.1.2.3 to cover red cross / olympics

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Indeed Annebeth that out of Synch is important to note

Julie Hedlund: See the table at:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-

3A gnso.icann.org\_en\_issues\_new-2Dgtlds\_final-2Dreport-2Drn-2Dwg-

2D23may07.htm&d=DQIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I 5cM&r=8\_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe\_5iHWGlBLwwwehFBfjr sjWv9&m=lDrkjUSWxiH6YXRdYjYR6YTk35JT1AwGgRzdinv\_7gU&s=zTew0mJ0smz Hg hkXualbyHbXDHJr1sSScf4k50bE-k&e=

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry): May I suggest that we start with what was in the AG and only revert back to the Reserved Names WG recommendations and the 2000/2003 Reserved Name requirements, as needed?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):works for me Kristina

Annebeth Lange: I agree

Annebeth Lange:It has been a lot of discussion between the result of the Reserved Names WG recommendations and the result in the AG

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):+1 Jeff

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):+1

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry): Is there anyone who thinks that we shouldn't have reserved names on the top level?

Annebeth Lange: The AG should be the starting point here

Kevin Kreuser:home

Alexander Schubert:hiome?

Alexander Schubert: Yap: home

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):4

Julie Hedlund: All: Just a time check. 2 minutes to the top of the hour.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):WT4

Heather Forrest:It seems to me that it would be helpful to have everyone in the group go back to the RNWG Report to understand the justifications reached by that group

Jeff Neuman:@heather - yes please

Annebeth Lange: And we have to remember that this was long time ago - before the AG that I think had input from more stakeholdergroups than RNWG Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): Have to leave my next call is starting now Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Bye Paul McGrady: Thanks all! Annebeth Lange:Bye Alexander Schubert: Thanks! Jeff Neuman:@Annabeth - Agree, BUT we need to revise the policy so we need to understand the original policy Annebeth Lange: Absolutely, Jeff Heather Forrest: thanks everyone Robin Gross: thanks all, bye Alexander Schubert:Midnight :-) Robert Burlingame: Thank you. Bye. Annebeth Lange: Here too, ALexander

Emily Barabas: Next call will be after ICANN57, invitation to be

sent out