

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear All, Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WG call on Tuesday, 07 March 2017 at 20:00 UTC.

Michelle DeSmyter:Meeting

page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_Ha-2DRAw&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGIBLwwwhehFBjrsjWv9&m=GpkcbbtPvo5J88YbJtILSGRaVH9F4nm4hDIRQcORVdg&s=DvDKT C9jFEUKRMqYQlIh9Alq_TZWbGpREM3IT_HUKE&e=

Katrin Ohlmer, DOTZON:loud and clear.

Alexander Schubert:Feels to me like "Groundhog day" https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.youtube.com_watch-3Fv-3DeZbtAFq7dP8&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGIBLwwwhehFBjrsjWv9&m=GpkcbbtPvo5J88YbJtILSGRaVH9F4nm4hDIRQcORVdg&s=8_IM4V5qcRrUef_HJLt_F3ENhFGLeyVEh0IQdyKNtbM&e=

Katrin Ohlmer, DOTZON:loud and clear, avri.

Emily Barabas:Please note, we are working with a new Google Document: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_docs.google.com_document_d_1qutP4I6fpyTtH4uSgLqsSFDn7082Guexr7gU8YD78Zg_edit-23&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGIBLwwwhehFBjrsjWv9&m=GpkcbbtPvo5J88YbJtILSGRaVH9F4nm4hDIRQcORVdg&s=UamAK7GaGVkTffsbAF_7eWvHIROpUXGo23xmryO7vow&e=

Emily Barabas:If you would like to read along in the Google Doc, please use this link

Emily Barabas:The document is not synced

Emily Barabas:everyone can scroll

Emily Barabas:the formatting of the redline in the pod and the google doc look a little different, but the content of the edits is the same.

jeff neuman:I like periodic...

jeff neuman:but that is just me

Donna Austin, Neustar:agree with Jeff

jeff neuman:Should we say "a RSP" or "an RSP"

Sara Bockey:a RSP, I think

Donna Austin, Neustar:agree with Sara

jeff neuman:I know the general rule is you only use "an" before a word that starts with a vowel...but it sounds weird

jeff neuman:again that is just me

Donna Austin, Neustar:if we spell out RSP it would be 'a registry service provider'

jeff neuman:true

Alexander Schubert:1.1.7 should be periodic in my opinion - as it doesn't involve any publishing.

Steve

Chan:<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1qutP4I6fpyTtH4uSgLqsSFDn7082Guexr7gU8YD78Zg/edit#>

Steve Chan:Apologies if we've gotten the sentiment wrong, but not a lot of details in the placeholder.

Katrin Ohlmer, DOTZON:support for 1.5.3. as it is worded.

jeff neuman:@Steve - you got it right

jeff neuman:have some confidence :)

Alexander Schubert:In 1.7.1 we should ask in a way that would allow to create this answer: No "draw" needed when we issue a random number during application submission - then use that random number in an algorithm that creates a queue! This who wish to be at the end of the quezuecan indicate at application submission.

jeff neuman:SHould we use "category"

Alexander Schubert:Sorry typos: "Those who wish to be at the end of the queue can indicate at application submission."

Alexander Schubert:Regarding my previous post!

Alexander Schubert:In WT2 I still miss any question about 2.2.1.4.1 Treatment of Country or Territory Names

Heather Forrest:Interim report of CWG-UCTN has been published for comment

Steve Chan:Further to Heather's comment, it was published on 24 Feb here: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_public-2Dcomments_cwg-2Ductn-2Dinterim-2Dpaper-2D2017-2D02-2D24-2Den&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3Pjp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4i5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGIBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=GpkcbbtPvo5J88YbJtILSGRaVH9F4nm4hDIRQcORVdg&s=v9GW6B

[VdihBWfuiEN_5cKMHuAoLYwhLvIBXSKrASa9o&e=](#)

jeff neuman:yes

Heather Forrest:To put a finer point on Alexander's comment, the group as a whole has not agreed because the scope of the group's work was very narrow. Certainly the participants have views that need to be discussed here in the PDP.

jeff neuman:But we will address that issue when the CWG is done.

Donna Austin, Neustar:should there be a note mentioning that country and territory names have been left out of this exercise for x reason

Alexander Schubert:Footnote that we deal with it later!

Steve Chan:Jeff, you deleted it :)

Donna Austin, Neustar:yep

Justine Chew:Yes

Heather Forrest:Excellent question!

jeff neuman:I would like to hear from Paul

Heather Forrest:Sorry - slow to post check mark for Option 1. It's wordy, but if there are 'yes' answers out there, this group should hear them

jeff neuman:Understood. We can start with a word other than "should"

jeff neuman:Structured and/or evaluated?

Justine Chew:Yes

Steve Chan:Yes, thanks

jeff neuman:3.4.6 is new

jeff neuman:so let people read

jeff neuman:the CCWG on Auction Proceeds is not discussing how auctions work or why they exist

jeff neuman:it is only talking about the use of funds

jeff neuman:@Avri - correct

Julie Hedlund:@Avri: That is correct. Only the funding.

Greg Shatan:Actually, they're talking about the mechanisms for deciding how to spend the money.

Greg Shatan:Others will then decide how to spend the money using those mechanisms.

jeff neuman:only 1/4 of a billion :)

Greg Shatan:You got it....

Greg Shatan:Rounding error.

Trang Nguyen:4.3.2.3 The AGB criteria did not include evaluation of an applicant's business model. Meaning, Q18 was not evaluated. And the

projections in Q46 was not evaluated against the proposed business model in Q18.

jeff neuman:I am fine with that

Trang Nguyen:yes

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):if we drop then do ask for the any other comments

jeff neuman:Is anybody out there?

Greg Shatan:Agree with dropping the question.

Martin Sutton:Fine to drop q

Greg Shatan:4 3 2 6 ask or both.

Greg Shatan:Please see chat

Greg Shatan:at application time, at contract signing time, or at both times?

Greg Shatan:Sounds good

Greg Shatan:I have no voice

Greg Shatan:and I must scream

jeff neuman:You better get it back before friday ;)

Steve Chan:There is a similar question in the technical section. If there are no objections, I'll make the same change there.

Greg Shatan:Just not plugged in. Bonus points for literary reference in my prior interventions..

Trang Nguyen:That timing question probably applies to background screening as well.

jeff neuman:no objection

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):fine

Paul McGrady:"Additional Questions"

Julie Hedlund:Could just say "data"?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):data points refers to any discreet unit of information

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):usually in an analytical context

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):it is an Observation

Katrin Ohlmer, DOTZON:"data points" is quite common as a standing expression, I believe.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):can be single or multiple measures

Alexander Schubert:Noun 1. data point - an item of factual information derived from measurement or research

Rudy Mendoza:agreed

Katrin Ohlmer, DOTZON:yes, please keep it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):can also be seen as a term in multifactorial statistical analysis

Paul McGrady:Excellent Avri! Great run through the document.

Martin Sutton:well done

Sara Bockey:Great job, Avri!

Alexander Schubert:I second Kavouss

Martin Sutton:well said Kavouss

Katrin Ohlmer, DOTZON:kavouss' motion seconded!

Trang Nguyen:Thanks, All! Bye!

Donna Austin, Neustar:well done Avri

Alexander Schubert:Bye!

Sara Bockey:thanks everyone

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):bye

Martin Sutton:thx, bye

Christopher Niemi:Thank you!

Katrin Ohlmer, DOTZON:thanks, all - bye.

Heather Forrest:Safe travels, everyone - thanks Avri and Jeff