Julie Bisland:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 1 - Overall Process/Support/Outreach Issue on Tuesday, 16 May 2017 at 15:00 UTC.

Julie Bisland:Agenda Wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_x_EtTRAw&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=KT9yZegfV_4Os1sfXC6WRsBgN6zfUqk7Ifi2Lu7kbhU&s=EoVZc6PG2JAdQC-XVCfAvIXwFqayXDncT1mcX_Wb6xU&e=

Sara Bockey:Much better!

Ashley Roberts:for the record, I am on the call (I see I am listed as having sent apologies).

Julie Bisland:I'll correct that, Ashley, thank you.

Ashley Roberts:thanks

VANDA SCARTEZINI:sorry to be little late

Alan Greenberg:JOnathan fading...

Jeff Neuman:Hard to hear Jonathan

Jeff Neuman:Is there anyone that can present the RySG position on this call?

Jonathan Robinson (Afilias):Correct. RySG group is scheduled to meet tomorrow

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Jeff, I can more or less

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):here now

Jeff Neuman:@Donna, that would be great

Donna Austin, Neustar:but as Sara said there is a call of the RySG group tomorrow

Christa Taylor:last slide - May 30th

Christa Taylor:20:00 UTC

Julie Bisland:The next New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 1 - Overall Process/Support/Outreach Issue will take place on Tuesday, 30 May 2017 at 20:00 UTC

Christa Taylor:https://participate.icann.org/newgtldsubteams/?launcher=false&disclaimer-consent=true

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):good point made by Jim

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):indeed Donna we need more info here

Jonathan Robinson (Afilias):@Crista - Julie Hedlund's notes on the RHS shoudl be a helpful aide memoir to updating the document after this meeting

Jonathan Robinson (Afilias):Sorry Christa

Christa Taylor:thanks Jonathan

Steve Chan:WT2 had asked questions about the EBERO in relation to registrant protections. Here is the response from GDD.

Steve Chan:Section 6 of Specification 10 of the Registry Agreement for new gTLDs provides emergency thresholds for the 5 critical registry functions. Per the Registry Agreement, reaching any one of these thresholds could trigger an EBERO event.

Steve Chan:ICANN monitors registries' performance of these critical registry functions, and regularly engages with Registry Operators and Registry Service Providers when service outages occur. Not all services outages reach emergency thresholds. If emergency thresholds are reached, ICANN evaluates each individual case and make decisions regarding whether to trigger an EBERO event based on the unique circumstances.

Steve Chan:Since the launch of the New gTLD program, an SLA has reached or exceeded the emergency threshold 27 times. However, no EBERO events have been declared to date. In each of these 27 cases, ICANN technical teams were already working with the registry before the threshold was reached. In many of the cases, the TLD had no registrations. In the cases in which there were registrations, ICANN considered the EBERO option. However, ICANN determined that it would have less of a security and stability impact to assist the RSP through resolution rather than activating an EBERO event.

Ashley Roberts:slides are here: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.icann.org_en_system_files_files_presentation-2Dslam-2D13may17-2Den.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=KT9yZegfV_4Os1sfXC6WRsBgN6zfUqk7Ifi2Lu7kbhU&s=6achwTKZWWErsE6Le5KSQUcpCXJsQqaTk9Itmdse8bk&e=

Jessica Hooper (Verisign):Agree. This could lead to a race to the bottom by setting minimum standards rather than having providers strive for excellence in service. (third bullet point)

Jeff Neuman:@Jessica - How is setting SLAs in the agreements now any different than setting them in a pre-approval process?

Jeff Neuman:I am not sure why this would become a race to the bottom

Jeff Neuman:Can someone clarify that

Jeff Neuman:sorry, have a noisy printer going off now and cant speak :)

Alan Greenberg:Given how many people on this call, pretty quiet group.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:guess burden should be more clearly expressed.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:@alan -I am in the airport, better be mute... quite a noise

Kurt Pritz:@ Jeff. SLAs are sort of backward looking. Some registries will cut costs until there is a failure. Then it is too late. A pre-approved RSP might have forward-looking criteria that are intended to avoid failures such as statistical process controls and new threat identification and remediation.

Jeff Neuman:@kurt - then this is a problem with existing registries and RSPs already. Its not something that is new. Nor is it something that would be worse with a Pre-approval process.

Donna Austin, Neustar:@ Trang: we haven't decided anything yet.

Jeff Neuman:@Donna - correct. No decisions yet, but the trend has been towards a "pre-approval" process prior to the applications being submitted for TLDs. It would be voluntary.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:@kurt, looks you have a point - agree with you comment

Jonathan Robinson (Afilias):Pre-approval to meet a minimum standard which seems to be demonstrably inadequate doesn't sound like it's moving in the direction of future security and stability

VANDA SCARTEZINI:+ 1 Jonathan

Trang Nguyen:@Jeff, there were 3 firms providing technical evaluation.

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Trang, but PDT is done by the same provider?

Sarah L Verisign:@Jeff I thought the RSP accreditation process was intended to make improvements to what we have today rather haan not make something that already exists without it "worse" - I dont see how that plays into security and stablity. Sorry for beeing late to the meeting I only just joinned.

Trang Nguyen:@Donna, correct, PDT is performed by 1 vendor.

Jeff Neuman:@sarah = Sure, standards can be approved for future as well and apply retroactively to all providers. If we think the standards are too low now (which I am not saying), then we can always through a policy that starts today amend the existing agreements to increase the SLAs for all.....and then apply that to the future applications

Christa Taylor:Impro

Jeff Neuman:I guess what I am saying is that there should not be additional barriers to entry in the future that do not exist today.

Ashley Roberts:Jonathan, if we think the standards in the current RA are insufficient then that is a different conversation. I believe that topic comes under the remit of WT4 (please correcct me if I'm wrong).. All we are talking about is at what stage and how many times we evaluate whether the RSP meets the required standards (whether they be the current standards or some otherwise agreed standards)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):indeed it does not Jonathan, and an issue to be delt with, no doubt... but it's an issue not a new issue with any proposed pre approval, what is to me an opportunity is to possibly

explore and enact mitigation or risk management of heading to a failure point, to be tethered to any such recommendations, and that also could help avoid the same risk in existing standards...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):yes Ashley far more clearly said... sorry ðŸ™ not fully operational atm

Ashley Roberts::-)

VANDA SCARTEZINI:Ok got it Ashley. tks

Kurt Pritz:I think #4 is kind of irrelevant. If an RSP bears costs associated with its certification, those costs have to be passed on to registry operators somehow, either through a one-time charge or some rate. I think it is up to the RSP what they want to charge and then up to their customers if they want to pay that charge

Jeff Neuman:Kurt - I disagree. This is costs to pay ICANN. Not costs paid by Registry to RSP

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Staff can we make sure we capture this standards issue, chat extracts etc., and send it to our WT4

Kurt Pritz:@ Jeff - lemme think about that. Maybe the Proposal should be edited a little

Alan Greenberg:@Kurt, if testing is done ahead of time, there are no applicants at that point, only RSPs. If an RSP does not end up being used by any applicants, RSP is only entitty to bear costs.

Jeff Neuman:ICANN collected approx $61,667 from each application (paid for by Registry Operators) to pay for evaluations. A substantial portion of that was paid for technical evaluation. That can be eliminated from the Registry Operator's application for the TLD with a pre-approval program

Kurt Pritz:@Alan - but it passes those costs along at some point. If an RSP makes an initial investment, it has to recoup that investment

Jeff Neuman:It can then charge RSPs to get "pre-approved" one time.

Jeff Neuman:@Kurt - There is a big difference to pass through an evaluation cost incurred once divided by all its customers, then to be charged that evaluation costs 300 times (in the case of some RSPs) and pass those on to the ROs

Emily Barabas:@Cheryl, notes, chat transcripts, and recordings for this call will be available here: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_display_NGSPP_2017-2D05-2D16-2BNew-2BgTLD-2BSubsequent-2BProcedures-2BPDP-2BWork-2BTrack-2B1&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=KT9yZegfV_4Os1sfXC6WRsBgN6zfUqk7Ifi2Lu7kbhU&s=suOciiSRhnh0225UI1AYC7e8QsdXu402U5rh5CQTXHU&e= . Once all documents are posted, we can share this link with WT4.

Jeff Neuman:For example, if RSP Approval costs $50,000 (hypothetically), then dividing that one time charge amongst 300 registry operators is much different than passing through $50,000 to each of its ROs to be evaluated 300 times.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):thanks Emily, I don't want any nexus points overlooked...

VANDA SCARTEZINI:donna's points in the doc cover up the point

Jeff Neuman:I have to drop. Thanks everyone

Kurt Pritz:@Jeff : Won't the market deal with that?

Donna Austin, Neustar:What is meant by 'functional areas' in Q7?

Donna Austin, Neustar:thanks

Julie Bisland:The next New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 1 - Overall Process/Support/Outreach Issue will take place on Tuesday, 30 May 2017 at 20:00 UTC

Julie Hedlund:@Jim: Yes, staff will include the link to the document in the notes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):thanks everyone good call, talk again soon... bye for now

Jonathan Robinson (Afilias):@staff. PLease can I be added to this / relevant mailing list/s. Thank-you

Alan Greenberg:Thanks all.

Donna Austin, Neustar:thanks Christa

Sara Bockey:Thanks all!!!

Jonathan Robinson (Afilias):Thank-you Christa
Ashley Roberts:thanks
Katrin Ohlmer, DOTZON:thanks and bye, everybody.
Trang Nguyen:Thanks, all! Bye!
VANDA SCARTEZINI:thnaks to all
Phil Buckingham:.thank you Christa
Phil Buckingham:thank you Christa