

Julie Bisland:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 3 – String Contention, Objections & Disputes call on Tuesday, 06 June 2017 at 20:00 UTC.

Emily Barabas:slides are unsynced

Steve Coates:Super complaints.

Steve Chan:There is also the Registration Restrictions DRP. And I would note, the RPMs PDP has agreed to take the TMDRP off our hands.

Rubens Kuhl:COI as in "Conflict Of Interest", not "Continued Operations Instrument".

Rubens Kuhl:I also believe one degree of substantive review is needed. Local court system allows 1st and 2nd instances to look at substance, produce evidence and witnesses.

Rubens Kuhl:After that, higher courts only look at already in-file evidence.

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:I agree Robin.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):I think we need mechanisms to do both, and YES clearer definitions and Guidelines is needed for s

Karen Day (SAS):I'm not hearing Robin

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Robin is breaking up

Rubens Kuhl:Exactly, Robin seems to be breaking up.

Steve Chan:@Robin, I'll type it here for you to catch up on what I said.

Julie Bisland:Robin, it seems intermittent. currently cannot hear you.

Robin Gross:I'm speaking

Steve Coates:Apologies, have to drop off.

Robin Gross:I'll have to dial-in

Robin Gross:I'll have to dial-in again

Jeff Neuman:yes

Steve Chan:All, here is the point I was trying to make, for those that may have missed it: It may make sense to think about the phases of accountability separately. On the one hand, there is ICANN's accountability to the evaluation procedures, and applicants' ability to seek redress to decisions and actions of ICANN and it's providers. And then perhaps it might make sense to think of the accountability of registries and their commitments in the application and and in the registry agreement.

Kurt Pritz:@Jeff: That is not my recollection. I remember a webinar where ICANN staff member said that an action by one of the review panel was the same as a staff action for the purposes of Reconsideration Requests and IRP

avri doria:Kurt, that is the way it was treated.

Jeff Neuman:But that does not change the fundamental point that no one reviewed the decisions by the evaluators.

Kurt Pritz:Those Reconsdieration requests were generally lost because the Board Governance Committee found no policy violation (not judging as to whether there was one or not)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):agree Jamie

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):good point Kristina... makes sense to me to address

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:Lack of transparency around evaluators used in CPE is also an issue. There is no way to assess any conflict of interest issues.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):makes dealing with potential COI. impossibly challenging it seems Karen and Jamie

Karen Bernstein:I have a problem with the qualifications of arbitrators overseing objections. Specifically, we had an admiralty lawyer preside over a String Confusion Objection.

Rubens Kuhl:While we look at accountability mechanisms, we need to make sure they are not used, or we try to avoid that, them to be used to delay a contention set.

Kiran Malancharuvil:Of course the problem with limiting areas of expertise is that those who have an expertise in this area are VERY likely to have conflicts of interest

Susan Payne:I don't have audio I'm afraid. I seem to recall the IO, in his own review of his role, raised the issue about having an alternative IO who could act in situations on conflict. Assuming the IO role is retained that seems a sensible suggestion

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):There's a difference between requiring experts to have expertise in the DNS and the domain industry, on the one hand, and requiring tht experts have expertise in an area more closely related than admiralty.

Jeff Neuman:I am not sure we can improve the accountability mechanisms as they are pretty well baked right now

Jeff Neuman:but we can focus on new things like a substantive appeals process.

Rubens Kuhl:I believe PICDRP has such a first look mechanism.

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):Thanks, @Karen (Day)!

Karen Bernstein:Kristina, this particular arbitrator had no experience in trademark or DNS/dn industry

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):makes sense if first look s used across and to take in COI issues as consideration

Rubens Kuhl:Not fine, for sure.

Jeff Neuman:Agree with Steve

Julie Bisland:The next New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 3 – String Contention, Objections & Disputes will take place on Tuesday, 20 June 2017 at 15:00 UTC for 60 minutes.

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

avri doria:bye

Karen Day (SAS):Thanks, Robin.

Susan Payne:thanks

Kiran Malancharuvil:Thanks

Karen Day (SAS):Bye all

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Thanks everyone