

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear All, Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WG call Monday, 12 June 2017 at 20:00 UTC

Michelle DeSmyter:Agenda wiki page:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_GRLfAw&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrw113mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe5iHWGlBLwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=euemKHkPt1LFD_6Ud272N00Fp_YEqwyLcnAJs6KoslE&s_nrLRrQ17reii-ft79sE80hdXRm0eUG9kEvUyGpq_yc&e=

vanda scartezini:hi Everyone!

Annebeth Lange:Hi all!

vanda scartezini:yes

Dietmar Lenden - Valideus:we can hear you Jeff

Christa Taylor:Background noise is unusual

Bruna Santos:Hello, everyone!

Hadia Elminiawi:Hello from Cairo

vanda scartezini:christa Majority is not mute on the adobe. it is really huge noise

avri doria:ok, then it is not me as i am muted at the moment.

Karen Day (SAS):I'm not hearing any background noise at this time

Phil Buckingham:Re WT2 - Last meeting (June 1) We put four questions re Global Public Interest . Please take a look .

Donna Austin, Neustar:got it. thanks Karen and Jeff

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):staff are we 0500 or 1300 UTC for WT4 next week?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):1500 sorry

Jeff Neuman:If you were part of a group that submitted comments, can you review to make sure abbreviated version is correct

Susan Payne:I thought they weren't abbreviated - didn't Steve say in his email it is verbatim?

Jeff Neuman:Yes, sorry...it is just taking provisions that may be out of context

Jeff Neuman:for example if one made some general statements up front that applied to all....then that may not be in abbreviated versions

Steve Chan:Or perhaps weplaced in the wrong category

Susan Payne:ah, ok thanks

Jeff Neuman:They did not rewrite anything

Emily Barabas:There are a few responses that provided narrative answers without referencing specific questions. Staff tried to place them under the appropriate questions, but it is helpful to check.

Steve Chan:* Monday 26 June 2017* 09:00 - 09:30: Update to the GNSO, in Committee 4

Steve Chan:* Tuesday 27 June 2017* 08:30 - 12:00: Working Group

F2F meeting, in Committee 4*; 17:00 - 18:30: Cross Community Discussion - Geographic Names at the Top-Level Session I in Bill Gallagher room

Steve Chan:* Thursday 29 June 2017* 15:15 - 18:30: Cross Community Discussion - Geographic Names at the Top-Level Session II in Ballroom 1

Annebeth Lange:Seems to be very good prepared.

vanda scartezini:indeed. Annebeth...

Steve Chan:Correct

Donna Austin, Neustar:sure

Donna Austin, Neustar:ah, okay, got it. all good

Alan Greenberg:We would not need 100,000 to swamp us....

Phil Buckingham:Yes , we set limits

Hadia Elminiawi:how do you determine the number of applications above which there would be a problem?

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):In order of submission by date and time EXCEPT where there are string contention sets - BUT ONLY AFTER TESTING TO MAKE SURE STRING IS NOT HIGH RISK FOR NAME COLLISION

Alan Greenberg:If we assume less than or equal to 1,000, would not apply if much greater.

Greg Shatan:100,000 applications would net \$18.5 billion in application fees. That could solve a lot of problems. But I can't imagine any market analysis that reasonably foresees anything like that.

vanda scartezini:yes , good suggestion Donna.

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Greg, I expect that amount of money would likely create many more problems than it solves.

Rubens Kuhl:Applications could receive objections, GAC advice... name collision high risk is just one of the possibilities.

Alan Greenberg:Not ordering within window was, at the time, a feature and not a bug.

vanda scartezini:yes. flood of application is not positive

Jim Prendergast:the window was frozen shut for a month because of the "glitch"

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Just because you have a lot of money does not mean you want to suddenly hire a bunch more ICANN staff with no background.

Phil Buckingham:Assumption : Ratio of evaluators to applications

Christa Taylor:Why can't we determine our capacity limits ahead of time? (ballpark)

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Christa, because then you get into the first come first serve debate.

Christa Taylor:Ask of ICANN

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@Rubens - no reason to even obtain GAC advice if string is HIGH RISK for name collision - it should be a screening mechanism as to eligibility to operate as gTLD - see SSAC comments on CC2

Alan Greenberg:Again, we probably need assumptions. We may need a bifurcated plan with one path forward if there are <N applications and another if much more.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):agree Alan

Rubens Kuhl:@Anne, GAC Advice is coming for every string listed on reveal day, no matter it failing one evaluation criteria further down the road...

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@Rubens - you don't have to waste the GAC's time if a string is really not eligible to operate as a TLD based on security and stability assessments.

Christa Taylor:+1 Alan

Phil Buckingham:Disagree Alan , we double / treble the number of evaluators !

Rubens Kuhl:@Anne, we can suggest GAC to wait, but they will do it or not based on their working process... and I believe they will go thru the list of strings no matter what.

Karen Day (SAS):No predicibility for those that file in next batch

Alan Greenberg:If we have no predictability on processing, it becomes a lot easier! ;-)

Sara Bockey:I will need to drop at the top of the hour. many thanks to all for the good discussion

Donna Austin, Neustar:Agree with Avri

Alan Greenberg:Maybe you don't have to pay the bulk of the fee until your processing slot comes up.

Phil Buckingham:Agree Avri . Need an SLA , time processing limit

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@Rubens - Assessment for HIGH RISK strings that should not be eligible should be first and fast. CC2 comment by SSAC was SSAC 94. See this recommendation:The SSAC recommends that ICANN consider the following in the context of the newgTLD program.

- Prohibit the delegation of certain TLD strings. RFC 2606, "Reserved Top Level Domain Names," currently prohibits a list of strings, including test, example, invalid, and localhost.
- 4 ICANN should coordinate with the community to identify a more complete set of principles than the amount of traffic observed at the root as invalid queries as the basis for prohibiting the delegation of additional strings to those already identified in RFC 2606.
- Alert the applicant during the string evaluation process about the pre-existence of invalid TLD queries to the applicant's string. ICANN should coordinate with the community to identify a threshold of traffic

observed at the root as the basis for such notification.

Greg Shatan:Lost sound?

Karen Day (SAS):Jeff???

Christa Taylor:Can't hear as well

Greg Shatan:We might want to know what caused the most "friction" in the process the first time around, and whether solutions were found.

Donna Austin, Neustar:There is a lot of 'chicken'n'egg' in what we're doing.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):indeed Donna

Jeff Neuman:@Donna - Was thinking that same thing

Phil Buckingham:Good Point , Kurt

Jeff Neuman:WT4 has asked the SSAC to reconsider their recommendations on the number of entries into the zone per year based on the study of the root that concluded no issues

avri doria:i appreciate Kurt's point on the only time there isn't pent up demand and think we should give that timing aspect consideration in any solution.

Alexander Schubert:It doesn't make any sense to open the ongoing process after the next window: Say we get 4,000 applications - and ICANN can process 2,000 per year - then it will take anyways 2 years before ANY new application could be processed. During these 2 years of course there will be pent up demand!

Alexander Schubert:And pent up demand equals competition! And competition drives innovation and is beneficial for the industry!

avri doria:20 minutes left

Alexander Schubert:Why would we want to "avoid contention"? Competition doesn't happen without contention.

Alan Greenberg:Could not hear Kurt. Could you summarize?

Kurt Pritz:Jeff

Kurt Pritz:nvm

Kurt Pritz:@Alex. it isn't about avoiding contention. it is about when it is feasible to open a continuous application window.

Kurt Pritz:sorry about shortening your name

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Anne, I think its an idea worthy of consideration, but I'd start at a much higher threshold.

Kurt Pritz:the contention would be among the price brackets only

Alexander Schubert:Hi Kurt, "Alex" is fine. I am all for continuous process, but as long as processing time prevents new applications from being processed in the first place: Let's close the next window only once additional applications can be processed. Once we see no contention anymore we can go into continuous mode.

avri doria:8 minutes remaining

Jeff Neuman:ok

Donna Austin, Neustar:Depending what we decide for underserved region applications, if there is a waiver on the application fee associated with such an application then the fee is irrelevant.

Kurt Pritz:the one lesson from the community round in 2003-4

Kurt Pritz:was that there shouldn't be a community only round

avri doria:let's continue the discussion on the list and in the doc https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_docs.google.com_document_d_1u3UzvZIXzjnxtklgPmqArqff6dyckUbyuzWyLz7dK0w_edit-23&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrw1l3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=eueMKHkPt1LFD_6Ud272N00Fp_YEqwyLcnAJs6Kos1E&s=IL62uB5gvng8at3t4S0UQ5R4uv0iEDq4lmmDBGfwnt0&e=

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Well get ready to define what qualifies as Community because the GAC will advise priority round for community applications and things won't move forward until that issue is resolved. We need to resolve it before the Board says "work out your differences please".

Jeff Neuman:Yes, Even if to just document the interdependencies, that is extremely helpful!

vanda scartezini:thank you quite interesting call...

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

Alexander Schubert:Thanks, bye!

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Thank you

Christa Taylor:thank-you

Kiran Malancharuvil:Thanks!

Karen Day (SAS):Thanks, bye all

Hadia Elminiawi:thank you all, bye

Bruna Santos:thank you, bye