Julie Bisland: Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 1 - Overall Process/Support/Outreach Issue on Tuesday, 25 July 2017 at 20:00 UTC

Julie Bisland: Agenda wiki

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

3A community.icann.org x WXHwAw&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6w rcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-

<u>05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=WfCzAhSpqjavY</u> <u>TAdBJ3s257fNrnG0js30_qjN9j3uws&s=-</u>

8VWWeKSTIuT944jqJ0VcKVOGBlvWXfUrm2CpqqVWT0&e=

vanda scartezini:hi all, I am in the airport so will keep myself as listen only to avoid any noise interference

Julie Bisland:thank you, Vanda:)

vanda scartezini:cheryl nice to hear you again today... kisses

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):hugs n kisses Vanda

avri doria:better to wait for jeff

Julie Hedlund:Jeff is trying to join but having Adobe Connect issues Jeff Neuman:Hello all. New computer.....adobe doesnt like it apparently

Jeff Neuman:sorry for my tardiness

Jeff Neuman: This overlaps with the discussion from yesterday Jeff Neuman: I think the main point for us to consider here is HOW

LONG should the period be

Jeff Neuman:to receive applications

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON:3 month is fine

vanda scartezini:from here the msot relevant is advance infromation

- last time was basically none in the south hemisphere.

Jim Prendergast: I would caution against the use of the term "pent up demand" as to date the only evidence of such is annecdotal at best and I have seen nothing to suggest it is widespread.

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON:+1 Jim

Jim Prendergast:3 months is fine by me

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Jim, while it may be anecdotal, given it's more than 5 years since the 2012 application round, can we agree that there is or will be demand for new gTLDs?

vanda scartezini:from the survey I did last year in this LAC region the answer is Yes Donna, we did not have good chance to enter last round Jim Prendergast:there will be people who appply for sure. But we have no idea how many. Number like 25k application are thrown around with no factual bassis behind those numbers. It's like 2012 all over again where we just dont know how many there will be.

Jim Prendergast:apologies but Adobe is really acting up so im switching to audio only

Donna Austin, Neustar: I'll refrain from using the term 'pent up' demand for just 'demand'

Jeff Neuman:my adobe is acting up as well, so I am joining audio bridge

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON:Prioritization draw is ok

Rubens Kuhl:Katrin, I just hope that the ticket is included in the application fee... having to pay separately for it was a mess.

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON:+1 Rubens - and also the flight+hotel ;-)

Rubens Kuhl: Make Digital Archery Great Again

Donna Austin, Neustar: Is that a comment from the GAC or the UK GAC representative?

Jeff Neuman: UK GAC Rep

Kurt Pritz:@Rubens - there were legal reasons for paying separately for the draw

Rubens Kuhl:@Kurt - I believe it needs to go to a separe pot, but looking forward ICANN could collect it at application time.

Jeff Neuman:Didnt we get feedback from ICANN on whether they are able to do a lottery again

Rubens Kuhl: I think that is a decision to be made in the TLD Types discussion...

Phil Buckingham:one assumes that the lottery would be done again in California?

Sara Bockey:@Jeff, yes, I recall something from staff... mainly that we're not supposed to call it a lottery (legal reasons) They may be able to do something similiar if I recall correctly

Kurt Pritz:To get the terminology straight: (1) the prioitization draw was a "raffle" and (2) ICANN did not conduct a lottery

Rubens Kuhl:We could win priority numbers using buzzword bingo @ ICANN Public Forum. I want all my cards with "Swenglish".

Rubens Kuhl:Even if possible to use, it could be either easy or cumbersome.

Jeff Neuman:less prescriptive mean digital archery again:)

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Steve, that seems to be a rather important consideration.

Phil Buckingham:so will there be a prioritisation this time. So will IDNs still get priority this time?

Kurt Pritz:Maybe this group could ask ICANN for formal advice on the draw issue and whether it can be legally repeated - with a one month or so delivery. That way, we would know our options.

Rubens Kuhl:IDNs have quit a larger challenge to overcome than time-to-market. Their priority didn't bring them much return.

Rubens Kuhl:(quite a)

Donna Austin, Neustar: Agreed Rubens

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON:+1 Ruben

Steve Chan 2:I would note, the comments I made earlier wouldn't preclude the WG from saying the mechanism SHOULD be a priotitization draw, in the form of a raffle, similar to the 2012 round. That makes it very clear what the WG wants, but at least allows for some level of adjustment if the mechanism is not legally feasibile.

Trang Nguyen:If we get 25,000 applications, we will need a way to batch the applications for processing.

Kurt Pritz:@ Steve: if a draw is not legally feasible, we don't want to spend time discussing it. We should be able to understand if the law has changed since the last round.

Jeff Neuman:not mine

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Trang, what do you mean by 'batch'? Do you mean by similar type of application or just in batches of 100 or 200

Jeff Neuman: I do not believe there have been any changes to the lottery laws of california in over 30 years

Rubens Kuhl:25,000 applications could be 25,000 applicants to 1 TLD each or 25 applicants of 1,000 TLDs. Those two scenarios would need

very different resources.

Jeff Neuman:Different cases, bot not statutory

Phil Buckingham: Correct Donna.

Rubens Kuhl: "Please put me first" () "Please put me last" ()

Julie Bisland: I'm sorry, i cant find that line beeping. but its gone:)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):sorry that was my next ICANN. call dial out,

I am muted but the beeps on call waiting came through... I have it held now

Julie Bisland:oh, thank you, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):took a while for my stop message to filter to Audio ;-)

Trang Nguyen:@Donna, some considerations if we get 25,000 applications include whether the application comment should be extended to allow the community more time to review the large number of applications and provide comment, whether the objection submission window should be extended, evaluation of applications would be extended, or whether the 25,000 applications would be batched in some form into smaller groups for processing.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):makes sense Trangie

Donna Austin, Neustar: Thanks Trang, that's helpful context.

Julie Bisland: The next New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team -

Track 1 - Overall Process/Support/Outreach Issue will take place on

Tuesday, 08 August 2017 at 03:00 UTC

Jeff Neuman:thanks all!

Rubens Kuhl:Thanks all!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):bye

Phil Buckingham: thanks Christa & Sara