Terri Agnew:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 3 – String Contention, Objections & Disputes on Tuesday18 July 2017 at 20:00 UTC for 60 minutes.

Terri Agnew:agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_x_mnHwAw&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpCIgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIgn-H4xR2EBk&m=1XzvS_BUYogQD9npo882Fg3oEOp06wj-6MmAW2BSuVM&s=GTqj4rkkqhnn-QjYU0tNuyXI5n82E_PbOf62mrpQClM&e=

Steve Chan:Full WG meets on 24 July at 15:00 UTC

Terri Agnew:everyone can scroll themselves

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:@Terri .. yes

Jim Prendergast:Does Recommendation 2 include singular and plurals?

Emily Barabas:Full versions of comments excepted above are available here: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__docs.google.com_spreadsheets_d_1A5uaxBAgmg7QsFuqMdVvt1HxNZ4jKXnm3Hp0gZra7U0_edit-23gid-3D845153891&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpCIgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIgn-H4xR2EBk&m=1XzvS_BUYogQD9npo882Fg3oEOp06wj-6MmAW2BSuVM&s=bFfqtquszig0F4x8_V2VQnNv3Uo9KVDegF0FDcAfxJg&e=

Emily Barabas:*excerpted

Jeff Neuman:@JIm - agree and that was discussed previously by this group when we looked at the small RySG group recommendations

Jon Nevett:If we have a clear recommendation, let's make it clear in the policy

Jon Nevett:ok to add it to guidance if we don't want to change the policy

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Policy needs to be clear and unambiguous

Jim Prendergast:yes

Gg Levine (NABP):I agree that the policy should be clear.

Jim Prendergast:clear and unambiguous as CLO says

Jim Prendergast:thats a very important distinction Jeff

Susan Payne:need to be clear. if we are talking about singular/plural it needs to be policy

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:agree it needs to be clear

Jeff Neuman:@Alan - Just to clarify, the GNSO policy did not just think about visual similarity. That was much more of an ICANN-staff interpretation later on

Jeff Neuman:but agree that being clear here is important and agree with Paul that singular/plural is not the only kind of confusion

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):I agree with Alan as to developing policy on singular and plural. However it also has to be qualified in relation to closed generics, if awarded.

Jeff Neuman:WE would also incorporate the previous discussions on this

Alan Greenberg 2:Jeff, My recollection is that we discussed all sorts of confusions during the PDP, but that it was only visual that we included as something to review during the application process. Other types of confusion could be raised in objections.

Trang Nguyen:String similarity review vs. string confusion objection.

Paul McGrady:@Jeff, correct.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):For example, if a closed generic is awarded for .poppy, I would feel more favorably disposed of .poppies - but we also have to be aware that the meaning and purpose of the particular word may not be the generic. So, for example, if there is a registered trademark for .poppy that is for children's clothing as a brand, that probably should not prevent .poppies for sale of the flowers.

Paul McGrady:@Jeff, two different times to look at confusion, but only one policy governing both.

Jon Nevett:early on for sure

Jim Prendergast:yeah - why create a situation where applicants spend time and resoruces applying, only to be denied once ICANN has the application fee?

Trang Nguyen:@Alan, are you talking about an appeals mechanism for the string similarity review and not using string confusion objection if the applicant disagrees with the string similarity panel's determination?

Jeff Neuman:We have string similarity review in this Work Track :)

Jon Nevett:But we should not foreclose the opportunity for an objection

Alan Greenberg:@Trang, yes. Correct.

Jeff Neuman:@Paul - if there are other types of "String similarity" other than singular/plurals that should be handled up front, you should propose that

Alan Greenberg:Where are we in the document?

Steve Chan:@Alan, the bottom of page 2

Steve Chan:and page 3

Alan Greenberg:Thanks.

Paul McGrady:Is this a policy issue or an implementation issue?

Paul McGrady:It feels like it should be in the implementation Guidance instead of policy. Flat fee is a good idea but it seems granular.

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:as long as implementation guidance provides assurance to applicants

Paul McGrady:@Jamie, it will if it makes it into the Guidebook

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:my concern is that the guidebook in the last round provided markers that were not adhered to, so that is not really assurance

Jon Nevett:ICANN could do the remediation

Paul McGrady:+1 SLO

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Thankyou.