

Terri Agnew:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 3 – String Contention, Objections & Disputes on Tuesday, 01 August 2017 at 15:00 UTC for 60 minutes.

Terri Agnew:agenda wiki page: [https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_community.icann.org\\_x\\_twAhB&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=taqsTungLzfujYRllqnFQSUsXCHXbuHvh5hHV\\_8W00k&s=gaN5ZSI4galccaFpEcTE\\_vdCnTrb3PTySAsqcHcmLb4&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_twAhB&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=taqsTungLzfujYRllqnFQSUsXCHXbuHvh5hHV_8W00k&s=gaN5ZSI4galccaFpEcTE_vdCnTrb3PTySAsqcHcmLb4&e=)

Jeff Neuman:hearing a bunch of crackling noise

Jeff Neuman:Anne, that may be coming from you

Jeff Neuman:Is Robin on?

Jeff Neuman:Just give us one more minute and we will start

Jeff Neuman:sure

Michael Flemming:yes

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:I was curious if we will be returning to 3.1.5 since it was not covered on the last call

Terri Agnew:New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group will take place on Monday, 07 August 2017 at 20:00 UTC for 90 minutes.

Alan Greenberg:Not particularly relevant to this group, but I have been selected as Chair (Interim) of the RDS-WHOIS2-RT.

Emily Barabas:The full group call will be on 29 August at 3:00 UTC

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Congrats Alan - good to know.

Emily Barabas:(Tuesday in UTC, but Monday night for those calling in from the Americas)

avri doria:no addition

Emily Barabas:document is now unsynced so everyone can zoom as needed

Emily Barabas:we are on page 7

Emily Barabas:Excerpts are on display in the central pod. Full text of the comments are available here:

[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_docs.google.com\\_spreadsheets\\_d\\_1A5uaxBAGmg7QsFuqMdVvt1HxNZ4jKXnm3Hp0gZra7U0\\_edit&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=taqsTungLzfujYRllqnFQSUsXCHXbuHvh5hHV\\_8W00k&s=jLCBZwF85LNAScKDFApSmyc0c\\_vBtg8G-4t2WlMr9sA&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_docs.google.com_spreadsheets_d_1A5uaxBAGmg7QsFuqMdVvt1HxNZ4jKXnm3Hp0gZra7U0_edit&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=taqsTungLzfujYRllqnFQSUsXCHXbuHvh5hHV_8W00k&s=jLCBZwF85LNAScKDFApSmyc0c_vBtg8G-4t2WlMr9sA&e=)

avri doria:so yes dotgay was forced to respond to someone who was ultimately denied standing.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):COMMENT: I support the idea of a screening based on standing but it should not take forever to do - should be done quickly in order to provide certainty for Applicants and potential Objectors.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):makes sense to me Anne

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Agree with Alan it is difficult to determine standing without both sides filing pleadings.

Alan Greenberg:I strongly support a preliminary determination (which will catch most who do not have standing).

Alan Greenberg:Better said by Anne.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):indeed! be very useful

Alan Greenberg:To be clear, what I was saying was that there should be a preliminary determination on standing, and if it fails, the objection is dead. Only if preliminary standing is granted does the complain proceed.

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:I could concur with that Alan. Basic investigation to confirm that the objector represents a legitimate organization that is capable of achieving standing is key.

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:but does it mean that no other entity can object to the community application if they select CPE?

avri doria:and for a community objector, is this just the applicant being barred or any of the community who supported the application?

Alan Greenberg:Note that 2/19 is 10%.

Alan Greenberg:I presume the IO was not paid on a per-objection basis. That would be a direct conflict of interest.

Trang Nguyen:The IO was not paid on a per-objection basis.

avri doria:the degree to which any of the money spent on application processing and objection resolution were good expenditures is a large subject of its own.

Trang Nguyen:@Jeff, the AGB says "The IO may consider public comment when making an independent assessment whether an objection is warranted. The IO will have access to application comments received during the comment period."

avri doria:i.e once we start the evaluation of function versus expenditure, this is not the only one that should be subject to such analysis.i.e once we start the evaluation of function versus expenditure, this is not the only one that should be subject to such analysis.

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:i think it would be hard to conduct a full 360 on the effectiveness of the IO. we will never have any idea how many gTLD ideas or applications were thwarted by the mere existence of an IO.

Greg Shatan:We need a Bodhisattva.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Underlying philosophical basis was the Limited Public Interest Objection. If poorly executed, it needs to be fixed. Otherwise, we are getting rid of that Objection.

Greg Shatan:@Jamie, do you have any reason to believe that any applications were thwarted/unfiled due to the existence of the IO?

Trang Nguyen:The AGB also says "In light of the public interest goal noted above, the IO shall not object to an application unless at least one comment in opposition to the application is made in the public sphere." So, you are correct, Jeff.

avri doria:can we invite IO for a discussion?

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:@Greg, without the IO role to intervene on issues of morality or human rights with string applications, what would stop people from applying from them and who would intervene to prevent some of the ideas mentioned on this call?

avri doria:the discussion of his understanding might help in revising the description of the function

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Agree with Jamie. If the IO is the wrong tool or needs more support to determine Limited Public Interest, we should fix that. What if the ICANN Board appointed a non-conflicted subcommittee?

Susan Payne:IO's final activity report may be of interest

[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_www.independent-2Dobjector-2Dnewgtlds.org\\_home\\_final-2Dactivity-2Dreport\\_&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=taqsTungLzfujYRllqnFQSUsXCHXbuHvh5hHV\\_8W00k&s=0In10JVVDYy6Fne0MVMtRawwujuzlbsMtE-22UlyT8s&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.independent-2Dobjector-2Dnewgtlds.org_home_final-2Dactivity-2Dreport_&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-H4xR2EBk&m=taqsTungLzfujYRllqnFQSUsXCHXbuHvh5hHV_8W00k&s=0In10JVVDYy6Fne0MVMtRawwujuzlbsMtE-22UlyT8s&e=)

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

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

Terri Agnew:@Jeff, apology noted for next call

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Thanks Jeff et al.

Robin Gross:Thanks Jeff for jump in! Bye!

