

Michelle DeSmyter>Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team - Track 1 - Overall Process/Support/Outreach Issue on Tuesday, 08 August 2017 at 03:00 UTC

Michelle DeSmyter:Agenda wiki page:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_xAAhB&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrw113mSVzgfkbpSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe5iHWGlBLwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=ILBgL6kSRfMm8dz_eITbKtzjeDcOmm0VxXHBqrxVUd0&s=CnsRsmm8zggkwxpw44-BpSze0-6RoPLrN15T1Ty6uJE&e=

Jeff Neuman:We are rocking the attendance tonight, huh

Christa Taylor:rocking

Jeff Neuman:Lets give it a couple more minutes

Jeff Neuman:but if it is just leaders and ICANN staff, it will be tough to have the call

avri doria:there is the 5x5 rule they use in WS2 = 5 attendees (not staff, not chairs etc) by 5 minutes after the appointed time.

Jeff Neuman:2 minute warning

Sara Bockey:@avri, does that exclude leadership folks?

avri doria:yep, we don't count.

avri doria:although we can always do what we want.

Jeff Neuman:Why dont we get the recording started Christa / Sara and then see what attendance is like then

Jeff Neuman:if still below 5 non-ICANN staff/leadership, we can call it

Jim Prendergast:I'm having issues with dial in. anyone else?

Michael Flemming:I don't hear anything either

Michael Flemming:Oh I hear Steve

Christa Taylor:yes

Jim Prendergast:yes

Sara Bockey:yes I can hear now

avri doria:yep

avri doria:lets do it

Rubens Kuhl:I suggest John Poole to deposit 1,000,000 from his money for every application filed.

Jeff Neuman:Does Mr. Poole represent an organization or just himself

Rubens Kuhl:Jeff, basically himself, he is the editor of Domain Mondo.

Rubens Kuhl:<http://www.domainmondo.com/>

Rubens Kuhl:While Brand TLDs might have a different financial analysis, it also has a Spec13 validity or not for that TLD, which is an added cost... so it could be higher than the standard type.

Alan Greenberg:Sorry to be late.

Michael Flemming:Rubens, are you meaning that the verification

of the Spec 13 requires a different cost than other applicants?

Rubens Kuhl:Michael, yes.

Donna Austin, Neustar:Good point Rubens. Similarly, geographic names also require additional evaluation if the government support requirement stays in place. It would be simpler to maintain a standard application fee.

Michael Flemming:If that is the case, then I would like to see if we can reach out to ICANN or ask for Trang's input in regards to the impact of the verification procedure for Spec 13 applicants and if there was any data on how much that cost was.

Rubens Kuhl:Donna, I'm more inclined to a standard application fee... but if we open this box for TLD types, my warning is that it might not be lower as some people think it would be.

Donna Austin, Neustar:we are in agreement Rubens.

Michael Flemming:I think it is a good point. Lets see if we can get the data that argues that point.

Rubens Kuhl:If it's cost-recovery, then it can't be used for compliance or returned to community. So the two are contradictory.

Donna Austin, Neustar:Agreed Rubens.

Donna Austin, Neustar:Surplus from 2012 is not within our scope.

Donna Austin, Neustar:Important distinction Jeff.

Rubens Kuhl:BTW, ongoing fees are also outside of the picket fence.

Justine Chew:Good point, Jeff

Rubens Kuhl:Underserved Regions is an invitation for gaming. I'm from one such region, but I don't want to see people exploiting it as an arbitrage tactic.

Michael Flemming:If we are talking about reducing fees for underserved regions, I think we need to talk about that together with Applicant Support.

avri doria:and personally I would have to see us price the whole world except for the very rich out of the market.

Justine Chew:Agree with Donna, perhaps we should consider a reasonably high entry point application fee but offer "subsidy-type" rebate to underserved regions. +1 Michael

avri doria:... would hate to see ...

Michael Flemming:That is why we have Applicant Support and considerations for underserved regions should be done so there.

avri doria:Does this just become a way for ICANN to make money?

Michael Flemming:But also, we need to review the Applicant Support conditions, of course.

Rubens Kuhl:And Flint, MI might be as underserved as Brazil...

avri doria:Rubens, I agree on the definition of underserved. it needs thinking.

Justine Chew:@Michael, I'm not sure that Applicant Support applies to a reduction of fees as opposed to support in putting the application together for submission.

avri doria:Justine in the last round it covered both, though not successfully.

Michael Flemming:Applicant Support covered financial support and the complexity of the procedure.

Justine Chew:Yes definition of underserved needs reconsideration.

Jeff Neuman:i agree with the way Donna phrased it

Justine Chew:Application fees goes towards cost of processing applications only, no?

Jeff Neuman:I would also include things like covering the communication period, setting up the application systems, etc.

Jeff Neuman:So Donna's version was more accurate than my formulation

Alan Greenberg:@Justine, no, in the first round, there was a VERY substantive program development cost that was repaid via the fees.

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Justine, there is going to be establishment costs, for example TAS has been retired and a new TAS needs to be developed. the application fee should, in my opinion, cover those establishment costs.

Rubens Kuhl:As I mentioned in the list, I oppose keeping 185,000 as the application fee.

Justine Chew 2:Thanks, Alan, Donna, and Jeff. I was attempting to clarify what Jeff had said earlier when my connection dropped.

Michael Flemming:+1

Alan Greenberg:I wasn't assuming that, and that is one of the reasons I would support differential application fees depending on the type of registry.

Rubens Kuhl:Brand TLDs are more of an ongoing cost for ICANN than commercial TLDs, due to them not being dedicated to the domain industry. Lots of compliance activity related to lack of payment of fees, lack of CZDS approvals etc. So from an administrative standpoint, brands are not that cheap for ICANN.

Alan Greenberg:HAVE we lost Donna?

Donna Austin, Neustar:sorry all, not sure what happened.

Donna Austin, Neustar:Let me dial back in.

Donna Austin, Neustar:but please don't wait for me

Steve Chan:All, I think this is the last Cost Considerations document: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_archive.icann.org_en_topics_new-2Dgtlds_cost-2Dconsiderations-2D04oct09-2Dden.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrw1l3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xc14I5cM&r

[=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=ILBgL6kSRfMm8dz_eITbKtzjeDcOmm0VxXHBqrxVUd0&s=7FFATtgnY2m3bin900sNfNHgM8lyvQNb1VNMnMwaeCs&e=](#)

Jeff Neuman:I think this has been a good call in the sense of further refining the concept of cost recovery

Steve Chan:The document I shared helps illustrate how the \$185k was determined

Justine Chew 2:Great, thanks Steve.

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Christa, I disagree, I think there is agreement on cost recovery.

Donna Austin, Neustar:I don't think the ceiling or floor clouds that principle.

Donna Austin, Neustar:Don't wait, we're at the top of the hour.

Michael Flemming:But we did get through a topic!

Michael Flemming:Good call.

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

Sara Bockey:thanks all

avri doria:bye

Justine Chew 2:My apologies for the next call.