Terri Agnew: Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 1 - Overall Process/Support/Outreach Issue call on Tuesday, 22 August 2017 at 15:00 UTC for 60 minutes.

Terri Agnew:agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-

 $\frac{3A - community.icann.org - x - JQEhB\&d=DwlFaQ\&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4l5cM\&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0Algn-$

H4xR2EBk&m=JenAbyn7jXXXPh8zjzmu65audlg2VirwxtaWCT2iP5A&s=gdswa-

ZIEwjYV9C4iprTmB3CM0rMTxm8Qw3tJ0m6iNM&e=

Terri Agnew:The CC2 responses we will be covering may be review in the google document:

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

3A docs.google.com spreadsheets d 1427pgTCkguOj2NZZzMnz-5FH-5FlPe54dtvUErSJd9uhkZw edit-23gid-

 $\underline{3D1442059046\&d} = \underline{DwIFaQ\&c} = \underline{FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4l5cM\&r} = \underline{DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfga0Algn} + \underline{DRa2dXAvSFpClgmxAvSfpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfga0Algn} + \underline{DRa2dXAvSFpClgmxAvSfpClgmxAvSfpClgmxAvSfpClgmxAvSfpClgmxAvSfpClgmxAvSfpClgmxAvSfpClgmxAvSfpClgmxAvSfpClgmxAvSfpClgmxAvSfpClgmxAvSfpClgmxAvSfpClgmxAvSfpClgmxAvSfpClgmxAvSfpClgmxAvSfpClgmxA$

H4xR2EBk&m=JenAbyn7jXXXPh8zjzmu65audIg2VirwxtaWCT2iP5A&s=NIGKnSfOzDc41RVFR_28g7Yc6uCL4HUirxnvKOCZndU&e=

Christa Taylor: Can you hear me?

Christa Taylor:rebooting

Jeff Neuman:hello all

Alan Greenberg: Conundrum - great wiord!

Steve Chan:@Christa, Alan has his hand up

Alexander Schubert: Maybe not reducing fees - but offering financial "support" then?

Alan Greenberg: Agree with Donna both on need for discussion and potential reasons.

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Alexander, that's the term I was looking for: financial support. thank you.

Alexander Schubert::D

Alexander Schubert: Good idea!

Alexander Schubert:Problem: Volume based fee increase will be circumvented by the Donuts system: new entity for each app!

Donna Austin, Neustar: For the record, I don't believe there would be any variation in the application fee. It should be the same across the types of applications and to Alexander's point earlier, we can look at reasons for providing financial support.

Alan Greenberg: @Alexander. Perhaps, but they would have to work a lot harder at masking their shared ownership and presumably penalties for trying.

Greg Shatan: Alexander, that probably could be controlled for - after all, everyone knows that all of those came from are all Donuts from the same Donuts shop.

Donna Austin, Neustar: Donuts were not the only portfolio applicants.

Alexander Schubert: Donna: But Donuts had unique legal entities for every app! That's what I am referring to.

Greg Shatan: I think at least one other applicant used the multiple entity approach.

Donna Austin, Neustar: Understood Alexander, my point was more the point that Donuts is always referred to but there were other entities that had multiple applications as well.

Donna Austin, Neustar: Some of those are corporations.

Steve Chan:CPE was an additional fee that was paid back in the event the applicant met the criteria.

Steve Chan:Paid BACK

Alexander Schubert: Well: not many met the criteria: D

Donna Austin, Neustar:I think as a general principle, we should aim to have the application process as simple as possible for the applicants and for ICANN to administer. It seems that we may be overengineering for any positive outcome.

Jeff Neuman: It would only save time if no competing applications

Alexander Schubert: Christa: Then you need to have a "test" on wheher they are a "real brand"!

Anybody can register a TM and claim they are a "brand" - and all important generic terms are branded in many places!

Katrin Ohlmer: We also support the concept of simplicity - for applicants and ICANN

Alexander Schubert: "branded" = "trademarked" rather

Greg Shatan: The "community" status was arguably "gamed" quite a bit....

Greg Shatan:If a word is a trademark it is not being used in its generic sense. So it is not correct to say that "generic terms are trademarked," But I digress.

Phil Buckingham: Ffrom the financial model / evaluation perspective we cant have a "one size fits " all this time. A brand model would so easier to evaluate than a community model.

Jeff Neuman:Greg - what are the indirect costs?

Jeff Neuman:that you think should be covered

Jeff Neuman:Remember we have defined the costs as being of the application process itself

Jeff Neuman:ongoing fees are covered through ICANN yearly fees

Alan Greenberg:Jeff, we also clearly included costs of developing the program.

Alexander Schubert: Christa: Define "brand" application! So I can register a TM "orange" apply for ".orange" and then "lease" domains (much like CentralNic's .de.com third level registrations) avoiding all the hassle with registrant rights! People buy third level domain from CentralNic at even HIGHER prices than .com - the model works well. But "registrants" (leasees) have ZERO "rights".

Jeff Neuman: Alan - Yes we did previously. Doesnt mean we should going forward......

Jeff Neuman:that is still an ongoing discussion

Donna Austin, Neustar: Agree with Ashley, it would be good if we could aim to wrap up discussions in a timely fashion rather than drawing them out.

Terri Agnew: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 1 - Overall Process/Support/Outreach Issue will take place on Tuesday, 05 September 2017 at 20:00 UTC for 60 minutes.

Greg Shatan:At a minimum, I would think the costs of developing the program would be included in any cost analysis.

Jeff Neuman:We also need to balance that with a complete rehashing of the same issues if new people join :)

Greg Shatan: Query whether all the costs of ICANN in the New gTLD world should be as well.

Ashley Roberts:thanks Alexander Schubert:Bye! Katrin Ohlmer:Thanks! Greg Shatan:Bye!