

Julie Bisland:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 4 – IDNs/Technical & Operations will take place on Thursday, 31 August 2017 at 15:00

Julie Bisland:Agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_NAEhB&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3Pj6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=iITyTEVB6Wl3WODRJgu7nPSOa1zV3JrvEd0oigEfrMk&s=ujVOH7Rc5dG7IXGGSB5j99K8Cb-9zggPFnfKMG_xQY0&e=

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):hi there

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):hi Rubens

Trang Nguyen:Note that Q18, although not scored, is used by the Tech/Fin panel as context for those evals.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):oops I neglected to ask you all if there were any changes to your SOIs to report to the meeting, sorry ðŸ˜˜... I blame the hour here (0105)... PLEASE note here if you need to update your SOI, and we will come back to that at end of the call.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Noted, thanks Trang

Jeff Neuman:@Anne - do you have a proposal?

Jeff Neuman:@Rubens - I am not sure that was what I understood. If you have contention resolution prior to evaluating the new services, then in theory if there are auctions, the participant of the auction that proposed the new ancillary service will be assuming that the service will be approved in determining how much it wants to bid. IF the service is refused, that could be a huge hit on the winner

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@Jeff - I am very concerned about streamlining and granting early contracting to applicants that are not offering new services. Agree with Alan we are looking for innovation and new ideas. This proposal does not support that direction.

Phil Buckingham:@ Trang I agree.. The question is whether to drop Q18 . What happens if an applicant wishes to change their mission statement (Q18) post acheiving a financial / technical evaluation pass . Should the evaluations need to be redone based on the new mission statement .

Jeff Neuman:@Anne - To take the other side, speed of approval does encourage innovation.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):It almost sounds as though we are concerned about a contracting logjam. What is the concern we are trying to address for applicants? Is it earlier contracting and earlier launch?

Jeff Neuman:I should say, can encourage innovation

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Jeff - not if speed dictates sameness of servie. It will in fact discourage innovation, i.e. do what has already been done and you will launch and sell names very quickly.

Jeff Neuman:Because the last process took years for applications to be evaluated, approved, contracted, etc.....those that did want to innovate either had huge staff turnover, lost budget, lost staff, lost resources, etc. between the application submission in 2012 and when they were finally approved/contracted in 2015/2016

Jeff Neuman:@Anne - you are assuming a limited 3rd party registration model

Jeff Neuman:you need to think bigger than that

Jeff Neuman:One of the biggest reasons I have found that brands have not launched or have not launched as big as we all throught they would, is the time lage between app submission and approval

Jeff Neuman:all of the delays took its toll

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Odd refference to my type of thinking Jeff - please be more specific - it doesn't help to just say my thinking is somehow not big enough for you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):indeed Jeff

Jeff Neuman:So I would argue that the slowness discouraged innovation greatly

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@Jeff - so the problem is how quickly we process applications - it may be about not having enough qualified contractting staff that is temporary. The root cause could be something other than you say.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):yes Alan

Rubens Kuhl:Personal opinion: brands are waiting for Google to use non-legacy TLDs. ;-)

Alan Greenberg:@Jeff, that is exactly the type of registry that may NEED a special service.

Jeff Neuman:There were a lot of factors they caused the delays. There was not just one root cause

Jeff Neuman:@Anne - I disagree that that is the root cause

avri doria:i would probably argue that there are several contenders for root cause.

Rubens Kuhl:Amdahl's law: we can only increase the efficiency of the scope we are looking at.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):thanks Trang

Rubens Kuhl:.frogans was also something a bit different.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):I believe that proposed new services are part of evaluation. We should have dual simultaneous tracks - not just delay all new services to later contracting.

avri doria:yes, exception processing, of all sorts, was a time sink.

Rubens Kuhl:TM+50 also caused a delay.

Sarah L Verisign:Speaking of the new CEO (at the time) I remember when Fadi Chehade stood up at the time and said that the program wasn't ready, in his opinion, but he was being told by the community to push ahead regardless (paraphrase) and that is what happened. I think there is a concern that when we put expediency ahead of efficiency and general readiness there are going to be delays – things don't go as expected for any number of reasons which is why it's so important to get it closer to general readiness this time.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):thanks Sarah,

Jeff Neuman:@Sarah - Fadi claimed it wasn't ready because he believed that there should be a unilateral right to amend registry contracts and a way to incorporate "public interest commitments". I do not believe he claimed it was because ICANN staff and third party providers were not ready to accept applications and evaluate them

Jeff Neuman:@Sarah - and developing a predictability framework as we discussed on Monday is key to ensuring there is a process to handle the new things when they do arise

Sarah L Verisign:What he said was... . "Honestly, if it was up to me, I would delay the whole release of new gTLDs by at least a year." 2. "... a lot of the foundations that I would be comfortable with, as someone who has built businesses before, are just not yet there." 3. "We have people who took six years to write the [new gTLD Applicant] Guidebook and we're asking engineers and software people and third-party vendors and hundreds of people to get that whole program running in six months."

Sarah L Verisign:etc

Alan Greenberg:@Rubens First time I have heard Gene Amdahl or his law mentioned in a very long time.

Jeff Neuman:[Note that when he said this it was after his meeting in Davos with governments which raised his profile in the governmental community....something he was very interested in doing. Things need to be viewed in complete context

Alan Greenberg:He died just 2 years ago.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):PROPOSAL - ICANN Should have two sections for processing applications: one would process applications that contain no new services proposals. The other would handle applications which contain proposals for new services. In this manner, they would proceed in parallel so that processing of applications with new services proceeds apace and is not disadvantaged by being considered later at the contracting phase. The other problem with this is that applicants will come in with basic services in order to get approval and then raise new services later in contracting that may not be part of evaluation but maybe should have been part of evaluation.

Donna Austin, Neustar:Agree with Jeff, that its important that context is taken into account particularly when quoting Fadi, also important to understand who is audience was.

Sarah L Verisign:@Donna and @Jeff, I do agree that his comments should be considered in context are important but it isnt correct just to say they were contractual or framework related.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):ok

Julie Bisland:The next New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 4 – IDNs/Technical & Operations will take place on Thursday, 14 September 2017 at 20:00 UTC for 60 minutes.

avri doria:are variants to the strawproposal still possible?

Sarah L Verisign:I like Anne's suggestion that there should be an "off-ramp" for applications that have exceptional requirements so as not to delay more standard applications

Steve Chan:20:00 UTC

Rubens Kuhl:Avri, sure. I will send one to the list.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Thanks Sarah - I think that if you have two ramps up front - you have a much better "middle ground". That way extra services are part of evaluation phase (not just contracting.) and these proceed as quickly as possible.

avri doria:or an option to get an RSEP-like preeval before needing to pay for any other exception processing. (exception = objection, contentions, &c.)

Phil Buckingham:@ Anne , I agree the need for two sections . Perhaps there should be an inbuilt time factor. Applicant have to wait 2 years (say) post launch before new proposals for new services can be proposed . That would require a full re-evaluation of the new business model.

Jeff Neuman:@sarah and @Anne - if there is an off ramp, to the extent that we do rounds, that will be an off ramp for all applications in that contention set

Jeff Neuman:I would encourage that we tie this all to the predictability framework as well

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):thanks everyone

Phil Buckingham:thanks