

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear All, Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WG call on Tuesday, 29 August 2017 at 03:00 UTC

Michelle DeSmyter:Agenda wiki page:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_egchB&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrw113mSVz_gfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWG1BLwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=yzninMJUEcEsjY_rqjBXp4ch0Aq50Mf123tUJPFbQTW&s=eKZPz428zpWnX0a088PnF1Z8uFgu_WNLm3ph-Er1NuM&e=

Kavouss Arasteh:Hi Michelle

Michelle DeSmyter:Hi there Kavouss!

vanda scartezini:hi everyone

Michael Flemming:Afternoon, everyone.

Jeff Neuman:hello

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):yes Jeff

Michael Flemming:Loud and clear.

Krishna Seeburn (Kris):loud and clear

Kavouss Arasteh:Hi everybody

Jeff Neuman:hello

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):hi all

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Hi Cheryl

Jeff Neuman:Starting call soon

Kavouss Arasteh:Good time to all,the participants of the most popular and crowded group

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Hey Kavouss - hope this is a good time of day for you!

vanda scartezini:thanks kavouss

Kavouss Arasteh:Hi avri, here is 05,00 local time, your voice is sounds sleepy

Annebeth Lange, ccNSO:Hello, everyone

Michael Flemming:Sarah

Michael Flemming:We can't hear you too well

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Hello All

Karen Day:yes

Rubens Kuhl:We can hear you.

Sara Bockey:no worries

Kavouss Arasteh:not sufficiently high level

Michael Flemming:I turned up the speakers. It might've just been me

Rubens Kuhl:Since WT2 is so light on topics, we will be sending Question 18 to them... ;-)

Rubens Kuhl:(Actually WT2 and WT3)

Heather Forrest:Very cruel, Rubens

Heather Forrest:Great to hear that we have one co-leader for new WT5. Hope we can appoint others soon.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Heather we just like to share ;-)

Jeff Neuman:Nothing yet frm GAC, but I understand they may be

discussing it on their leadership meeting later this week

Heather Forrest:I can do my best (from GNSO Council Chair perspective) to answer any questions on the points Avri is raising re PDP guidelines

Heather Forrest:No problem Avri - I'm just going to ask about our progress in nominating a GNSO co-leader

Rubens Kuhl:There are no minority or majority concepts in a consensus-based decision making.

Kavouss Arasteh:Rubens, but there are some concerns about consensus meaning

Rubens Kuhl:Kavouss, consensus in a GNSO PDP can only mean one thing... but it shares its properties with the IETF rough consensus tradition, where even one view can change the outcome.

Rubens Kuhl:This is for instance the case of many encryption standards (TLS) where a single Google comment was able to change the outcome, since they were recognized as having the experience to point out things that don't work in scale.

Kavouss Arasteh:Ihope there would be no more than one person from each 4 group

Steve Chan:You can review GNSO PDP decision making rules under section 3.6 here in the WG guidelines:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_gns0.icann.org_en_council_annex-2D1-2Dgns0-2Dwg-2Dguidelines-2D01sep16-2Den.pdf&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl13mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xc14I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=yzninMJUEcEsjY_rqjBXp4ch0Aq50Mf123tUJPFbQTW&s=dhgBGvxjYq17Hs2I0hlmuAFQE8WInVlxVrPrbzjeDAM&e=

Heather Forrest:@Jeff, Avri, good to know that this is in progress, and in accordance with standard practice. I wouldn't anticipate that Council itself would make nominations (as that would come through the SSC)

Rubens Kuhl:Kavouss, it's never about quantity.

Kavouss Arasteh:That is not as simple as you qualified

Robin Gross:Policy for generic names is guided by the GNSO under ICANNs bylaws. It sounds like some have a problem with the structure of ICANN.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):very clear... thank you Arrive

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):I think it is a bit diifferent when ccNSO participates in a PDP. They don't really have quite the same policy-making process, do they?

Annebeth Lange, ccNSO:I am happy to hear that, Avri, since geographical names are of special interest to more groups than GNSO than any other gTLDs

Jim Prendergast:so just to recap. the ccNSO has put forth someone, waiting on GNSO and ALAC but they are moving on it and

we think GAC may be addressing it this week on leadership call. is that correct? and what is the best guess on when the leadership will be settled?

Robin Gross:When does the GNSO get to participate in CCNSO policy making?

Greg Shatan:Would it make sense to have a webinar on the GNSO PDP Working Group guidelines for those unfamiliar with them?

Philip Corwin:I don't understand how sincere outreach in the cause of inclusion could be regarded as an attempt to construct an 'alibi'.

Rubens Kuhl:Anne, ccNSO does have PDPs... their PDPs are usually less time-sensitive and less controversial, but they share some DNSO origins with GNSO, including PDPs.

Greg Shatan:That might allay some of these fears.

Karen Day:Good thought Greg.

Greg Shatan:It should be noted that GNSO PDP Working Groups are ALWAYS open to any participant from any group or no group.

Rubens Kuhl:Jim, GNSO Council will not be putting a name forward for GNSO. Those names were referred to reach out to the full WG chairs (Jeff and Avri) and come forward with their application.

Annebeth Lange, ccNSO:But Greg, in the end it will be the GNSO council that decides, will it not?

Anne Aikman-Scalase (IPC):It is a very positive that GAC representatives and ccNSO participate actively in Sub Pro.

Karen Day:@Kavouss - I can confirm that is the way this PDP is already operating with regard to work team co-leads.

Robin Gross:I'm trying to imagine what it would be like for GNSO participants to have equal footing with GAC in their working groups.

Greg Shatan:The Working Group's final report, after probably 2 rounds of public comment, and approval by the Working Group, will go to the Council for approval. But it is up to the WG to write and approve the report.

Heather Forrest:The GNSO Council is required, under ICANN Bylaws, to vote on any recommendations of GNSO PDPs - but Council obviously respects the work of the PDP WGs

Rubens Kuhl:Annebeth, GNSO Council is a process manager, not a legislative body... so the Council can verify if anything went outside of PDP process or conflicts with bylaws, but wouldn't replace the WG report with their own views on something.

Heather Forrest:(Greg, Rubens and I have all just made the same point in different words - great minds think alike - and of course it would have to be that Council couldn't simply legislate on its own or we wouldn't have or need PDP WGs)

Greg Shatan:Good points Rubens and Heather (both on Council, by

the way). The GNSO Council is also NOT a policy development body - that is the job of the (always open) Working Groups.

Greg Shatan:The role of the GNSO Council could be covered in the webinar as well.

Kavouss Arasteh:I suggest we say "SOME LEVEL"of predictability instead of "A LEVEL "

Kavouss Arasteh:Ialso suggest to add the word"relative"before stability

Annebeth Lange, ccNSO:I think there is a special sensitivity when it comes to geographical names among the other stakeholders, as many do not consider them "true generics". Since we only have 2 categories in TLDs, these naturally fall under gTLDs. However, what I was reporting here were the concerns I hear. Since ICANN Bylaws are as they are, we have to try to make the best out of it to avoid the same problems we had in the last round, when many years of discussion took place after the first AGB was produced.

Rubens Kuhl:Annebeth, I offer another angle on this: having the GNSO policy on those names defined is a kind of insurance that makes that if those names are considered gTLDs, they are also protected by reasonable rules to assure they are not misused.

Jim Prendergast:don't forget impact of GAC advice as well

Annebeth Lange, ccNSO:Thanks, Rubens

Michael Flemming:Jeff, question for clarity. Predictability in our discussion is limited to the process itself and not necessarily the outcome as in delay in some TLDs to launch/use their TLD, correct?

Heather Forrest:Do we address specifically in this document how it is determined that something is policy as opposed to implementation (and vice versa)?

Michael Flemming:How about a system that allows the applications to be submitted in document format?

Michael Flemming:Ah, my apologies.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):RFP for system?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):at the first place

Greg Shatan:It seems like the processes created by the Policy & Implementation Working Group should be applied to many of these instances.

Greg Shatan:Has this been considered?

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):We lost heather.

Heather Forrest:We need to know what the vendor's timeline for fix is

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Yes - Greg - I agree. The big issue here is Who should determine whether an issue involves policy or not. I think IRT should determine. I don't necessarily buy the notion that that staff or some informal discussion can determine whether or not policy issues are involved. Current

draft of Predictability Framework says "staff will collaborate with the community". I honestly don't know what that means in terms of decision-making.

Heather Forrest:@Jeff - one of the factors is the stress on the system. Having a "round" or "window" only opened for a brief time, with a definite closing day makes this more of an issue.

Kavouss Arasteh:Agree with Greg

Jim Prendergast:I wouldn't say the don't care about it. ensuring the application process is secure and fair is critical to the trust in the program.

Kavouss Arasteh:If an issue came up where ICANN had to change application process, is this purely implementation? Is it something the community should weigh in on?

Kavouss Arasteh:If fully agree with that

Heather Forrest:Looks like we have 2 different conversations here in the chat - one on policy vs implementation, the other on the system

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@Heather - the policy and implementation WG determined that it is not valuable to try to decide whether or not an issue is policy or implementation - it is only important to determine how the policy maker (GNSO) decides to treat that topic - whether or not it involves policy.

Michael Flemming:Depends on the issue, no?

Heather Forrest:I agree with Jeff but it's not clear to me how we determine whether something goes back to the IRT or not

Michael Flemming:Couldn't we have development of the system by one third party and then a risk analysis by another third party?

Rubens Kuhl:I don't think we can avoid an IRT, since this is a PDP WG . Non-PDP WGs perhaps could choose that.

Kavouss Arasteh:There is a background tlks

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):I have commented on the list that IRT should be "standing" - to be consulted whenever an issue arises.

Greg Shatan:I think trying to say some of these are not implementation issues is causing confusion.

Greg Shatan:Just as implementation problems raise policy issues, execution problems raise implementation issues.

Kavouss Arasteh:Jeff, I have some difficulties with your new term execution versus implementation

Greg Shatan:Maybe we need an Implementation & Execution Working Group....

Rubens Kuhl:Jeff, the type of issues you mentioned sounds similar to the IANA CSC (Customer Standing Committee) to me. Perhaps we could recommend something in that direction ? NTAG (New gTLD Applicant Group) and BRG (Brand Registry Group) both made interesting interactions with staff during the program.

Kavouss Arasteh:Jeff, may we avoid to use "Execution" as it

may cause some confusion with implementation

Kavouss Arasteh:eff, may we avoid to use "Execution" as it may cause some confusion with implementation

Jeff Neuman:@Kavouss - is there a better word to use?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):name collisions were poor third party report issue

Jim Prendergast:name collision was actually a security and stability issue but your point is still valid

Rubens Kuhl:Name collisions actually surfaced during policy development, nobody cared... surfaced during implementation, nobody cared... it ended up being defined at execution time, but it was not execution.

Kavouss Arasteh:Not to use it at all but stay with implementation only

avri doria:27 minutes left on meeting.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Msut leave Adobe - can stay on the phone

Rubens Kuhl:If CSC doesn't have a say in preventing a matter to be discussed at IRT, then when don't have to discuss what is execution, what is implementation, what is policy...

Rubens Kuhl:I'm not, sorry.

Rubens Kuhl:(then we)

avri doria:if we decide to use execution, we will obviously need to define it. I suggest we try and base our discrimination between the two based on the analysis done by the GNSO and published as a report.

Kavouss Arasteh:Yes

avri doria:and as Anee said, it determined that the two were never completely disentagled, though at the beginning of a project it was mostly policy and at the end it was mostly implementation.

avri doria:apologies: as Anne said ...

Greg Shatan:How would the ExCSC differ from the IRT?

Kavouss Arasteh:yes to the question you raised

Rubens Kuhl:Greg, usually less members, with roles representing different parties. In IANA they are gTLD registries, non-registries GNSO, ccTLD registries, RIRs, protocols;

Kavouss Arasteh:Jeff, as you suggested ,we need to give a hand to ICANN Staff in those circumstances

Michael Flemming:Greg has his hand raised

Rubens Kuhl:For a SubPro CSC, it could be "applicants", "current registries", "objectors" and "communities" or something like that.

Trang Nguyen:The process documentation work that we recently did can help to clarify the phases. There is the policy development process, carried out by the community. Once the Board

adopts, then it's the policy implementation phase carried out by ICANN and IRT. This phase concludes upon the effective date of the policy, which in this context would be the opening of the application process. Then it moves into the operations phase. The CPIF and IRT are applicable to the policy implementation phase. Once the policy is in operation and issues arise, we need some guidance on how to deal with issues, particularly issues where the policy is silent on.

Rubens Kuhl:Trang, operations phase is so much better than execution. Execution reminds me of people being killed. ;-)

vanda scartezini:quite clear Trang.

avri doria:i do not think there are any inherent limitations in the amount of time an IRT serves.

Rubens Kuhl:But I would hope that issues where the policy is silent on should go back to the IRT, because it looks like some policy guidance was expected but not available.

avri doria:and the WG makes recommendations on how an IRT will be formed and run.

Greg Shatan:If policy guidance is needed, then the P&IWG processes are supposed to be used.

Greg Shatan:I don't think "confusion" is the issue....

avri doria:i agree a graphic will be useful.

avri doria:15 minutes left to meeting

Michael Flemming:Wouldn't it be an ORT in that case?

Michael Flemming:poor joke, sorry

Kavouss Arasteh:How we are ensured that such action does not have any impact on policy developed

Kavouss Arasteh:How we are ensured that such action would not have any impact on policy developed

Rubens Kuhl:@Kavouss, that can be a post-facto control: somebody would file an RfR (Request for Consideration) for such action.

Rubens Kuhl:I did care a lot for that particular change Jeff mentioned.

Kavouss Arasteh:There is some voice in the background when Greg speaking

Greg Shatan:Apologies, I have guests. My cousin has just arrived from Los Angeles. My wife is entertaining him while I do this.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I think multistakeholder model works with policy and not with at implementation

Kavouss Arasteh:Maxim +1

Greg Shatan:I told them I was helping to run the Internet. They were not impressed.

Greg Shatan:I absolutely disagree with the idea that the multistakeholder model doesn't work with implementation.

Greg Shatan:IRTs are multistakeholder.

Kavouss Arasteh:I also have difficulties the MSH be involved in the implementation process

Trang Nguyen:The discussion around taking things back to IRTs imply that implementation needs to be changed/modified when in fact I think of the example about PDT test specs as operational evolution. From that perspective, I like Jeff's suggestion of a standing panel.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):ICANN staff implements, and they do not allow us to interfere directly :)

avri doria:I tend to believe that all processes in ICANN should be multistakeholder at their base.

Greg Shatan:Oh, those pesky multistakeholders. They keep wanting to stay in the room....

Greg Shatan:I don

Greg Shatan:I don't consider the role of the community to be "interference".

Rubens Kuhl:Greg, I like the multistakeholders in the room... but sometimes we need the ones directly affected by something to come forward.

Greg Shatan:It is guidance and review.

Greg Shatan:It sounds like some people don't like the idea of IRTs?

avri doria:i think that directly affected and indirectly affected are incredibly hard to disentangle.

Greg Shatan:The indirectly affected can be more objective about the issues.

avri doria:3 minutes

Kavouss Arasteh:Any thing that slow down the process should be avoided

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:lots to think over from today's call... Thanks everyone

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bye all

Heather Forrest:Thanks Avri and Jeff

Sara Bockey:thanks all

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:Bye for now then

Aslam G Mohamed:Thanks everyone. See you in Abu Dhabi

Greg Shatan:Bye all!

vanda scartezini:thanks all

Annebeth Lange, ccNSO:Bye