

Julie Bisland:Welcome to the The call for the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 3 – String Contention, Objections & Disputes on Tuesday, 10 October 2017 at 20:00 UTC

Julie Bisland:Agenda wiki page: [https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_community.icann.org\\_x\\_roJEB&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QjF-](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_roJEB&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QjF-)

[05YzARosRvTYd84AB\\_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=rMsh9VZz\\_J48OCp3snSsQytQ4EeEh7b1xMRW7hTnRh4&s=Yicn11YVUcyISXpQOCBA7Wa4ZzWO5itTFyQuMvnff80&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_roJEB&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QjF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=rMsh9VZz_J48OCp3snSsQytQ4EeEh7b1xMRW7hTnRh4&s=Yicn11YVUcyISXpQOCBA7Wa4ZzWO5itTFyQuMvnff80&e=)

jeff neuman:FYI - for the next 15 mins or so I will not be on adobe, but will be listening on the phone

Karen Day:Hi all

Julie Bisland:thanks Jeff, I've noted this on Adobe

Julie Bisland:Avri, we can't hear you

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:bad audio

Julie Bisland:Still nothing Avri

Julie Bisland:she's trying again to get audio

Karen Day:As well as accountability mechanisms no?

avri doria:after 3 tries back,

avri doria:i think

Jim Prendergast:is there a specific day you are looking at?

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Maybe those are good topics for Face to Face

Anne Aikman-Scalese:THanks Karen

Jim Prendergast:see i t in notes

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Be there or be square

avri doria:24th people are travelling

Julie Bisland:Donna, no audio

Jim Prendergast:so the plenary on 10/23 will be cancelled?

Donna Austin, Neustar:ok, thanks Karen

Anne Aikman-Scalese:I think Donna has a pretty good idea about reversing the order here and preparing on GAC topics.

Steve Chan>Note, the meeting with the GAC is only 30 minutes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:makes sense

Julie Bisland:Anne: no audio

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:audio?

Steve Chan:After the 30 minute GAC meeting with WT1 and WT3, the GAC will be talking amongst themselves, though it's an open session for anyone to attend.

Donna Austin, Neustar:Given Jeff's examples, I think opening this up will create more problems than its worth.

Phil Buckingham:That would be a great idea , Anne

Jim Prendergast:if as Jeff said it can be gamed too easily - I think we need to be very very cautious.

Roger Carney:@jeff @Jim, talking that one step further, I am not sure the benefits outweigh the risks/costs

Jim Prendergast:they way round 1 went - I would have loved to applied for a bunch of contended tlds. Would have made huge \$\$\$ in private auctions.

jeff neuman:@Jim - I know, but in the brands situation I can see areas where changing a string should be allowed

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Roger, I don't think any benefit would outweigh the risk/cost.

jeff neuman:Lets say a string is found to be "geographic" when no one thought it would be and the GAC objected. I think rather than the Board refusing to delegate anything, perhaps an alternative could be selected

Roger Carney:@Donna :)

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Roger, I meant to say I agree with you.

Alan Greenberg:Can I please be unmuted?

jeff neuman:I think we should separate String Similarity from String contention

jeff neuman:They are 2 different things

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Don't think you should be able to opt out of one string contention set into another. It would have to be an option to go to a clear string that was contemplated by your initial application as a fallback.

jeff neuman:The first part is String Similarity (a check against existing strings)

jeff neuman:if it is judged to be too similar to an existing string, the application dies

Phil Buckingham:Anne , I think we could apply that ( a second choice ) to a closed brand , but would be more difficult , in terms of potential gaming for an open TLD

jeff neuman:I am talking about at this stage that a string should be allowed to be changed as opposed to at the "Contention phase"

Alan Greenberg:I am muted and cannot unmute myself.

Jon Nevett:what if more than one party wanted to switch to the same alternative TLD? Would that create another contention set?

Steve Chan:Sorry Alan, just saw your note.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Rules: 1. you have to specify your alternates up front - max 4 total. You cannot opt into another contention set. (3) There should still be a reasonable relationship between the TLD name and the stated Question 18 purpose of the TLD.

avri doria:Jon, I think they would need to agree among themselves with a rule of no new contention produced.

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Jon, I think it would create another contention set.

Alan Greenberg:@Jeff, I did understand and I was (I thought) agreeing with you.

jeff neuman:@Alan - yes....i was referring to some others

jeff neuman:Does anyone agree with my example? I am not sure how that could be gamed

jeff neuman:I am not sure people are happy...but not sure what the alternatives are

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:the notion .. yes, the implementation .. no

Jim Prendergast:arent we still waiting for CPE review by board?

Donna Austin, Neustar:yes we are Jim

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:@Jim .. yes. we are now a year into the CPE investigation with no clear sight on a result

avri doria:i think they may provide a form of gaming.

avri doria:i mean private auctions - personal view

jeff neuman:how do we prevent private auctions?

avri doria:hard to prevent

Jon Nevett:private auctions is just one form of contention resolution -- policy question is whether we should support private resolution or not.

Jim Prendergast:you could allow for other resolutions - forming JVs wa prohibited last round

Phil Buckingham:exactly Jeff . so do we make ALL auctions public ? But what happens to the proceeds in that case ?

jeff neuman:Are there ideas on how we could stop private contention resolution

avri doria:never understood the prevention of partnerships and joint ventures

jeff neuman:The only other option for contention resolution is subjective evaluation.....

avri doria:as a contention resolution mechanism

Jon Nevett:JVs were permitted by the way -- just couldn't replace an applicant with a JV

jeff neuman:@Jon - right....hence why you all created so many new entities

Jon Nevett:"It is understood that applicants may seek to establish joint ventures in their efforts to resolve string contention"

Donna Austin, Neustar:Was there any context to the GAC input? I think the comments are expressly related to IDN ccTLD Policy. What is the EPSRP?

Steve Chan: Extended Process Similarity Review Panel, though I can't speak to the substance of the process.

jeff neuman:yes

Steve Chan:[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_\\_www.icann.org\\_resources\\_pages\\_epsrp-2Dreports-2D2014-2D10-2D14-2Den&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB\\_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=rMsh9VZz\\_J48OCp3snSsQytQ4EeEh7b1xMRW7hTnRh4&s=u69-CaA3o7U27OTNIK2jKzyuBMwbYRNfrQMYxKZrDnM&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.icann.org_resources_pages_epsrp-2Dreports-2D2014-2D10-2D14-2Den&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=rMsh9VZz_J48OCp3snSsQytQ4EeEh7b1xMRW7hTnRh4&s=u69-CaA3o7U27OTNIK2jKzyuBMwbYRNfrQMYxKZrDnM&e=)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:thought so Donna

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:there is some supposed confusability with some scripts lettering. yes Jeff

jeff neuman:it looked like .br not be

jeff neuman:the cyrillic version of Bulgaria two characters

Alan Greenberg:Yes, it was .br

jeff neuman:I thought it looked more like 6r

Emily Barabas:@Donna, the full text of the GAC comment is here:

<http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-subsequent-procedures-22mar17/attachments/20170521/3b44e88f/SubProCC2DraftGACResponse22May2017.pdf>

jeff neuman:[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_\\_www.icann.org\\_en\\_system\\_files\\_files\\_epsrp-2Dbulgaria-2D30sep14-2Den.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB\\_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=rMsh9VZz\\_J48OCp3snSsQytQ4EeEh7b1xMRW7hTnRh4&s=0iSK2gTcvtWwuHRnTQEKIR-M8n8ZpJtDjXp1GOikE5E&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.icann.org_en_system_files_files_epsrp-2Dbulgaria-2D30sep14-2Den.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=rMsh9VZz_J48OCp3snSsQytQ4EeEh7b1xMRW7hTnRh4&s=0iSK2gTcvtWwuHRnTQEKIR-M8n8ZpJtDjXp1GOikE5E&e=)

Emily Barabas:Unfortunately, no additional context is provided in the document related to this comment

Donna Austin, Neustar:thanks Emily

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:indeed Alan

Donna Austin, Neustar:thanks Alan, so its a decision relating to confusability that may be relevant/applicable to our discussions.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:good progress.. thanks everyone ðŹŹŹ bye for now...

avri doria:bye