

Julie Bisland:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 4 – IDNs/Technical & Operations on Thursday, 12 October 2017 at 03:00 UTC.

Julie Bisland:Agenda wiki page: [https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_community.icann.org\\_x\\_uYJEB&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QjF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB\\_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=1W14Jid0OK9pCHzG00zBuldun40vTpMWV\\_Rr\\_MboA8Y&s=W1doDw5qSEAaxebPbBrTAduKnsSOMA6NV6DZ7aQRRtc&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_uYJEB&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QjF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=1W14Jid0OK9pCHzG00zBuldun40vTpMWV_Rr_MboA8Y&s=W1doDw5qSEAaxebPbBrTAduKnsSOMA6NV6DZ7aQRRtc&e=)

Martin Sutton:Good morning/evening!

Julie Bisland:Welcome, Martin :)

Jeff Neuman:1,2,3 good

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Wow - attendance is not very good.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@staff- the 520 number is Anne.

Julie Bisland:thank you, Anne

Trang Nguyen:One additional note is that if a RSP program will exist in subsequent rounds, new registry services would have to be applied for by the RSP.

Jeff Neuman:@trang - why

Trang Nguyen:The RSP would be the one delivering the registry service. So if an applicant's business model necessitates a registry service that a RSP is not already approved for, the RSP would apply for the registry service.

Trang Nguyen:sorry, i'm not on audio.

Trang Nguyen:I can see how it could depend on how the service is proposed to be delivered.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):QUESTION: just to clarify, Jeff, are you saying Registry operator can offer a new service and it would not be the backend provider of registry services who applies?

Trang Nguyen:@Rubens, yes.

Jeff Neuman:yes. Not all Registry Services must be provided by the RSP

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):That seems right to me.

Jeff Neuman:P.S. it is BTAPPA, not BTPPA :)

Jeff Neuman:Bulk Transfer After Partial Portfolio Acquisition

Jeff Neuman:I am soooo sorry for naming the first one that. Did not expect that name to stick

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):okay thank you

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Jeff - we can't hear you

Julie Bisland:Jeff, no audio

Jeff Neuman:sorry,

Jeff Neuman:it says i am speaking

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@Jeff - What slide are you on?

Jeff Neuman:or you could say "but may extend the contract negotiation process"

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:Sorry for delay joining, as the telco tried to fix my line to the house, they disconnected the INTERNET line!!!!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:GRRR here now irritated but here

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Ouch Cheryl - glad you got "connected".

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:Phew indeed Anne

Martin Sutton:Agree Jeff, thx.

Rubens Kuhl:Yes.

Jeff Neuman:yes

Rubens Kuhl:Just a comment: the parenthesis is not contained in AGB.

Rubens Kuhl:This is a quote from AGB...

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):yes - but we don't have Question 23 and that is policy

Jeff Neuman: Provide name and full description of all the Registry Services to be provided. Descriptions should include both technical and business components of each proposed service, and address any potential security or stability concerns. The following registry services are customary services offered by a registry operator: A. Receipt of data from registrars concerning registration of domain names and name servers. B. Dissemination of TLD zone files. C. Dissemination of contact or other information concerning domain name registrations (e.g., port-43 WHOIS, Web-based Whois, RESTful Whois service). D. Internationalized Domain Names, where offered. E. DNS Security Extensions (DNSSEC). The applicant must describe whether any of these registry services are intended to be offered in a manner unique to the TLD. Additional proposed registry services that are unique to the registry must also be described.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry for bad formatting

Rubens Kuhl: [https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_\\_newgtlds.icann.org\\_en\\_applicants\\_agb\\_evaluation-2Dprocedures-2D04jun12-2Den.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB\\_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=1W14Jid0OK9pChzG00zBuldun40vTpMWV\\_Rr\\_MboA8Y&s=eO7kMXZpgzdd9j\\_AB8grlgKM-ms1nufwMYe0sX4Yf0&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__newgtlds.icann.org_en_applicants_agb_evaluation-2Dprocedures-2D04jun12-2Den.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=1W14Jid0OK9pChzG00zBuldun40vTpMWV_Rr_MboA8Y&s=eO7kMXZpgzdd9j_AB8grlgKM-ms1nufwMYe0sX4Yf0&e=)

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): Thank you Jeff. I think this is a good question as it stands. But it's possible we should have pre-approved services - they would have to be described in detail as a "safe harbor".

Rubens Kuhl: Page 2-24 and on.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I hope I managed not to hash it too badly Jeff

Jeff Neuman: I am not saying that

Rubens Kuhl: Anne, it's not that... what's in SP4 is a direct quote of AGB..

Rubens Kuhl: But it's the part that explains the procedures.

Rubens Kuhl: 2.2.3 "Registry Services Reviews"

Rubens Kuhl: Even in 2012, Registry Services was a non-scored question. So one could fail due to failing that review, but not get any points for passing it.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): COMMENT: I did not realize Jeff's comment related only to pre-approved services. I still think Question 23 would have to stay in if the registry is proposing new services.

Rubens Kuhl: Anne, current implementation guideline is what is in the evaluation procedures... the question text is how that guideline was implemented.

Jeff Neuman: IF there are new services, then yes we would need something that asks what those new services are and how they would implement it

Rubens Kuhl: SP4 doesn't have pre-approved services... even though 2012 AGB listed customary services, it gave no pre-approval status to them.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): @Rubens - I think we are talking about developing pre-approved services.

Rubens Kuhl: Anne, we are. SP1, 2 and 3 all suggest pre-approved services. And that's a change from current implementation.

Jeff Neuman: To me SP3 seems to make the most sense...but that is a personal opinion

Rubens Kuhl: Jeff, I believe the decision matrix will make it easier to pick individual decisions instead of an specific SP.

Jeff Neuman: ok..i will withdraw my personal opinion until then :)

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): Re last point on slide 11 - "last bullet point" - change "additional" to "new" in describing requirement to describe "new services"

Rubens Kuhl: Anne, since it's only a comparison instead of specific language I believe we just need to agree on the understanding, which is indeed "new" like you mentioned.

Rubens Kuhl: We can come to that conclusion in the next few slides.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): Certainly agree with that Cheryl.

Rubens Kuhl: Jeff, I believe so, yes.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Thanks Jeff - that's a good clarification question.  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:Not by my understanding Jeff Correct me if I am wrong  
Rubens Kuhl:Slide 14 will give more clarity on that, if we get to that.  
Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):QUESTION: Would there be a pre-approved manner of delivering DNSSEC as a "safe harbor" and only describe if you are doing it differently or uniquely  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:were avoiding evoking the words Qualifying Questions Anne ;-)  
Martin Sutton:good point Anne, seems sensible to explore  
Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Thanks Jeff so Applicant msut describe HOW it will deliver pre-approved services then  
Rubens Kuhl:In DNSSEC: NSECxNSEC3, use or not use an HSM, supported algorithms etc.  
Quoc Pham:a little off trace, I would like to just to make a statement that regardless of the straw-person that we put forward, applications should not be prioritised based on their listed registry services  
Quoc Pham:\*little off track  
Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@Quoc - very relevant and not at all off track  
Rubens Kuhl:Quoc, that's what question 3. Timing is all about.  
Jeff Neuman:So, @Anne I am not sure there is a way to streamline all aspects of evaluating how one operationalizes those services that may have common protocols  
Quoc Pham:@right, thanks Rubens that wasn't clear to me  
Quoc Pham:@Rubens  
Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):I think for the list, the questions would have to be longer and more detailed than portrayed in the matrix.  
Jeff Neuman:On slide 14, I think 1, 2 and 4 should be pre-approved  
Jeff Neuman:but 3 seems too broad  
Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@ Cheryl - sorry but I really must go - thanks so much!  
Jeff Neuman:Thanks!  
Rubens Kuhl:Thanks all!  
Martin Sutton:thanks all, bye  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:Bye  
avri doria:bye