Michelle DeSmyter:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 3 – String Contention, Objections & Disputes call on Tuesday, 28 November 2017 at 15:00 UTC

Michelle DeSmyter:Agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_x_rZlEB&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=BGGdX8_oeyIWyAzR3Ztf5hMyRPCJy3OjmUUBDVuueWQ&s=iQlWdVkIKlYNBVjspjddNAt5ijBdmo8EXdD9NaGTwEw&e=

Karen Day:Morning, Michelle. I'm going to let my headset charge up for another 5 min before I dial in.

Michelle DeSmyter:Hi there Karen, good morning to you as well, sounds good!

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:sure

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):fair enough

Robin Gross:sounds good, Karen

Jon Nevett:sounds good

Samantha Demetriou:Fine by me :)

Emily Barabas:Slides are unsynced

Steve Chan:The three drafting teams can be found here: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_x_XqLRAw.Aat&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=BGGdX8_oeyIWyAzR3Ztf5hMyRPCJy3OjmUUBDVuueWQ&s=1-0giVP0Ta1mKL0QO5T8n_XWCEtWo4sHoxhOJLNZc24&e= the bottom of each of the respective pages, you' fndl the current working document for each topic

Jim Prendergast:link doesnt work

Jim Prendergast:at least for me

Steve Chan:https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_x_XqLRAw&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=BGGdX8_oeyIWyAzR3Ztf5hMyRPCJy3OjmUUBDVuueWQ&s=n3OxmpUbku3QIemS9B7FuolLBbvl7WrjYs0sJ9QxNEM&e=

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):I apologize - i have not had time to read Mark's summary yet.

Steve Chan:@Jim, rhere was a period at the end of the URL - I guess it got integrated into the link?

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Are you linking to Mark's summary? I can't make ttha link work.

Jim Prendergast:that worked

Steve Chan:@Anne, you can find the Mark Carvell summary on the Wiki page here: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_x_Wz2AAw&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=BGGdX8_oeyIWyAzR3Ztf5hMyRPCJy3OjmUUBDV

   Steve Chan:FYI, we are on slide 5
   Donna Austin, Neustar:is that 75% figure accurate?
   Michael Flemming:Does the paper attempt to define the public interest? Apologies as I have not yet been able to read it yet either?
   Michael Flemming:.*
   Donna Austin, Neustar:What's the status of the CPE Review?
   Emily Barabas:@Donna, a summary document of community application is available here:
   Jamie Baxter | dotgay:@Donna .. we've been trying to get info on the CPE review, but all we know at this point is that Scope 1 results were delivered to ICANN several weeks ago and that Scope 2 findings should have been delivered at this point.
   Jon Nevett:Did the GAC approve the paper or is it a committee of interested GAC members?
   Donna Austin, Neustar:Thanks Jamie
   Steve Chan:According to Emily's link, 5 Prevailed CPE and 21 Did not Prevail.
   Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):QUESTION: THanks Steve for the link. I have the same QUESTION as Jon Nevett re this summary - Is this paper approved by GAC?
   Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):thanks Jamie
   Steve Chan:@Jon, Anne, I'm not sure actually. What I do know is that they consider the paper factual in nature (e.g., statistics and a collection of GAC Advice) and will, or already have, posted on the GAC site.
   Trang Nguyen:There were 84 applications that were designated as community applications. Of these 51 have been delegated.
   Alan Greenberg:Sorry to be late.
   Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):thanks for the data Trang
   Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):no reply that I am aware of
   Trang Nguyen:84 community applications. 51 delegated. 16 withdrawn. 4 in progress. 11 on-hold. 1 not approved. 1 will not proceed.
   Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):it is a piece of GAC

work

  Emily Barabas:note, the above referenced spreadsheet only covers CPE results, which explains the discrepancy

  Jon Nevett:so let's not call it GAC Advice in our deck

  Alan Greenberg:I believe that it was approved by the GAC but will ask.

  Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Mark holds the pen

  Jamie Baxter | dotgay:Of the community designated applications, only 5 actually passed CPE

  Jon Nevett:That has a formal meaning

  Donna Austin, Neustar:GAC input

  Jamie Baxter | dotgay:The pieces noted as GAC advise were actual elements of GAC advise duirng prior ICANN meetings.

  Jon Nevett:Combined with other input

  Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):yes Jon it is a review and status of GAC Advice on the topic, it is meant to be of assistance to our work

  Robin Gross:Unless we have confirmation that this is truly GAC Advice, we should consider this as GAC input (which discusses Advise).

  Susan Payne:Apologies if this has already been explained - is the first part of Mark's paper a summary of the Council of Europe report or something else?

  Alan Greenberg:As far as I know, GAC "ADVICE" only has specific meaning when directed at the Board.

  Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):correct Alan

  Robin Gross:That is also my understanding, Alan.

  Robin Gross:So let's not muddy the water by calling this GAC Advice, if it isn't that specific thing.

  Robin Gross:I didn't hear any argument for changing the title of the document.

  Karen Day:@Robin Jon asked that I not call it advice in our deck

  Karen Day:that is what got the conversation going

  Susan Payne:@Alan, I think we need to be clear that it is advice. It has been referred to as Mark Carvell's document - has it actually been adopted by the full GAC and submitted as advice (some of it is not a summary of past advice). I don't know the answer to that, it seems unclear and we need clarification

  Jon Nevett:Getting to the substance. Am I reading this right? So under this input if some users of Banks had gotten together and applied for .BANK as a community applicant, they would have gotten .BANK over the current registry operator of .BANK as they are a collection of commercial entities?

  Alan Greenberg:I have asked the GAC Chair whether this document was formally approved by the GAC.

Donna Austin, Neustar:If this has been attached to a communique then we should consider it advice, but what we probably should understand is how does that impact how we consider that advice. It doesn't necessarily mean that we have to accept it, but we should provide explanation as to why we did not accept it.

Robin Gross:Completely agree, Donna

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):Is there any reason why we couldn't as a Work Team write to Mark with clarifying questions (e.g., status of doc within GAC, answer to Jon's question, etc.)? I realize the fact that he's rotating out as UK GAC rep may complicate logistics, but it should be possible to have reasonable questions answered.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):I will reach out to Mark and the GAC via the secretary to clarify some of your questions

Alan Greenberg:@Jon, the operator of .bank DID designate that their application was a community application.

Jon Nevett:@alan I was talking about two competing .BANK applicants

Jon Nevett:two competing .BANK community applicants

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):and discussion on what constitutes Community as well as if there are class differences on how any preferences are given needs discussion and development

Alan Greenberg:If there had been a 2nd application that was not withdrawn, then the community application would have taken precedence *IF* it had passed the CPE.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):yes exactly Jeff

Donna Austin, Neustar:so, if the CPE stays, an additional point might be in the offing for a non-commercial community?

Robin Gross:That was my understanding as well, Jeff.

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:+1 Jeff .. I have the same understanding

Jon Nevett:Jeff, that is the scenario I am talking about -- two competing community applicants -- do we give preference to one over the other in the evaluation process because one is commercial and one isn't

Emily Barabas:Full text of responses is available here: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__docs.google.com_spreadsheets_d_1A5uaxBAgmg7QsFuqMdVvt1HxNZ4jKXnm3Hp0gZra7U0_edit-3Fusp-3Ddrive-5Fweb&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=BGGdX8_oeyIWyAzR3Ztf5hMyRPCJy3OjmUUBDVuueWQ&s=HvsXZWxoz_qvvAz1Zo0dpD6v6IKcTx_B8QCjAuQERA8&e=

Emily Barabas:The CC2 Themes document is available at the bottom of this wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-

Emily Barabas:We are now at the top of page 2

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):yes Jamie greater predictability

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:missed the call last night, but will listed to the recording today.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC) 2:I am not sure an Ian Mplementation Team would have authority over an Evaluation Panel? Does that seem obvious to others?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):all good

Jeff Neuman:Things that go to a "Standing Panel" would have general applicability, and would not be geared towards individual applications. But as Karen says, if there are questions of general applicability, that could be a topic for a standing panel

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):Have to drop. Thanks all.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC) 2:If you go that direction, you make the Standing IRT the appeals Board for the determination in Community Priority Evaluation. Not really appropriate.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):top of the hour but we waited for more to join a Few minutes extension seems reasonable Karen

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):good point Alan

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC) 2:Guidelines should be published before next round.

Jon Nevett:Agree with Jamie here -- goes to predictability

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):we have opportunity to look at and hopefully redress that now Jamie

Donna Austin, Neustar:need to drop. Thanks Karen

Jamie Baxter | dotgay:big lesson here .. community applicate processes cannot be an afterthought

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC) 2:Thank you Karen, Cheryl et al.   Have a good day - and Cheryl hope you can get back to sleep!

Robin Gross:+1 to using our mailing list to advance this discussion in the next two weeks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):thank you all lots covered today (more to do of course) Thanks everyone. Thanks Karen, bye for now ð

Robin Gross:Thanks Karen and all, bye!

Emily Barabas:I believe the next call is actually 20:00 on the 12th

Karen Day:thanks!
Michael Flemming:thx