

## **15 Members**

Avri Doria  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr  
Christa Taylor  
Christopher Niemi  
Donna Austin  
Jeff Neuman  
Jessica Hooper  
Jim Prendergast  
Jon Nevett  
Katrin Ohlmer  
Kurt Pritz  
Maxim Alzoba  
Nanig Mehranian  
Phil Buckingham  
Sara Bockey

### Staff:

Steve Chan  
Emily Barabas  
Julie Hedlund  
Berry Cobb  
Trang Nguyen  
Michelle DeSmyter

## **AC Chat transcript Track 1 16 January 2018**

Michelle DeSmyter: Dear All, Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 1 - Overall Process/Support/Outreach Issue call on Tuesday, 16 January 2018 at 20:00 UTC.

Michelle DeSmyter: Agenda wiki page:

[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_community.icann.org\\_x\\_UB1yB&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_UB1yB&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6)

[sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8\\_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe\\_5iHWGIBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=zirx3kvmo3DawNMRv4O8hyWUa4MabF5EqfbGbQ\\_kr7w&s=SyYckB4FVBX-KiyNT9Dmpnx3B7WbTyZCPCZIELC\\_ag&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_docs.google.com_document_d_1guiX3L0FQAd7ZpwYIJ14FdY3pv09u0EnHMAark84tmg_&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGIBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=zirx3kvmo3DawNMRv4O8hyWUa4MabF5EqfbGbQ_kr7w&s=SyYckB4FVBX-KiyNT9Dmpnx3B7WbTyZCPCZIELC_ag&e=)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Hello All, will use chat (can not use mic due to late hour)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co Chair):thanks for letting us know Maxim

Julie Hedlund:Christa is starting.

Christa Taylor:[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_docs.google.com\\_document\\_d\\_1guiX3L0FQAd7ZpwYIJ14FdY3pv09u0EnHMAark84tmg\\_&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8\\_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe\\_5iHWGIBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=zirx3kvmo3DawNMRv4O8hyWUa4MabF5EqfbGbQ\\_kr7w&s=VoXfBhKBimE3PJWSaBFXeGApWDljFv5z1QrL9km6iGc&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_docs.google.com_document_d_1guiX3L0FQAd7ZpwYIJ14FdY3pv09u0EnHMAark84tmg_&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSFO4VShFqESGe_5iHWGIBLwwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=zirx3kvmo3DawNMRv4O8hyWUa4MabF5EqfbGbQ_kr7w&s=VoXfBhKBimE3PJWSaBFXeGApWDljFv5z1QrL9km6iGc&e=)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I think we need to mention additional 5k USD TMCH

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):which was not predicted in AGB and added later

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):in the history overview

Julie Hedlund:@All: The PDF of the online document is displayed and unsynced if you prefer to view the document in the Adobe Connect screen -- Variable Fees (4.2.17)

Steve Chan:We are on page 29

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):how the difference is measured? in %of text?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):when we talk about %s

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):we need to understand what formula is used

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Different application fees for different types of applications is only warranted if the difference is significant (for discussion purposes, 20% was used with the actual percentage to be determined).

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):about this bit

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):quite small change of text can change application idea a lot

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):application = texts + PDFs

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I mean - we need to define how do we see if the change is significant

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):to prevent vague reading at the implementation phase

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):the issue is not the value of the threshold

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):but the way we evaluate the particular difference (for exaple 20%)

Kurt Pritz:How about, "the expense for handling changes to applications (when allowed) will be borne by the applicant." (or am I missing the whole point?)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Kurt, do you mean that if that leads to additional evaluations - then they should be paid for again?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):like additional community review adds the cost of the latter

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I think we need to clearly show in the text if we are talking about difference in costs or in the texts of the application - to avoid misunderstanding

Donna Austin, Neustar:Christa: my hand is up

Kurt Pritz:@ Maxim: I think so - I would keep the policy statement more general and not pre-suppose different types of applications

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I did not remember the voting about it

Jon Nevett:Not sure where we are going with this one either? The excess of these fees could follow the same disbursement mechanism as detailed in the Application Fees section.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):so far all funds go to some accounts of ICANN , without any explanations of what is going to happen with it

Jon Nevett:Donna +1

Jon Nevett:what does that mean?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I meant excess fees

Steve Chan:Christa, my hand is up

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I have a question : do we see 5k USD amount (TMCH fee) as installation fee too?

Jon Nevett:extended evaluation fee too

Steve Chan:RSTEP, Objections (as you noted)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):some cities demanded money for the letters ... but not to ICANN

Phil Buckingham:if we are going to do a cost plus model for each application type , then the initial application fee will be different . Surely it will be more expensive to apply for a community application than say a brand application

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):in reality only rich communities prevailed in the process

jeff neuman 2:I believe brands needed to have a TMCH token so they paid for that....which could count as their evaluation fee as a brand

Phil Buckingham:Steve +1

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):excess fees looks like "leftovers after the process finished" - and the current reading of it by ICANN that the 2012 round is not finished yet, so we can not estimate it

Kurt Pritz:@ Jon (about excess fees - I think): The Application fee section states that, "Excess funds resulting from the application costs versus the floor (item a) should be distributed back to applicants or used to benefit and to another category?" Then a number of other categories are listed, e.g., outreach and so on. I would change that to: Excess funds resulting from the application costs versus the floor (item a) should be distributed back to applicants (period).

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):also some applicants went out of business .. who inherits their hypothetical share?

Julie Hedlund:@Jeff: We can't hear you.

jeff neuman 2:I will sign back on...had some issues

jeff neuman:i think I am on the phone

Donna Austin, Neustar:Agree with Jon's comment and the general intent of that point.

Jon Nevett:@jeff thanks for the clarification

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):at least IANA (PTI ) is a registry of registries

Donna Austin, Neustar:Can we be more specific about what is meant by Registry of Registries. There was considerable discussion around this last week and I think it would be helpful to be more descriptive about what this means.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):it sounds like fist comes pays less

Donna Austin, Neustar:I mean in the text, not for discussion now.

Kurt Pritz:How about, "How do we promote competition and encourage innovation via pricing and the current ICANN fee structure?"

Phil Buckingham:i would have thought amortisation / depreciation of fixed assets would have to be in sync with ICANN 501 Californian corporation status

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):then 5k USD is not a part of costs (RO pays for TMCH after the execution of the RA)

Donna Austin, Neustar:Agree Jeff. It is for ICANN to manage the Compliance department within their current budget.

Trang Nguyen:@Jeff, yes, on my to-dos list.

jeff neuman:@Donna - Ah....yes, we need to be clear in the text....once we get Akram's response. Agree

Phil Buckingham:@ Donna - i would have thought that ICANN 's budgeted costs for R2 compliance costs would be passed on to applicants - within the application fee.

Jon Nevett:what page are we on?

Donna Austin, Neustar:15

Jon Nevett:thx

jeff neuman:[Personal Opinion] When people claimed that the submission window was too short / too quick, I think they were more referring to the lack of effective communication announcing that the round was going to open as opposed to having 90 days to enter applicant information into the portal.

jeff neuman:I am not sure they were saying that 90 days is too short to enter your information.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I suggest adding at least 1 month between rounds (to make cleaning / changes e.t.c)

jeff neuman:Plus, having predictable open windows should lessen the emphasis on the time period to enter information into the application portal

Jon Nevett:i have 10 applications filed just about 6 years ago that have been in various states of hell -- is 1 year enough?

jeff neuman:Jon - so long as no one can apply later for the strings that are in your personal hell, then does that matter

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):if no resolution for the leftover applications of the round is foreseen it might start looking like a Ponzi scheme

Phil Buckingham:+ 1 Jeff applicants should have notification - say six months - that the application window (for said type) opens on ... They have (say) one month to enter all data / models on application

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co Chair):makes sense Jeff

Jon Nevett:Yes Jeff. I agree that my personal hell might not matter, but if we can save others from in in the future, let's try to help them.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):.www might be quite challenging or .dns

Donna Austin, Neustar:So before each application window opens there would need to be a list of 'strings' that are not available.

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Jeff, I'm working on a letter right now.

Christa Taylor:Next meeting on Feb 6 at 20:00 topics include Applicant Support and RSP/Accreditation Pgm

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Donna, I think it will be replenished by GAC in the process  
(like in this round :(

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bye all

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co Chair):thanks everyone... bye ð for now.

Donna Austin, Neustar:No doubt Maxim

avri doria:bye, interesting meeting

Phil Buckingham:thanks Christa and Sara . Excellent .