

AC Attendance - 13 Members

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC)
Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO)
Christa Taylor
Donna Austin, Neustar
Jeff Neuman
Jennifer Chung
Jessica Hooper

Kurt Pritz
Martin Sutton
Maxim Alzoba (FAITID)
Roger Carney
Rubens Kuhl
Rudy Mendoza

On Audio Only: none

Apologies: Alan Greenberg, John Levine

Staff: Emily Barabas, Julie Hedlund, Nanig Mehranian, Trang Nguyen, Berry Cobb, Steve Chan, Julie Bisland

AC Chat Transcript:

Julie Bisland:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 4 – IDNs/Technical & Operations call on 05 February 2018 at 20:00 UTC

Julie Bisland:Agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_KgWfB&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl13mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=s4uSgDS8k17YPFxB9_XV27Wvb1XvHWdWe_SISxMRos&s=nPyuGp2D8oe9nb26cg87IFO8Fyrn9qWPXimDtqrnCO4&e=

Rubens Kuhl:SOP

Steve Chan:Slides are unsynced so you all can move them yourselves.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):thanks Steve

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):slide 5

Steve Chan:PIRR = Program Implementation Review Report

Jeff Neuman:My recommendation was combining 1 and 5

Jeff Neuman:Can you post the five options

Steve Chan:The summary of the 5 options is on slide 7

Kurt Pritz:@Jeff - slide 7 i think

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):the whole idea of CQs remind me university exams, where one side is trying to pass, and the other is not so sure about it

Jeff Neuman:was that the same order?

Jeff Neuman:ok. I thought a combo of 1 and 5 was the way to go which cost the least amount of money

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):5. might not work - it was quite long ago (many applicants were consultants and have no contract since then)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):combination options can be discussed and proposed of course

Rubens Kuhl:Any combination is fine, any new option is fine too.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):so .5 might be changed to survey of new Registries

Jeff Neuman:@maxim - true, but they still have email addresses on file. If they dont work, then they dont work

Jeff Neuman:I think we should try to reach out to the failed ones. In some ways, their feedback would be more valuable.

Jeff Neuman:There were not too many failed applications

Kurt Pritz:You can ignore this if it will drag us backward; what policy question are we trying to answer by reading the CQs? The answer to that would govern which option is selected

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Jeff, if applicant is not equal to Registry - most probably they might have no real life info from the current registry

Jeff Neuman:Kurt - Our mission, should we choose to accept it, is to make recommendations that will improve the questions asked in the previous round so as to make the questions more clear and to provide the information that was actually sought by the evaluators. It is hoped that this would reduce the number of CQs the next time

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):good point @Steve

Jeff Neuman:For example, if the same CQ was asked to 80% of the applicants, chances are that the problem was in the question and not the answers

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):exactly @Jeff

Trang Nguyen:If the goal is to understand what the issues were with questions, Option 1 would provide the most direct answer. Org published advisories on the issues that were encountered most frequently by applicants. That together with statistics on the number of CQs could help to identify the issues.

Jeff Neuman:@Trang - Agree that we need option 1 and I believe option 5 will also help.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):COI related questions were good example of wrong ones (where all companies had to change their letters of credit few times)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):1 as a priority and 5 as. following recommendation?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Could we update .5 with - ask the Registry - if it is Ok to ask Applicant or them ?

Trang Nguyen:@Jeff, option 5 could be useful as well. It hadn't occurred to me before, but now thinking about it, doing 5 during implementation may be even more impactful. Any changes to the questions based on policy recs could be made, then published for public comment, during which we could ask whether any formulation of the questions need clarification.

Martin Sutton:@Trang - agree that 1 is a sensible option, with option 5 to add more context to CQs they may have responded to.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):certainly could @Maxim

Martin Sutton:@maxim - I recall COI triggering the most CQs, which was mainly as a result of inadequate instructions provided in the first place.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):what was the justification for 5%? any ?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Martin, the requirements changes over the time - which is not good

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):*changed

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):why not 7% or 10%?

Jeff Neuman:This may be a stupid question, but is growth rate strictly limited to adding new TLDs, or does it include adding new records (like DNSSEC records)? If so, according to some rudimentary calculations on a spread sheet, it would take only 5 years to delegate 25,000 new TLDs at a growth rate of 5% per month

Christa Taylor:+1 Jeff

Christa Taylor:This would have some significant impacts to the delegation of new gTLDs

Kurt Pritz:I did some rough calculations that are close but not exact: if the 5% requirement was imposed in the 2012 round, some TLDs would have been delayed a year beyond the date when they were actually delegated and the backlog created (as compared to the actual delegations) would have taken 3 years to clear

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):and 5% gives 50 per month and 790 per year ... which is lower than 1000 , and thus it is not correct from perspective of 1000 per year is ok

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):*per first year

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):*ofr the first year :)

Jeff Neuman:@maxim, the 5% is cumulative

Jeff Neuman:If you start at 1200 and increase 5% per month, it would take 62 months to delegte 25,000 new gTLDs

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Jeff, my point that this number is not based on a research

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):it is just "we think 5% should be safe" - which is an opinion and not something calculated

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Could we request from RSSAC the method they used to calculate this particular threshold?

Jeff Neuman:at 6%, it would be take 53 months

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):5% will detoriate the speed of delegation from 1000per year

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):and that 1000 was not properly justified too

Jeff Neuman:at 7% per month, that would take 48 months for 25000 TLDs

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Jeff I am afraid that they meant 5% of the starting amount (not cumulative)...

Jeff Neuman:I interpreted it at 5% per month

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):I read as a " from now on" point as well @Rubens

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):so it is not $1.05 * 1.05$ but simply $1 * 1.05$

Jeff Neuman:5% from original amount is less than 1000 per year. That would make no sense

Jeff Neuman:They said there was minimal impact

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):formaly saying removing registries would even better improve the stability , but it does not mean we need to follow it

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):from rist perspective

Jeff Neuman:Look at the chart on page 7

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):*risk

Kurt Pritz:I am with Maxim about asking for the methodology to arrive at this number. If there is a methodology, then the number is a starting point for discussion, as Cheryl says. If it is an opinion without basis, then it is not a starting point

Jeff Neuman:of the RSSAC paper

Steve Chan:@Maxim, the RSSAC paper is available on the Wiki here:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_download_attachments_58735967_RSSAC031-2520FINAL.pdf-3Fversion-3D1-26modificationDate-3D1517582919000-26api-3Dv2&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=s4uSgDS8k17YPFxB9_XV27Wvb1XvHWdWe_SISxMRos&s=q5QIxHlb80jyOG9EWGBMHMnvDtGCclQbRs_dYL7fgLg&e=

Kurt Pritz:In the 2012 round 35-40% was acceptable in the first month of delegations

Rubens Kuhl:Do the resolution mentioned what would happen with the current work in progress at SSAC, asked by the board at November 2017 ?

Rubens Kuhl:(on home/corp/mail)

Rubens Kuhl:The graph on the appendix of the RSSAC suggestion makes clear which interpretation it is, which is $(1+5\%)$ to the power of number of months.

Christa Taylor:Maxim +1 - s/b linear

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Rubens, it is just a picture without any formula

Jeff Neuman:I think we all wanted option 1....so lets get started on that at least

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):next meeting details, not in, y calendar

Jeff Neuman:We have been waiting a year or so to start this work

Martin Sutton:1 is a good starting point.

Rubens Kuhl:Option 1 with the clarity that it doesn't preclude any other option from also being asked.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):option 1 looks reasonable

Martin Sutton:Option 1 may inform us what questions to ask if we proceed with option 5.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):see you in 6 hours

Julie Bisland:12 February 2018 at 15:00 UTC for 60 minutes.

Rubens Kuhl:Next week

Christa Taylor:Thanks all. Have a great day!

Martin Sutton:thx all

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bye all