Attendance: (45 members)

Alexander Schubert	Karen Carlson
Anne Aikman-Scalese	Karen Day
Avri Doria	Katrin Ohlmer
Ashley Roberts	Kavouss Arasteh
Bruna Martins dos Santos	Kristina Rosette
Christa Taylor	Liz Brodzinski
Chris Niemi	Martin Sutton
Christopher Wilkinson	Maxim Alzoba
Dietmar Lenden	Michael Flemming
Donna Austin	Neli Marcheva
Elisa Cooper	Phil Buckingham
Erica Varlese	Paul McGrady
Gg Leine	Poncelet Ileleji
Greg Shatan	Robin Gross
Jamie Baxter	Rubens Kuhl
Janvier Ngnoulaye	Rudy Mendoza
Jason Schaeffer	Samantha Demetriou
Jeff Neuman	Sara Bockey
Jim Prendergast	Sarah Langstone
Jonathan Robinson	Sophie Hey
Jorge Cancio	Susan Payne
Justine Chew	Zornitsa Marcheva

Audio Only:	Staff:
Harold Arcos	Steve Chan
	Emily Barabas
Apologies:	Julie Hedlund
Alan Greenberg	Berry Cobb
Annebeth Lange	Dennis Chang
	Trang Nguyen
	Michelle DeSmyter

WebEx Chat:

from Christopher Wilkinson to All Participants:Good afternoon - CW

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:Hi Everyone...

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:Jeff did you want to start at the next page on screen?

from Jeff Neuman to All Participants:We should start where we left off on 1.2

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:OK

from Jim Prendergast to All Participants:Jeff - could we start including the specific sections we will cover in the Agenda to help with prep?

from Jonathan Robinson to All Participants:Is there audio now? I hear nothing.

from Rubens Kuhl to All Participants:Jonathan, Jeff is talking.

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:There is audio

from Alexander Schubert to All Participants:Gosh - Webex is such a terrible app. HEar notzhing!

from Rubens Kuhl to All Participants:Dial-out works.

from Jonathan Robinson to All Participants:Ditto. Second recent meeting where I hear nothing.

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:we are all looking forward to getting back to Adobe Connect

from Phil Buckingham to All Participants:here you loud and clear , Jeff

from Phil Buckingham to All Participants:hear !!

from Jonathan Robinson to All Participants:@Rubens. Thanks. Got the dial out now.

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:PLEASE mute yout line if your not speaking

from Jim Prendergast to All Participants:for AOB - I believe there was supposed to be language circulated last week for the cover report that addressed the concerns Anne and Greg raised about Initial vs Interim report . Either I missed it (very possible) or it wasnt sent out.

from Jorge Cancio to All Participants:question: is there any place in the PDP WG site where we can look at the texts of the preliminary report being prepared?

from Gg Levine to All Participants:Where does the latest draft live?

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:And Thanks *very much* to Steve for the Wiki page re all these section

from Steve Chan to All Participants:All, the WIki page is here: https://community.icann.org/x/NwUhB

from Terri Agnew to All Participants:your line sounds good, Jeff

from Jamie Baxter to All Participants:it sounds perfect to me Jeff

from Steve Chan to All Participants:That link to all of the Initial Report sections has been shared in the Agenda emails, but that link can be shared in a separate message if folks find it helpful.

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:11

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:Sec 1.2.2.1

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:1.2.2.2 Clarity of Application Process

from Steve Chan to All Participants:@Jim, thanks for the suggestion about specifying in the agenda which sections are intended to be covered. We will take that onboard.

from Jim Prendergast to All Participants:thx

from Susan Payne to All Participants:this sounds like a comment on the substance

from Rubens Kuhl to All Participants:This is 1.2.5, application submission limits.

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:is the comment related to prohibition to register domains ?

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:or applications ? if latter , how can we register an IDN pair for a ASCII TLD ?

from Karen Day to All Participants:Is Christopher's comment about Registrar's or Registry Operators??

from Karen Day to All Participants:He kept saying "Registrars"

from Rubens Kuhl to All Participants:Karen, I believe he confused the two indeed, but market power could be attributed to both types of contrated parties.

from Jamie Baxter to All Participants:Question to the WT1 group .. does the reference to "all associated processes" include specific acknowledgement to evaluation processes? For example, community priority evaluation process was not formalized until after applications were submitted.

from Karen Day to All Participants:I was just trying to understand if his concer was related to verticle integration.

from Rubens Kuhl to All Participants:Karen, likely not related to vertical integration.

from Christa Taylor to All Participants:@Jamie, what section are you referring to?

from Jamie Baxter to All Participants:@Christa ... section f of 1.2.2.2

from Jamie Baxter to All Participants:@Christa .. first bullet point

from Christa Taylor to All Participants:Got it

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:the cost is per TLD

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:was

from Christa Taylor to All Participants:@Jamie: To my understanding yes. The Applicant Guidebook should reflect and include all processes including community priority evaluation

from Rubens Kuhl to All Participants:mul·ti·ple

ˈməltəpəl/Enviar

adjective

1.

having or involving several parts, elements, or members.

from Jamie Baxter to All Participants:@Christa .. that is good to hear. Could I request that evaluation processes be specifically called out in this language to that it is very clear.

from Susan Payne to All Participants:Could we please stick to the section we're actually looking at rather than raising issues which are not relevant to the section we are reviewing

from Christa Taylor to All Participants:@Jamie - yup - adding comment for future updates

from Jamie Baxter to All Participants:@Christa .. much appreciated.

from Steve Chan to All Participants:As Rubens noted, Application Submission Limits is 1.2.5

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:Yes Susan, that would be less confusing

from Christa Taylor to All Participants:@Jeff it was a WT1 topic and should be covered there

from Steve Chan to All Participants:@Jeff, yes, staff is capturing notes offline and will circulate after the call.

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:WebEx mobile app does not allow to properly zoom the screen

from Rubens Kuhl to All Participants:1.9.1 - Community Applications

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:Re some of your other questions. Multiple is any number more than 1; Cost is flat fee Per Application; We are not at the Section that discussed "Community" just yet

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:cost can rise with RSTEP or other additional panels

from Rubens Kuhl to All Participants:Maxim, RSTEP cost is captured in the registry services evaluation part, to be published in a few days.

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:I meant that the cost might not be flat per application

from Jorge Cancio to All Participants:of" not "or a round", right?

from Katrin Ohlmer to All Participants:"none months" -> "nine months"

from Jorge Cancio to All Participants:I do not see any pros/cons under d) - does it come later?

from Jorge Cancio to All Participants:thanks, Jeff - am learning to handle this webex...

from Susan Payne to All Participants:We decide - the WG. And we won't be counting them

from donna austin to All Participants:I agree with Jeff, it's not about the numbers or weight of pros and cons at this time, its to ensure that they are all captured.

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:Deffinatly Donna

from Jim Prendergast to All Participants:does the limit of 1,000 delegation per year also impact this?

from Rubens Kuhl to All Participants:1.7.6 Security and Stability

from Rubens Kuhl to All Participants:(not yet published)

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:any justification for the number of 1000 at least with formulates instead of "we think that isight be safe "?

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:* formulas

from Anne Aikman-Scalese to All Participants:COMMENT: In 1.2.3 Dependencies, in addition to the CCT-RT Final Report, the SSAC NCAP study may affect this report if the SSAC develops a list of TLDs or a method for testing TLDs that yields the "DO NOT APPLY" categoriy.

from Katrin Ohlmer to All Participants:To point e.: "What would be the benefit of adding a further category/further categories?"

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:New hand from CW

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:Yes

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:1.2.5 Application SubmissionLimits

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:We see your hand Kavouss

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:number limit will be gamed, most probably with the purchase of the winners after the RA executed

from Christa Taylor to All Participants:The pros and cons reflect some additional insights on Kavouss's comment

from Rubens Kuhl to All Participants:I thought Geographical Names were not part of the report we are discussing.

from donna austin to All Participants:Just a formatting suggestion. Pros and Cons were listed in a table in a previous section, but not this one. I think the tables are better presentationally.

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:Good point Donna

from Alexander Schubert to All Participants:There have been multiple "out-of-jurisdiction" applicants for geo tlds in 2012!

from Susan Payne to All Participants:Geographical names are in WY5. Please raise this there Christopher. However if ashould be noted that not everyone agrees with you that all names which have some random geographical connotation "belong" to a country. That ignores principles of international law and the fact that many names have multiple meanings and usages

from avri doria to All Participants:aren't there already rules against warehousing?

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:Janvier I beleive you are after Paul

from Alexander Schubert to All Participants:And if the application fee goes down to US $50k you might see applicants going for up to 1,000 names EACH! Easily. If we want the next round limited to a managable amount of applications - let's RAISE the application fee! e.g. to US $500k a pop!

from Jorge Cancio to All Participants:comment on 1.2.5.: I feel we should include questions for the public comment period. Just stating that there are none does not help to trigger the discussion. At least: "do you concur with the assessment made by the WG?"

from Susan Payne to All Participants:Hear hear Paul

from Martin Sutton to All Participants:Agree Paul, well said

from Katrin Ohlmer to All Participants:+1 Paul

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:Noted Paul

from Jorge Cancio to All Participants:As a matter of format and readability, I feel that each section should conclude with the questions to the "audience" taking part in the public comment. Readability is key... also, please reduce any cross-references to a minimum

from Greg Shatan to All Participants:Thank you, Paul.

from Kavouss Arasteh to All Participants:Not agree with the comment made. We need to clarify all problems irrespective whether they discissed or not discussed in the qwork track

from Kavouss Arasteh to All Participants:CORRECTION

from Kavouss Arasteh to All Participants:work track

from Kavouss Arasteh to All Participants:Jeff, but we could ask opion of the public on that

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:No Expert on Webex of course

from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants: Sorry if that Red ! doesn't mean that

from Rubens Kuhl to All Participants:Kavouss, that is a possibility for the final report. The initial report shoud only reflect the work track discussions, and corrections are only when (a) something was discussed in WT but it's not

reflect in the report (b) something was discussed in the report and is incorrectly reflected in the report (c) something is factually wrong

from Kavouss Arasteh to All Participants:Views were expressed that this group is entitled to take into account comments made in discussing output of a given group and NOZ merely ensure that the document reflects the discussion held at thev level of a given group

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:I suggest we check with the https://ntldstats.com/backend the names we used for example - not all of them ara there

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:for backends

from Jim Prendergast to All Participants:and some of those new RSPs dont exist anymore - Rightside and AusRegistry

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:ISC?

from Rubens Kuhl to All Participants:Rightside -> Donuts

from Rubens Kuhl to All Participants:ISC -> Uniregistry

from Kristina Rosette to All Participants:Perhaps best not to identify any entities by name.

from Rubens Kuhl to All Participants:AusRegistry + Neustar -> Neustar

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:

or we need to add words that it was example from the application phase

from Rubens Kuhl to All Participants:I have to drop now.

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:

so we do not have to update it

from donna austin to All Participants:My hand is up

from Susan Payne to All Participants:me too

from Kristina Rosette to All Participants:Is there deadline by which we need to provide written comments on 1.2?

from Steve Chan to All Participants: @Donna, there is this comment in the deliberations section: The specific technical requirements will be consistent with those set forth in section [1.7.7].

from Steve Chan to All Participants:Does that go some ways to addressing your comment?

from donna austin to All Participants:Thanks Steve. I'll re-read.

from Christa Taylor to All Participants:Good point

from Alexander Schubert to All Participants:Yeah: When can we DISCUSS stuff - outside of "submitting comments"?

from Jonathan Robinson to All Participants:Hand

from Greg Shatan to All Participants:The idea is to get this document out for comments. We can discuss stuff by submitting comments and by participating in the work of the group after the comments are received and analyzed.

from Jorge Cancio to All Participants:not sure whether this work on checking whether the initial report reflects the work track discussions should not have been better done by the work tracks themselves and allow for a substantive discussion at WG level?

from Alexander Schubert to All Participants:Some work track sessions had less than 10 participants ....

from Alexander Schubert to All Participants:So some issues are decide by 10 people - and all we can do is making a "comment" if we weren't in that WT?

from Alexander Schubert to All Participants:The next issue "application queuing" is a good example:

from Susan Payne to All Participants:but Alexander, each topic was discussed on multiple WT calls to try to ensure that there was adequate opportunity to engage even if you missed a call

from Alexander Schubert to All Participants:Seemingly the easiest solution has never been considered - and the only method is to make "comment" to have one injected?

from Alexander Schubert to All Participants:Not everybody can participate in 5 work tracks!

from Anne Aikman-Scalese to All Participants:The Working Group doesn't actually have any recommendations. This is more of an "Interim Report" where we are testing the waters based on discussions that have occurred.

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:to be precise not all registries were registries by then

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:I am not sure that the discussion should be removed , it will not be transparent

from Katrin Ohlmer to All Participants:Alexander, the WorkTracks do not make "decisions", but rather summarize the discussion. SO everyone who did not participate in a certain WT, can comment during the Public Comment Period.

from Jim Prendergast to All Participants:Cheryl - Interim or Initial?

from Anne Aikman-Scalese to All Participants:It should actually be called "interim", not "initial".

from Steve Chan to All Participants:Draft GNSO schedule is available here: https://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/file/field-file-attach/icann62-draft-gnso-schedule-26apr18-en.pdf

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:

note: other parties than applicants and registries can not share experience from the application phase (due to not having those)

from Steve Chan to All Participants:On day 1

from Steve Chan to All Participants:@Jeff, the scheduling for the cross community/high interest sessions remains tentative

from Martin Sutton to All Participants:Given the fact that the issue of substantive comment vs report review has intefered with the progress of successive meetings, perhaps the repeated responses and clarifications by Jeff & Cheryl should be circulated in writing. With approx 50 members joining the calls it does consume alot of time that could be used more effectively to review the report.

from Jorge Cancio to All Participants:following Martin: the goal of these meetings could be described in the agenda circulated for them

from Phil Buckingham to All Participants:Agreed Martin

from Martin Sutton to All Participants:Thanks Jeff

from Anne Aikman-Scalese to All Participants:Thanks all

from Katrin Ohlmer to All Participants:thanks all

from Robin Gross to All Participants:Thanks, Jeff and CLO, bye all!

from Jorge Cancio to All Participants:thanks all and bye

from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:bye