

Attendance - 36 Members

Alexander Schubert

Anne Aikman-Scalese

Bruna Martins dos Santos

Cheryl Langdon-Orr

Chris Niemi

Christa Taylor

Christopher Wilkinson

Donna Austin

Gemma Keegan

Gertrude Levine

Greg Shatan

Harold Arcos

Jamie Baxter

Jeffrey J. Neuman

Jessica Hooper

Jim Prendergast

Karen Bernstein

Karen Day

Katrin Ohlmer

Kavouss Arasteh

Ken Stubbs

Liz Brodzinski

Martin Sutton

Maxim Alzoba

Michael Flemming

Phil Corwin

Raymond Zylstra

Robin Gross

Roger Carney

Rubens Kuhl

Rudy Mendoza

Samantha Demetriou

Sara Bockey

Sarah Langstone

Sophie Hey

Vanda Scartezini

Apologies: Alan Greenberg, Justine Chew

Staff: Julie Hedlund, Emily Barabas, Trang Nguyen, Michael Karakash, Steve Chan, Berry Cobb, Julie Bisland

Webex chat:

05/07/2018 12:52:36 PM from Vanda Scartezini to All Participants:
hi all, today I have another call in one hour. so my previous apologies for leaving early today.

05/07/2018 12:54:25 PM from Vanda Scartezini to All Participants:
can someone say something just to chek if my audio is working ok? thank you

05/07/2018 12:55:06 PM from Vanda Scartezini to All Participants:
yes thank you!!

05/07/2018 12:55:10 PM from Steve Chan to All Participants:
:)

05/07/2018 12:55:18 PM from Vanda Scartezini to All Participants:
i am mute to avoid noise

05/07/2018 13:00:45 PM from Jeff Neuman to All Participants:
one minute countown

05/07/2018 13:04:03 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:
Sorry for delay in getting into WebEx today.

05/07/2018 13:05:01 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to All Participants:
Hello , will not be able to use mic (quite late) , chat only this time

05/07/2018 13:05:10 PM from Steve Chan to All Participants:
You can see a list of all of the sections and what has been released here:
<https://community.icann.org/x/NwUhB>

05/07/2018 13:05:11 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:
1.10 close to ready

05/07/2018 13:06:52 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:
noting that the preamble is an open Action Item on Jeff and I but it is expected soon

05/07/2018 13:07:49 PM from Vanda Scartezini to All Participants:
i have used new Adobe with another external group, worked not so well

05/07/2018 13:07:57 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:
Will do so Jeff

05/07/2018 13:09:24 PM from Jim Prendergast to All Participants:
FOR AOB - the call next week is during the GDD summit. That will likely hurt attendance. Should strongly consider rescheduling. thanks

05/07/2018 13:10:08 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to All Participants:
Jim we are planing to chane the time to better suite Jim so yes noted

05/07/2018 13:10:18 PM from Jim Prendergast to All Participants:
thx

05/07/2018 13:10:49 PM from Terri Agnew to All Participants:
@Christopher: I see you rejoined, your connection was definitely frozen. Glad you're back!

05/07/2018 13:11:10 PM from Terri Agnew to All Participants:
REMINDER TO ALL: please mute mics :)

May 7, 2018 3:13:53 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: Suggestions for any edits to the new 'conditional language' would be appreciated in chat or to the email list, rather than in intervention today please

May 7, 2018 3:14:09 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: that will help us capture any suggestions

May 7, 2018 3:15:16 PM from Terri Agnew to all participants: Christopher has hand raised

May 7, 2018 3:17:39 PM from Anne Aikman-Scalese to all participants: QUESTION: What is meant in this particular work track by the term "Excess Fees". How would the Work Track define that?
QUESTION

May 7, 2018 3:18:43 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: I am not sure if ICANN stopped adding to what was related to last round

May 7, 2018 3:18:47 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: Anne, ICANN Org uses the same terminology in their financial statements, and it usually means what was received less expenses.

May 7, 2018 3:20:02 PM from Anne Aikman-Scalese to all participants: Yes - Jeff I am aware of the Working Group on the Auction fees and their usage and the proposal that some be used for Reserve fund. I don't know how it was determined by ICANN that this was the right amount.

May 7, 2018 3:20:34 PM from Anne Aikman-Scalese to all participants: Okay - sorry - how was the amount of "excess" determined by ICANN?

May 7, 2018 3:21:58 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: The final amount is still to be determined, because they are still incurring expenses, like refunds and legal fees.

May 7, 2018 3:22:00 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: @Anne , to calculate excess fees there is a need to know the "relevant spending" for the last round (we know the amount of initial payments , but we do not know what to remove (spenings))

May 7, 2018 3:22:03 PM from Kavouss Arasteh to all participants: Jeff, pls repeat the available amount of excess fee, 100 or 200 million

May 7, 2018 3:22:08 PM from Anne Aikman-Scalese to all participants: Okay, thank you. Does it relate to cost of processing an application versus cost of application at \$185,000?

May 7, 2018 3:22:26 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: It's not 100 million, it's more like 5 million.

May 7, 2018 3:23:36 PM from Vanda Scartezini to all participants: yes the auction will release a report shortly

May 7, 2018 3:24:29 PM from Steve Chan to all participants: Hands up: Donna and Kavouss

May 7, 2018 3:24:38 PM from Anne Aikman-Scalese to all participants: Thanks Jeff.

May 7, 2018 3:25:04 PM from Steve Chan to all participants: Christopher, I was assuming old hand, but please let me know otherwise.

May 7, 2018 3:26:30 PM from Steve Chan to all participants: Thanks Christopher, I see your hand is down.

May 7, 2018 3:27:31 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: will be potential court hearings (unhappy applicants) spending be a part of the last round ?

May 7, 2018 3:27:36 PM from Jeff Neuman to all participants: @Kavouss - Thanks. I admit to not having paid too much attention to the amount of auction funds

May 7, 2018 3:28:25 PM from Jim Prendergast to all participants: the \$185,000 breaks down in the following. \$100,000 for evaluation. \$25,000 for historical costs and development. \$60,000 was for legal defense fund

May 7, 2018 3:28:40 PM from Christa Taylor to all participants: The \$185k was broken down as: \$73k for Processing & Evaluation Costs - Variable; \$26,950 was for development costs; \$24,800 was for processing & Evaluation Costs and \$60,000 was for Risk Mitigation

May 7, 2018 3:29:15 PM from Alexander Schubert to all participants: If the application fee had been half the amount (\$ 90k) - we would have had probably at MINIMUM double as many applications! We HAVE to regulate the "work load" per round: SOME "hurdle" needs to be established that limits the number of applications. At US \$50k I can PROIMISE you that you will see way more than 5,000 applications. 1,000 of them would come from a consortio that I would personally set up - it's just US \$50 Million after all.

May 7, 2018 3:29:37 PM from Vanda Scartezini to all participants: totallya gree Ken.

May 7, 2018 3:29:46 PM from Christopher Wilkinson to all participants: @Donna page 6 para 4. I am not criticizing; just want the final document to be internally consistent and not open to obvious questions.

May 7, 2018 3:29:54 PM from Martin Sutton to all participants: I think we capture the most reasonable aspect of this by the phrase "though the accuracy should be improved" under (2) which can use the benefit of actuals from the latest round.

May 7, 2018 3:30:47 PM from Alexander Schubert to all participants: Either we have a high application fee - or some other pain that limits the application flood to something around 1,000 to 2,000 applications.

May 7, 2018 3:31:20 PM from Jim Prendergast to all participants: The irony of applicants paying into a legal defense fund when ICANN forbade applicants from suing ICANN

May 7, 2018 3:31:39 PM from Anne Aikman-Scalse to all participants: COMMENT: I think ICANN has to be able to defend itself - the cost of "doing business" in this realm includes addressing that sort of risk. COMMENT

May 7, 2018 3:31:51 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: Legal includes internal accountability procedures, not only court litigation...

May 7, 2018 3:32:34 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: Cost of doing business is not a figure that non-profits usually have.

May 7, 2018 3:33:33 PM from Anne Aikman-Scalse to all participants: I agree with Donna re contingency for litigation and other risks.

May 7, 2018 3:34:28 PM from Martin Sutton to all participants: Agree Donna + increasing accuracy based on experiences of precious round

May 7, 2018 3:34:29 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: I hope GDPR fines are not part of what needs to be recovered

May 7, 2018 3:35:19 PM from Anne Aikman-Scalse to all participants: FYI if ICANN has to defend against GDPR enforcement, could not the current "excess fees" fund be used for that purpose?

May 7, 2018 3:35:36 PM from donna austin to all participants: @Maxim, for the 2012 round or future?

May 7, 2018 3:35:47 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: the last round

May 7, 2018 3:35:55 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: Anne, GDPR applies across the board for gTLDs, not only for new gTLDs.

May 7, 2018 3:35:56 PM from Jamie Baxter to all participants: @Donna .. I understand your point, however I'm not sure I agree, especially if there are no controls, transparency or restraints on how ICANN uses applicants money to defend themselves.

May 7, 2018 3:36:41 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: @Jamie, the restraint is the amount they reserved in the application fee.

May 7, 2018 3:37:20 PM from Anne Aikman-Scalese to all participants: Of course Rubens but considering the ratio of new gTLDs to legacy TLDs, it strikes me that use of excess fees for defense to GDPR makes perfect sense.

May 7, 2018 3:37:39 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: given the current ICANN idea of going to court against EU ... those money might not be enough (fines in GDPR are per incident and with great number of TLDS even 10m eur ones might kill)

May 7, 2018 3:37:39 PM from Jamie Baxter to all participants: @Rubens, is it a specified amount, or how is it calculated against the application fees?

May 7, 2018 3:37:40 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: The ratio of legacy gTLD domains is still dominant.

May 7, 2018 3:38:36 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: @Jamie, I believe people posted above is USD 60k per application. So it could be something USD 120 mi.

May 7, 2018 3:38:37 PM from donna austin to all participants: @Jamie, fair point, but the concern really is that if ICANN doesn't fund through the application fee they have to find the money somewhere else. To Rubens point, perhaps there should be a specific amount attached to such events.

May 7, 2018 3:39:45 PM from Anne Aikman-Scalese to all participants: QUESTION: Did the Work Track consider whether different application fees should be applied to different categories of applications? Shouldn't the WG be asking for public comment on this? QUESTION

May 7, 2018 3:39:49 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: "As of Dec. 31, 2017, total new gTLD (ngTLD) domain name registrations were approximately 20.6 million or 6.2 percent of total domain name registrations across all TLDs" (Verisign DNIB)

May 7, 2018 3:40:05 PM from Christa Taylor to all participants: Hi Anne, yes we did and it is in the Variable Fees section

May 7, 2018 3:43:10 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: why - is there no need for IDNs anymore ? to have a TLD in ascii and an IDN - there is a need for two applications

May 7, 2018 3:43:39 PM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: Good Point, Maxim!

May 7, 2018 3:43:49 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: Kavouss this text is meant to reflect the deliberations of the WT. your points would be well made as a comment on this matter in the PC process I think, as the WG has not (so far) limited the numbers of applications per applicant

May 7, 2018 3:45:02 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: do we have a definition of speculation or warehousing ?

May 7, 2018 3:46:42 PM from Christa Taylor to all participants: I don't recall a discussion on specifically defining 'speculation or warehousing'

May 7, 2018 3:46:46 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: the current ICANN term for warehousing is related to bad actors (resellers or registrars)

May 7, 2018 3:47:30 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: I am not sure we can resolve political issues

May 7, 2018 3:47:30 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: Both already happened, and the sky has not fallen...

May 7, 2018 3:47:40 PM from Alexander Schubert to all participants: If we have no "letter of non-objection" I know for SURE there are players who go for hundreds of city gTLDs!

May 7, 2018 3:48:00 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: MMX applied for a number of GeoTLDs, and did a quite good job of managing each one towards its potential.

May 7, 2018 3:48:14 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: @Alexander , capitals will win

May 7, 2018 3:48:53 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: how do we prevent gaming ? (via procurement of the winners)

May 7, 2018 3:49:02 PM from Jeff Neuman to all participants: All - lets stay away from expressing opinions on the merits of applications or their uses (both positive and negative). Thanks

May 7, 2018 3:49:18 PM from Martin Sutton to all participants: These are all comments to submit in the public comment period, can we focus on making sure the Initial Report is a fair representation of the WT discussions that took place beforehand

May 7, 2018 3:49:29 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: if we can not - then it is going to bit pointless

May 7, 2018 3:49:49 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: br

May 7, 2018 3:49:52 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: be

May 7, 2018 3:50:07 PM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: +1 Martin

May 7, 2018 3:50:17 PM from Vanda Scartezini to all participants: agree Cheryl...

May 7, 2018 3:50:31 PM from sara bockey to all participants: +1 Cheryl!

May 7, 2018 3:50:33 PM from Alexander Schubert to all participants: But how can those who haven't participated in a certain WT know what was reflected there? Some work tracks had just a dozen participants?

May 7, 2018 3:50:44 PM from Kurt Pritz to all participants: @Maxim - in your comment about IDNs, are you proposing one application for multiple TLDs so long as each is the translation of the first applied-for string into a different script? Is that to avoid fees or paperwork?

May 7, 2018 3:51:14 PM from Kavouss Arasteh to all participants: Jeff, I wish to reply to CHERYL STATEMENTc

May 7, 2018 3:51:32 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: @Kurt , it was an example of why limit of 1 hurts IDNs

May 7, 2018 3:52:01 PM from Martin Sutton to all participants: @Alexander - summaries have been prepared and circulated regularly, as have the transcripts/recordings to capture any areas that members would have focused on if they were unable to participate in the individual WTs

May 7, 2018 3:52:02 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: might hurt

May 7, 2018 3:52:15 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: And if someone wants to apply to all languages used in India, even 5 TLDs won't be enough.

May 7, 2018 3:53:05 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: 22 then?

May 7, 2018 3:54:34 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: We are revieeing the draft Reprt if you don't wish to assist in that Kavouss that is *your* choice of course

May 7, 2018 3:54:41 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: Only a person can make a judgement on the value of his or her time.

May 7, 2018 3:54:53 PM from Martin Sutton to all participants: @Kavous - those that have followed the WT activities and the numerous PDG WG calls have an oppportunity to review the content of the report for accuracy

May 7, 2018 3:55:44 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: and what Jeff is saying now about our purpose here has been covered in numerous calls.

May 7, 2018 3:57:07 PM from Kavouss Arasteh to all participants: But not all of us have had the oppportunity to attend various work chats

May 7, 2018 3:57:07 PM from Christopher Wilkinson to all participants: @alexander +1 on WTs reports for the PDP

May 7, 2018 3:57:12 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: Exactly Jeff that is our current purpose as we work towards PC

May 7, 2018 3:57:30 PM from Martin Sutton to all participants: The sooner the report is finalised, the sooner comments can be submitted....

May 7, 2018 3:57:32 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: This is in a different section.

May 7, 2018 3:58:07 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: Thx Anne good segway

May 7, 2018 3:58:07 PM from Kavouss Arasteh to all participants: But not all of us have had the opportunity to attend all calls and all work chats

May 7, 2018 3:58:24 PM from Christopher Wilkinson to all participants: I think that we are not the 'public' wed are determining what the text will say to the public consultation.

May 7, 2018 3:58:45 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: Kavouss, but all will have the opportunity to comment in the public comment period, or participate in the deliberations.

May 7, 2018 3:58:45 PM from Kurt Pritz to all participants: @Maxim - sorry I am so dense - you mean the possibility of a limit of 1 app per applicant?

May 7, 2018 3:59:29 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: more "Current thinking" of the WT

May 7, 2018 3:59:55 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: Yes it is Kavouss

May 7, 2018 3:59:56 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: In 1.5, 1.5.1 .2 .3 and .4 were WT2. 1.5.5 was WT2.

May 7, 2018 4:00:35 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: We see your chat Kavouss \

May 7, 2018 4:00:39 PM from Christopher Wilkinson to all participants: No, we owe it to ICANN that the report for public consultation will be corrected by the PDP for errors, internal conradictions and the more 'provocative' political staatements. CW

May 7, 2018 4:01:13 PM from Anne Aikman-Scalese to all participants: Can't get it down.

May 7, 2018 4:01:21 PM from Emily Barabas to all participants:@Kavouss, please select "Send to: All Participants:" in the dropdown so that everyone can see your comments

May 7, 2018 4:02:04 PM from Terri Agnew to all participants: Hi Kavouss, you need to select ALL PARTICIPANTS

May 7, 2018 4:02:33 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: Kavouss you are sending to all Panalists not all Participants so we are seeing your chat but everyone else is not, we are also seeing hands from you and not it up now

May 7, 2018 4:02:50 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: @Kurt, I meant that limit of 1 is a bad idea

May 7, 2018 4:04:07 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: and as an example used Ascii and it's IDN equivalent(s)

May 7, 2018 4:04:48 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: Kavouss you are still sendinf your chat to only the Panalists

May 7, 2018 4:05:16 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: please select All Participants fro the drop down menu

May 7, 2018 4:05:48 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: In Registry Services, there was an additional charge only if an RSTEP panel was convened, and AFAIK, that didn't occur.

May 7, 2018 4:07:38 PM from Kurt Pritz to all participants: @Maxim - yes it is, for several reasons. Whew - glad we got through that.

May 7, 2018 4:08:17 PM from Kavouss Arasteh to all participants: Cheryl, tks for your attention.

May 7, 2018 4:08:18 PM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: One proposed question to add to 1.5.2. e.2.: How to avoid gaming/circumventing such exceptions?

May 7, 2018 4:08:40 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: Kavouss your comment repeatedly sent to Panalists "but not all of us have had the opportunity to attend all calls of a given work track" the Leadership of the WT's and the WG recognise that as a limitation of us not working as a committee of the whole on this process, but we established the WT's for good reasons of logistics

May 7, 2018 4:09:45 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: Thanks Katrin (staff can you note that addition please?

May 7, 2018 4:10:23 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: Katrin, I am not sure it is possible to identify gaming if it happens after the application phase

May 7, 2018 4:10:42 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: We don't know yet the capacity for the SubPro model. RSP Program will make it scale much better in technical evaluation, financial evaluation will be very different (and simpler).

May 7, 2018 4:10:56 PM from Kavouss Arasteh to all participants: This means that the purpose of this meeting is to seek clarification but NOT to raise any question not make any coment.That is surprising and non democratic and non transparent

May 7, 2018 4:11:10 PM from Vanda Scartezini to all participants: sorry ineed to leave, thanks

May 7, 2018 4:11:27 PM from donna austin to all participants: I think we've acknowledged many times that we have chicken and egg challenges associated with this effort.

May 7, 2018 4:11:37 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: the number should be well justified

May 7, 2018 4:11:43 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: Kavouss, all the WT deliberations have recordings so any information you wanna know is published transparently.

May 7, 2018 4:12:32 PM from Kavouss Arasteh to all participants: I do not seek any information at all.I just provide my comments

May 7, 2018 4:12:34 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: it does not cosy a fortune to create a lot of entities

May 7, 2018 4:12:43 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: *cost

May 7, 2018 4:12:53 PM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: Amnother proposal for e.: If costs become variable, how to ensure predictability for applicants?

May 7, 2018 4:13:31 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: Thx again @Katrin

May 7, 2018 4:13:32 PM from Alexander Schubert to all participants: "Limiting numbers of applications per entity" - will be super easy gamed!

May 7, 2018 4:13:53 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: if costs depend on the type of application, then class of the application will be gamed

May 7, 2018 4:14:14 PM from Kavouss Arasteh to all participants: Ido not agree with such argument that this meeting is limited to only seek clarification

May 7, 2018 4:14:16 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: And we don't have any evidence to associate any bad outcome of an applicant making multiple applications.

May 7, 2018 4:14:30 PM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: @Maxim: Yes, I would assume that, too.

May 7, 2018 4:14:32 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: On the contrary, most solo applicants have failed and been bought.

May 7, 2018 4:15:21 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: the current round was delayed and applicants were bleeding money (name collisions , archery e

May 7, 2018 4:15:23 PM from Christa Taylor to all participants: @Maxim - there was discussion on if they changed the application afterwards there would be additional fee (more than just the set application fee)

May 7, 2018 4:15:25 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: t.c.

May 7, 2018 4:15:32 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: Kavouss, not agreeing doesn't change the purpose of the meeting.

May 7, 2018 4:16:23 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: @Christa , I think it is more about using the tld without changing the class

May 7, 2018 4:16:32 PM from Anne Aikman-Scalase to all participants: It probably makes business sense to make several applications - risk of failure is spread across several names - portfolio managment says some will succeed and some will fail.

May 7, 2018 4:16:57 PM from Steve Chan to all participants: @Christopher, you can find CC1 and CC2 here: <https://community.icann.org/x/Ngp1Aw>

May 7, 2018 4:17:06 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: @Anne, most angel investors do exactly that, in fact. Good point.

May 7, 2018 4:17:39 PM from Emily Barabas to all participants: hb

May 7, 2018 4:17:56 PM from Kavouss Arasteh to all participants: Ifully disagree with such comments

May 7, 2018 4:18:15 PM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: I'm not sure if a period of 1 month between end of communication period and end of application period is sufficient to propose. Even in Europe many applicants made the decision on the last minute.

May 7, 2018 4:18:40 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: +1 Katrin

May 7, 2018 4:18:56 PM from Jim Prendergast to all participants: hand up

May 7, 2018 4:18:56 PM from Steve Chan to all participants: Anne, Jim, with hands up

May 7, 2018 4:19:18 PM from Kavouss Arasteh to all participants: We need to allow everybody to raise ihis or her point without a judgement of others

May 7, 2018 4:19:25 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: Perhaps then a question on that

May 7, 2018 4:19:41 PM from Steve Chan to all participants: and now Anne, Jim, Christopher, and Jamie hands up

May 7, 2018 4:19:52 PM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: OK, will file the comment then.

May 7, 2018 4:20:03 PM from Martin Sutton to all participants: But the communication period will run for x weeks/months prior to the end date of communications

May 7, 2018 4:20:13 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: Kavouss, this would imply that meetings have no order. We could discuss politics, sports...

May 7, 2018 4:20:29 PM from Kavouss Arasteh to all participants: I REITERATE THAT THEREIS NO OPPORTUNITY TO RAISE ANY QUESTION OR EXPRESS AND COMMENTS BUT WE ARE EXPECTED TO SAY yes TO EVERYTHING

May 7, 2018 4:20:38 PM from Martin Sutton to all participants: the 1 month period relates just to the gap between the closing part of the comms period to the start of applications

May 7, 2018 4:20:50 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: Martin , amount of LOC can be changed last minute or some other significant part of the equation. .

May 7, 2018 4:21:02 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: Leaving to the last minute is human nature, so giving more time doesn't automatically provide more working time.

May 7, 2018 4:21:49 PM from Kavouss Arasteh to all participants: Some people over reacting on comments of others

May 7, 2018 4:22:18 PM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: @Martin: Of course, and this would be an improvement to the 2011 comment period (which literally did not exist). But

entities will be forced to decide and prepare an application within 1 month, which might not be sufficient.

May 7, 2018 4:22:34 PM from Rubens Kuhl to all participants: Kavouss, using all caps is usually considered rude in online communications. See "Association with shouting" in https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/All_caps . It might not be your intention.

May 7, 2018 4:23:49 PM from Kavouss Arasteh to all participants: Sorry it was my mistake pls forget it was just an oubl e

May 7, 2018 4:24:04 PM from Martin Sutton to all participants: @Katrin - thx, understood. I suppose the point at which someone takes notice of the communications is the issue and some may leave it until the last minute. Does this mean that the length of comms period is more important, rather than the gap between comms closing and application opening?

May 7, 2018 4:24:42 PM from Karen Day to all participants: I don't think this question presumes 1 window

May 7, 2018 4:24:59 PM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: Personally, I think it is more about an efficient communication period rather than the necessary length of it.

May 7, 2018 4:25:04 PM from Jim Prendergast to all participants: hate to bug staff on this but if they could point me to where a 60 day app window was discussed, I'd like to go back and review that.

May 7, 2018 4:25:05 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: I don't believe it was intended to

May 7, 2018 4:25:15 PM from Kavouss Arasteh to all participants: RUBEN, pls kindly cool down and not constantly react on all of my comments

May 7, 2018 4:26:16 PM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: Jamie, good point!

May 7, 2018 4:27:00 PM from Anne Aikman-Scalese to all participants: COMMENT I Agree with Jamie that Community applications take longer to get consensus and make application. COMMENT

May 7, 2018 4:27:01 PM from Kavouss Arasteh to all participants: it happened in the past that I forgot to change from CAP to lower case after I start a sentence it was not intended to mean any shouting at all

May 7, 2018 4:27:17 PM from Jamie Baxter to all participants: @Jeff .. what section was that again?

May 7, 2018 4:27:32 PM from Jim Prendergast to all participants: old hand sorry

May 7, 2018 4:27:32 PM from Steve Chan to all participants: @Jamie, section 1.4.2 on Communications

May 7, 2018 4:27:59 PM from Alexander Schubert to all participants: Good point Jamie. Applies for constituent funded and operated city applicants as well!

May 7, 2018 4:28:11 PM from Jamie Baxter to all participants: @Steve ... thanks

May 7, 2018 4:28:52 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: I think this PDP is about the next round and not about last one

May 7, 2018 4:29:18 PM from Anne Aikman-Scalèse to all participants: COMMENT: Maybe the question to the public is: DO DIFFERENT CATEGORIES OF APPLICATIONS NEED DIFFERENT LENGTHS OF APPLICATION WINDOW? COMMENT

May 7, 2018 4:29:26 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: Time check

May 7, 2018 4:29:59 PM from Maxim Alzoba (FAITID) to all participants: bye all

May 7, 2018 4:30:11 PM from Katrin Ohlmer to all participants: bye all

May 7, 2018 4:30:12 PM from Alexander Schubert to all participants: bye!

May 7, 2018 4:30:17 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: Bye for now

May 7, 2018 4:30:23 PM from Cheryl Langdon-Orr to all participants: thank you all

May 7, 2018 4:30:23 PM from Christopher Wilkinson to all participants: B'ye. Thanks Jeff and all. CW

May 7, 2018 4:30:34 PM from Robin Gross to all participants: Bye. Thanks Jeff and CLO