

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group
Work Track 5 Geographic Names
17:00 - 18:30, Sat, Oct 20, 2018
Session 3 of 3 -- Sub Group 1-3 kickoffs

Notes:

Group A: 1.1.3 Applications Assessed in Rounds

Recording: <http://audio.icann.org/meetings/bcn63/bcn63-OPEN-2018-10-20-T1457-114-en-GNSO--New-gTLD-Subsequent-Proced.m3u>

Google Sheet: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/15zDdzlBwLCz5m2sNXui6N6pporbUq-IDFEwf4rKi4A/edit?usp=drive_web&oid=103865008760080873867

Summary:

-- The Sub Group's focus is to try to tie the comments that have been submitted together, but not to provide our own comments. Our own view can be presented in the full WG.

-- Not overt support for FCFS but generally for rounds.

-- If we recommend to the full WG a proposal for rounds and that the distance between two rounds is 6-months/year. Very few support starting on day one with a FCFS-process.

Discussion:

ALAC:

-- Choose the topic of applications assessed in rounds because it seemed like there was some agreement in the comments.

-- Sub Group A will address the topic of priority.

-- On FCFS ALAC didn't say it supports rounds but said it does not support FCFS. Ask the liaison of the ALAC if it is okay to go with rounds.

-- Need to make sure ICANN Org has the capacity.

-- Need further details from the ALAC on their comments. Need quantified information beforehand.

-- Strings need to be applied to each batch as a practical compromise.

Brand Registry Group:

-- If you do batches on a regular schedule then that would solve the timing issue.

Question: Do we want to accept applications at any time but batching them?

Sub Group B: 2.5.1 Application Fees

Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p2tdnr2h3wn/>

Google Sheet: <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/133WbhWYB4M4kT6DqSfiCR2-ij7jxNkLj5EWZL-NA95M/edit#gid=0>

Summary: Support overall for lower fees.

2.5.1.c.1

-- largely in support of recommendation, others seem to add additional elements (50% refund, expects fees to be reduced)

25.1.c.2

-- Some suggest \$185k and refund back, some suggest new pricing exercise and excess going to applicants, others suggesting distribution to other groups (per Initial Report). Others suggest higher fees.

-- Several commenters raise question about what cost recovery is. Want to understand if 2012 fee was accurate, high, or low. There are still costs being incurred, which could complicate analysis.

-- Important to understand how close to the estimates are (e.g., far below or far in excess of estimates).

Group C: 2.10.1 Base Registry Agreement

Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p69sqxbna7j/>

Google sheet: <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/u/1/d/1MQmo1B6zBqGXYFRF2pKZXPhGmz0JfZhlAMxKldVsT1g/edit#gid=330918767>

-- How does the group want to approach reviewing the questions?

-- Will all groups use the same approach?

-- Each group will have their own approach, but they will likely learn from one another and share best practices?

-- Will the agenda be shared ahead of time for each call so members can prepare prior to discussing the comments?

- Suggestion to use the spreadsheet as a primary source of material.
- In terms of roadmap, the intention is to cover at least one topic per call.
- The subgroup may want to go over again the topics it covers on this call depending on how much progress we make today.
- If we are unsure what is meant by a comment, we can go back with clarifying questions to the group that submitted the comment.
- We would also like to get a reasonable amount of work done between meetings. We should be able to do some collaboration between the calls in the Google doc.
- Work plans will be mapped out and agendas will be circulated ahead of each call.
- How will we as a sub team add comments to the google doc?
- One possibility: first, we will categorize the comments to assess what the comments say. Then we can do a second pass if needed. For example, we can color code the responses to capture the sentiment of the comment, we can also have notes and comments column to make sure that we capture the nuance.
- The group will need to record how each comment has been taken into account.
- Ultimate output of the report -- we are sifting and sorting comments -- it is up to the plenary to make recommendations or determinations based on these comments.

2.10.1.c.1: review of the question

- Reading BRG comment. This comment supports, but also provides specific suggestion. We need to capture the fact that they have made a suggestion, and if possible digest what it is that they are suggesting.
- What exactly do we report back to the plenary?
- We should make sure that the plenary knows what issues came up and what points they may need to consider, make decisions about.
- Reading comment from ICANN Org. Clarification, will ICANN org say that they be expressing support or lack of support for specific recommendations, options, questions, etc?
- ICANN org's comments primarily seek clarification about the impacts of the recommendations and raises considerations that the group might want to take into account.

-- These will have a slightly different approach compared to other comments. May need to be coded differently or pulled out for separate analysis. This will be discussed further.

-- Reading through comments from XYZ and Neustar.

-- Reading through RySG comments. Reading through Mark Monitor comments.

-- Question for further consideration -- how much time does the group want to spend preparing individually and then discussing vs. reading on the call?