AC Chat:
Julie Bisland:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP - Sub Group A call on Thursday, 20 December 2018 at 20:00 UTC
 Julie Bisland:Wiki agenda: https://community.icann.org/x/fgbuBQ
 Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair)::-)
 Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):I have to leave just before top of the hour to get into the GNSO COuncil Call apologies in advance
 Jim Prendergast:can someone post the google doc link please?
 Robin Gross:https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__docs.google.com_spreadsheets_d_15zDdzlBwLCz5m2sNXui6N6pporbUq-2DlDFEwfh4rKi4A_edit-23gid-3D1627799531&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=hbXUa08DULc1Hk5FNaWjeEpjB7hoey7AbdsGH_nNszQ&s=gYo7xxxja4MJ2ZeFjaBGMYtZmSEDbRe4Z341aurZp9c&e=
 Julie Bisland:understood, Cheryl, thank you for the heads up
 Robin Gross:We will end a couple minutes before the hour so folks can join the GNSO Council call happening in one hour.
 Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):Ohh Also if I suddenly dissapear before that it may be that they cut powere to the street to fix the tree down blocking the road still it is making its own attempt of being a horizontal Christmas tree with still live power lines
 Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):bad Storms in Sydne last evening
 Julie Bisland:oh no, Cheryl, hope they are able to clean up quickly and get your lines back up and running
 Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):Sydneys storms are being declared disasterous with many millions of $$ damage done so I guess we will just be on the list of critical fixes with the powere lines on and downed
 Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):back to work here though

Kathy Kleiman:I think NCSG comments belong here too

Kathy Kleiman:not on the phone yet.

Kathy Kleiman:Robin - in chat

Kathy Kleiman:can someone stop Robin for a sec

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):these seem to be more greenish to me

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):Yes Jeff new idea but not concern

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):as such

Katrin Ohlmer:Agree with Jeff

Anne Aikman-Scalese:that makes sense

Emily Barabas:Hi kathy, can you send us the comment you want included under this item?

Donna Austin, Neustar:Sorry to join late.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):We can duplicate and note that as we have in other SGs

Kathy Kleiman:listed in both :-). Tx!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):If it makes it INTO the PDPs Final Report that is subject to PC

Kathy Kleiman:@Emily, let's duplicate - tx!!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):Jeff and I switching here last time I spoke and he typed ;-)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):tag team Leadership

Kathy Kleiman::-)

Jim Prendergast:thats more a homework assignment than concern

Katrin Ohlmer:Yes, better described as new idea.

Emily Barabas:I just added the comment from 58 under this item as well

Emily Barabas:(NCSG comment)

Jim Prendergast:so an ongoing accreditation process similiar to registars is something the NCSG opposes?

Jim Prendergast:^ meant as a clarifying question

Jeff Neuman:Ignore the time period of the round

Jeff Neuman:I just used the hypothetica

Steve Chan:@Jeff, if it helps, the NCSG comment specifically supports d.3

Steve Chan:2.2.3.d.3: Conduct all future new gTLD procedures in "rounds" separated by predictable periods for the purpose of course corrections indefinitely. Policy development processes would then be required to make substantial, policy-driven changes to the program and would then only apply to the opening of the application round following the date in which the PDP recommendations were adopted by the ICANN Board.

Donna Austin, Neustar:Does the round dates relate to the application window only, or does it extend to evaluation and delegation?

Jim Prendergast:I think the key assumption is the previous round has closed

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):That is my assumption @Jim

Jeff Neuman:Actually I think we need to be careful about using the term "round closed"

Jeff Neuman:We have not yet defined that

Jeff Neuman:That is what we are referring to the full group

Kathy Kleiman:where is this example?

Donna Austin, Neustar:thanks Jeff, so it is an open question.

Kathy Kleiman:right -- that's all part of a "round" to us

Jim Prendergast:when a round closes is an open question..

Kathy Kleiman:is the first round closed?

Donna Austin, Neustar:The application window is closed :-)

Anne Aikman-Scalese:We need the list o f all applications still pending from 2012 and why they are "stuck".

Jim Prendergast:Agree with Anne

Jim Prendergast:data

Donna Austin, Neustar:Just to make a point though: The 2012 application window closed 6 years ago. So it seems a stretch to sugged that the round is still open.

Donna Austin, Neustar:should be 'suggest' not 'sugged'

Donna Austin, Neustar:But if we take the example used, 50% of the applications have been processed so the round is closed.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:.MAIL is not an example of an open question from 2012. It was not approved by the Board. Could come up again in next round. Same applies to .HOME and .CORP

Jeff Neuman:@Donna -The 50% is not when the round is closed, but when the next one can begin....

Jeff Neuman:which does mean you can have several round technically open at the same time

Kathy Kleiman:But if we take the example used, 50% of the applications have been processed so the round is closed ==> that still leaves 50% subject to Community and public involvement!

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Jeff, might be a difference in interpretation, but I don't think we're disagreeing.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:hand up

Jeff Neuman:@Donna - yes....we just need to define terms.

Steve Chan:Hmm, I think we got the Agreement designation incorrect for the RySG comment.

Kathy Kleiman:@Anne -- agreed, and it took awhile to think this one through :-)

Jeff Neuman:Well get you in Anne

Donna Austin, Neustar:Did we miss the RrSG comment, or am I behind?

Jim Prendergast:the problem wiht 50% processed as the threshold for when a round is closed is that it presumes that policy issues cant surface after that and we have seen in the current round that that is not the case.

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Jim, maybe I'm being rather optimistic, but I would hope--given the work we're doing here--that there would be less issues to surface.

Jim Prendergast:good point

Emily Barabas:we are now discussing 2.2.3.d.1

Donna Austin, Neustar:I think Anne makes a good point, if we have that data, perhaps we can draw some conclusions that would be helpful to this discussion.

Donna Austin, Neustar:Agreed Jeff: we're looking forward not back, but we can learn from the past (which is what we're doing :-)

Donna Austin, Neustar:Also important to think of this in the context of 'predictability for applicants' as an important principle of any future program.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):Exactly Donna

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):Clear dissagreement

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):This is why going through all this to catch that sort of thing is so important :-)

Jeff Neuman:To be clear, the data we are getting is which applications for strings that have not been allocated are still pending (meaning applications still subject to contention or an accountability mechanism or otherwise have not been witdrawn.

Jeff Neuman:[And of course why they are still pending]

Donna Austin, Neustar:Sounds good Jeff

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):This is of course why the FULL PC recived is linked from each cell as well of course ;-)

Emily Barabas:we are now on 2.2.3.d.2

Michael Casadevall:Apologies for getting in very late. RL got in the way

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):Welcome Michael

Michael Casadevall:What line in the gdoc?

Steve Chan:25

Emily Barabas:now 26

Emily Barabas:line 28

Jeff Neuman:Prounounced "Marks"

Jeff Neuman:Though they I am sure love being Marquis

Michael Casadevall:I have a comment, is my audio not working?

Anne Aikman-Scalese:@Jeff "or otherwise have not been withdrawn" will be an interesting discussion. there are some which were not approved by the Board, but are listed as string contention resolved and yet have not been withdrawn.

Kathy Kleiman:???

Kathy Kleiman:Could Michael clarify?

Kathy Kleiman:yes

Jeff Neuman:@Anne - I was thinking alos about how some have been listed as "Will Not Proceed", but they may be in an accountability mechanism or within the time period for which they could file an accountability mechanism action

Jeff Neuman:But we could put .web in the category where string contention has been done, but no apps are withdrawn because of an accountability mechanism pending

Jeff Neuman:and therefore it is "still pending" in my mind

Emily Barabas:@Michael, is there specific text in the Marques comment that you want to mark as concern with the proposal?

Jim Prendergast:Marquis de Trademark

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):Heading off to the GNSO COuncil Meeting now ... Seasons Greetings to you all... Bye for now and Great work! More LOTS more to do in 2019!

Emily Barabas:Kathy, that would be very helpful

Emily Barabas:we will keep an eye out for your email

Michael Casadevall:Emily: The larger brands part at the beginning, with a comment clarifying that smaller brands may not be able to cope.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:I support a priority round for brands! ;-)

Jeff Neuman:Happy New Year everyone!!!!!!!

Anne Aikman-Scalese:happy happy!

Kathy Kleiman:Happy Holidays!!!

Katrin Ohlmer:Happy Holidays!