

Attendance - 13 Members

Anne Aikman-Scalese
Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair)
Christa Taylor
Crystal Ondo
Donna Austin, Neustar
Jim Prendergast
Juan Manuel Rojas
Justine Chew
Martin Silva
Michael Casadevall
Phil Buckingham
Rubens Kuhl
Susan Payne

Apologies: Katrin Ohlmer, Kristine Dorrain, Jeff Neuman, Michael Flemming, Vanda Scartezini

Staff: Emily Barabas, Julie Hedlund, Steve Chan, Julie Bisland

AC Chat:

Julie Bisland:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP - Sub Group B call on Tuesday, 11 December 2018 at 20:00 UTC

Julie Bisland:Agenda wiki: <https://community.icann.org/x/hgbuBQ>

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):Hopefully a few more people will trickle in soon

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):Note Jeff is an apology for this call as is Michael

Julie Bisland:thank you, Cheryl!

Michael Casadevall:Can someone post the gdoc link, I'm having issues accessing my email

Susan Payne:oh sorry, I have to update SOI

Martin Silva:hello all

Rubens Kuhl:https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__docs.google.com_spreadsheets_d_133WbhWYB4M4kT6DqSfiCR2-2Dij7jxNkLj5EWZL-2DNA95M_&d=DwlCaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=twQr331mEKQBTIZEb_RPgMcKz5gFnU5QbuhNu5fCnb0&s=dqzp1cDEQen_adxKffpljXxEcS5P3yxgol9zCAa2Bhk&e=

Susan Payne:but haven't done it yet, just to note I'm now secretary of IPC, so not a major change

Rubens Kuhl:Susan, noted. The chat is part of the record for the session.

Juan Manuel Rojas>Hello all

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):Line 45

Susan Payne:do we know what Lemarit means by the exemption comment?

Jim Prendergast:I think Kristine drafted the RySG comment. too bad she's not able to make it

Jim Prendergast:to clarify ^ This section of the comment. not the entire RySG comment

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):indeed @Jim

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Sorry to be late into Adobe - I have been on the phone though.

Julie Bisland:thank you, Anne

Justine Chew:Sorry I'm late

Susan Payne:so are Lemarit saying you shouldn't be able to switch between types if there is differential pricing?

Susan Payne:sorry, I'm not dialled in at the moment

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):line 49

Susan Payne:I don't think iNTA envisages a refund. This comment from INTA was specifically about notion of gaming, ie applying for a lower fee type and changing later

Justine Chew:@Christa, I had a couple of questions which I had posted to the Sub-Group B list post last call: They are:

Justine Chew:1. Pertaining to text in the 'WG Response' columnIn many instances, I see "WG Response: The WG will refer the New Idea / Concern / Divergence to the full WG." Is this meant to be the sub-group's proposed WG response, as in is the sub-group is proposing that the WG's response to the Contributor be this. Or is it meant to be the sub-group's response to the comment for the full WG's consideration? I'm a little confused with the use of "WG Response", "WG" and "full WG" in this column.2. Question 2.5.1.e.6While I think I understand the brevity in "No Cap = agree" entries under the Comment column, I just wanted to re-confirm that they actually mean "No Cap beyond stability and operational constraint considerations".

Susan Payne:changing later to something which would have been a higher price - so trying to game the system. Proposing a disincentive to that

Steve Chan:Ack, sorry, forgot to respond Justine.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:@Steve - which cell are we on in the Google doc please

Steve Chan:@Anne, we are working through 2.5.2.e.3 (line 45)

Justine Chew:I wonder if one of the "WG" should be "Sub-Group"

Steve Chan:Exactly Justine

Steve Chan:The first WG should be Sub Group

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Thank you Steve - I got confused there for a minute.

Justine Chew:Thanks for clarifying @Christ and @Steve, appreciate it

Steve Chan:A typo that has sadly been propagated throughout much of the document :(

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):next Tab 2.5.2

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):opps 2.5.3

Justine Chew:Meant to say, thanks for clarifying @Christa and @Steve, I appreciate it.

Jim Prendergast:seems like RySG and BC bot support longer window. say similar things, dont they?

Phil Buckingham:@ Michael , Suggestion. I think the PDP (inconjunction with ICANN staff) could do/ should do an exercise to work out the average cost to each of the (1890) applicant s. We have ICANN financial actuals. Steve , CLO thoughts ?

Anne Aikman-Scalese:SHould we seek clarification from the BC related to whether the comment means geographic region or otherwise?

Julie Hedlund:@Rubins: Jim has his hand up.

Jim Prendergast:hand

Julie Hedlund:@Rubens, I mean.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):Phil are you volunteering ;-)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):2.5.3.d.2 is at Line 16 in the spreadsheet

Steve Chan:@Phil, that's for the WG to determine. If there is a clearly articulated goal that this analysis would benefit, then perhaps?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):Line 21

Anne Aikman-Scalese:Hand up

Phil Buckingham:@CLO . Yes . Think it would be a very useful exercise . @ Steve, agreed. how can we move this forward ?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):@Phil as @Steve stated it would need to be proposed and garner support from the Full WG and for that clearly atriculated objectives would be desirable.

Jim Prendergast: this is a good comment from Anne - is what we are suggesting only applicable to a round vs ongoing basis?

Christa Taylor: That was part of the issues of the ongoing basis methodology

Jim Prendergast: it applies to much more than objections

Anne Aikman-Scalese: COMMENT We just need to make sure that if we go the direction of successive follow-on windows, we clarify the Objection periods and deadlines and whether or not the Objection procedure can apply across a window or not. And if an Objection is filed, is it just fine for the Objecting party to file for the same application in the next window and how is that evaluated in light of the standing Objection?

Christa Taylor: I think we may be better to see if it fits better elsewhere

Donna Austin, Neustar: I'm on the call from Neustar. Will you be following up via email?

Christa Taylor: Agree - it seems clear to me

Rubens Kuhl: Donna, if you are available to talk on this right now, please do... we can follow-up via email either way.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Agree with Susan

Donna Austin, Neustar: I don't have audio right now, sorry Rubens.

Donna Austin, Neustar: But I agree with Susan, we answered the question.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair): Seems you have an answer to me @Rubens

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair): at least from Neustar

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair): ALAC seems to be making just general additional concerns regarding first time (inexperienced) applicants

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair): treat it as General if you wish

Justine Chew 2: @CLO - I think that's fine, ALAC's comment (line 26) neither agreement nor divergence, and not require a new idea.

Steve Chan: @Cheryl, perhaps it might be seen as Divergence (e.g., a shortened period could be seen as disadvantaging inexperienced applicants)?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Agree with Steve re his comment to Cheryl

Justine Chew 2: I don't object for line 26 to be designated as divergence either - the aim being so long as the concern is highlighted.

Christa Taylor: I'd suggest reviewing WT1 discussions as the different time periods and implications were discussed which might shed some additional light on the thinking

Steve Chan: Thanks Justine. Just wanted to make sure we were reading the comment correctly.

Susan Payne: no IPC

Susan Payne: :)

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you Susan. We are blessed!

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you to Christa & Rubens for setting out meeting dates coordinated with the topics to be covered!

Emily Barabas: 17:00 UTC on Dec 18

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair): Thanks everyone good progress today :-). Bye for now...

Susan Payne: yes please

Justine Chew 2: Thanks. Till next week then.

Christa Taylor: Thanks all...

Susan Payne: thanks all

Juan Manuel Rojas: Thanks all