

Attendance - 12 Members

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair)

Gg Levine (NABP)

Heath Dixon (Amazon)

Jamie Baxter | dotgay

Jeff Neuman

Jessica Hooper

Jim Prendergast

Justine Chew

Kathy Kleiman

Katrin Ohlmer

Susan Payne

On audio only: Kristine Dorrain

Apologies: Michael Flemming, Julie Hedlund (staff)

Staff: Emily Barabas, Steve Chan, Julie Bisland

AC Chat:

Julie Bisland: Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Group C call on Thursday, 20 December 2018 at 15:00 UTC

Julie Bisland: Wiki agenda: <https://community.icann.org/x/kgbuBQ>

Emily Barabas: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__docs.google.com_spreadsheets_d_1MQmo1B6zBqGXyFRF2pKZXPhGmz0JfZhlAMxKIdVsT1g_edit-23gid-3D0&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=Lu1cb0WVDZOIheBrWBAA0E3o84ZIM1SkMpndakzD4Kc&s=-8lZX5Uj3lJS_p4ea3d82hLCaDU6KuHTvv7jCpEa-bs&e=

Steve Chan: We are at line 30 in the displayed version, but as Cheryl noted, likely easier to follow in the Google Sheet.

Steve Chan: oops, page 30!

Jim Prendergast: so line 195 in google docs?

Katrin Ohlmer: yes

Emily Barabas: Jim, correct

Susan Payne: INTA not IPC

Jeff Neuman: sorry...you are right...I meant INTA

Justine Chew: What does INTA's comment say in 2.7.4.c.1.1?

Jeff Neuman: i can address that

Jeff Neuman: INTA supports the recommendation that singular and plural versions of the same word in the same language of the same type of string should be evaluated for string confusion, with the intent that where an application for a string is the singular/plural of an existing string the application will not proceed unless the applicant is also the registry operator (or an affiliate) of the prior blocking string. Further, where there are multiple applications for the same term and/or its singular/plural these should be placed into a single contention set. INTA has concerns that allowing further singulars and plurals of the same string to coexist at the top level will open the Internet community to potential abuse, consumer confusion, and the need for additional defensive registrations. Applicants may feel compelled to apply

for additional strings, thereby unnecessarily increasing the cost for TLDs, complicating the launch process for Applicants, and crowding the root zone with largely unused or unwanted TLDs.

Steve Chan: There is a little more: We also support this applying to foreign equivalents. Where applicants are brands which co-exist in the real world, applying for a .Brand, it should not be assumed that one is a plural of another. The nature of the TLDs in this case should be taken into consideration in evaluating the string similarity. The mere addition of the letter "s" to an English word should not be assumed to indicate that it is a plural – it will depend on context. The word "news" is not the plural of "new".

Jeff Neuman: thanks Steve

CHeryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair): Supportive of the Comments and with New Ideas

CHeryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair): Yes I agree Jeff

Justine Chew: @Jeff, good point

Susan Payne: the question is should the standard stay the same - so the divergence is that they say no, it needs to be improved

Steve Chan: Added an explanatory note in the notes column: Note, Divergence is in relation to the standard of proof rather (as asked), rather than opposition to the LRO itself.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Steve

Justine Chew: +1 Steve

Steve Chan: And fixed the typo already, since it says rather twice :)

Kathy Kleiman: Sorry, entering late.

Kathy Kleiman: Do we have any studies of the legal rights objections?

Kathy Kleiman: How they worked?

Jim Prendergast: wow good memory Jeff

Steve Chan: @Kathy, there are statistics in the Initial Report on outcomes. However, whether the panels determined everything accurately is a more subjective matter.

Jeff Neuman: @Kathy - As Steve said, the data is there. It can be interpreted in a number of subjective ways. BUT it is worth noting for the record that no one opposed the notion of continuing with having Legal Rights Objection

Jeff Neuman: @Kathy - At this point there is only support from the IPC/INTA for the proposal. It will be discussed by Full Working Group. If the Full Group wants to consider adopting it, then there would have to be public input into it

Kathy Kleiman: @Cheryl - tx you!

Kathy Kleiman: @Jeff: that makes sense -- tx you.

Kathy Kleiman: I like the idea of the public input!

Jeff Neuman: @Kathy - understood. But if the working group does not agree on a proposal, then I am not sure there is a need for public input.

Jeff Neuman: Otherwise there would be a never ending loop of public comments anytime any one person or group has an idea

Kathy Kleiman: @Jeff - agree -- unless there is a new WG proposal, then no need for public input...

Steve Chan: Thanks Cheryl, replicated to e.18

Jeff Neuman: I think the question should say action or inaction

Jeff Neuman: @CLO - you read it right, but the words used in the written question was wrong :)

Katrin Ohlmer: Question: Do we classify a statement of "does not support" as Concerns or Divergence?

Katrin Ohlmer: @Jeff: That was my impression, too.

Jeff Neuman: And for the record, although I am employed by Valideus, I was not responsible for the comments that were submitted by the Company :)

CHeryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair): Yes I saw that change Thx Steve

Kathy Kleiman: Steve - what line?

Steve Chan:Line 12

Steve Chan:It's the line now in green

Steve Chan:That seems like some level of Agreement with the recommendation.

Jeff Neuman:@Steve - It does seem like that NCSG comment is mostly in support. They seem to say that the Accountability mechanisms were burdened with new gTLD appeals type questions and that next time there should be a different process.

Jeff Neuman:So I see the comment agreeint that an appeals process is needed

Jeff Neuman:But the NCSG should confirm

Jeff Neuman:This is such an obvious recommendation, I think anyone objecting would be out of the norm

Katrin Ohlmer:How can the answer from the RySG - referencing the previous answer - be classified?

Jeff Neuman:yes

Jeff Neuman:According to the Jewish and Chinese calendars, January 2nd will still be "this year" :)

Emily Barabas:Next call is Thurs 3 Jan at 20:00 UTC

Emily Barabas:For those celebrating this particular New Year, Happy New Year!

Justine Chew:Thanks Cheryl, all, and happy holidays!

Kathy Kleiman:Happy Holidays, All! Tx you Cheryl!

Katrin Ohlmer:Happy Holidays!

Emily Barabas:Correction: 21:00 UTC!

CHeryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair):Bye for now Seasons Greetings

CHeryl Langdon-Orr (PDP Co-Chair): Great Progress!!

Julie Bisland:**The next Sub Group C: Thursday, 03 January 2019 at 21:00 UTC for 60 minutes