

# New gTLDs WG 16-07-2012 Summary Minutes

## Summary Minutes and Action Items

16 July 2012

AD Reviewed the agenda

1. AD stated that she would like the New gTLD WG to meet at least once a month from now through Toronto.

2. GG carried out the Roll Call

3. ANgRG status update was given by Dev. The RG had a joint meeting in Prague. The key take away was the main focus of the meeting. That was to encourage At-Large members to make comments. There was also a discussion of COI issues. In the time since Prague, Rudi Vansnick has resigned. The Dashboard has also been updated by Dev. Regarding the comments and timing, there is a new suggested and updated timeline. The Prague Meeting took up a large chunk of time.

AD: Has the RG made any decisions on choosing a non-interim Chair rather than interim Chair. Also, there were two RG members with a possible COI. Also, please remind RG and new gTLD WG members frequently of the new time-line, esp the deadline for comments.

DT: There will be a RG call tomorrow. Re the COI RG members - Rudi has stepped down. However, the second is still pending. Re the timeline, I'll send out a message to the RALO lists today. Given the large number of applicants, there is no ...

AG: We've heard a lot of comments, but they are not finding their way into the Comment section.

AD: I didn't mean to minimize the issue of people commenting. Perhaps some can be covered under the roll-out period. Perhaps this can be explored in the context of this group.

TBJ: Something that is not in your duty now, I think you need to send messages to the lists reminding them of the deadlines - stating that if they do not make comments by a specific date, they will not be able to make comments. So a reminder email will be very good.

AG: Tijani said part of what I was going to say. This is a crisis time. I don't think that many will be serious comments (within the limited objection criteria), but this is our one kick at the can. Timing couldn't be worse given the summer and post-Prague.

DT: I agree. There is fatigue from the Prague Meeting. I agree. If there are comments, they should send them. Please send their messages. I will update them today. I will also send a message out today.

AD: I don't think this is a crisis period - I think it is a critical period. Also, the comment period is not only for negative comments but also for positive comments.

4. COI and other conflict of roll issues

AD: We know and have seen the attention that the At-Large objection process is getting. We know that any potential registrars will likely be watching...I would like to ask those who are involved in the RG process to highly police themselves re COI. On the conflict of roll, one of the discussions that have been going on in the background is the SARP. Because of the dearth in the number of applicants from developing countries,...Re the CMR probably one is enough...we now have two people who are interested in doing it (Rafik and Cintra). We have left it up to staff to pick. Staff don't wish to pick. On Cintra, I have a concern that because she is responsible for the Objection process - so she could have a conflict of roll. Cintra did mention that if this was a conflict of roll, she'd drop her roll as the leader of the At-Large Objection Process. A decision will need to be made by someone. I wanted to make sure that this was recorded.

EL: To confirm, if Cintra gets the roll, she'll step down from the SARP leader.

AD: It is not as SARP leader, it is the leader of the New gTLD WG on the At-Large Objection Process.

EL: So not really an issue, as Rafik doesn't have a conflict and Cintra will step away from the possible conflict of roll if selected for the SARP.

AM: I agree with Evan. I think this is a non-issue and either candidate would be good.

AG: Someone has to make a decision.

AD: Flip a coin if no other process - if that is what this group would like to say.

AD: This is actually a JAS WG issue.

AG: I don't think I have the stomach to reconvene the JAS WG at this time. The last thing I remember is that Kurt said...

TBJ: I don't like the coin of Evan. I think that the rep should be chosen by objective criteria. I think that the right reason is a real contribution to the substance of the issue and contribution to the JAS WG, etc. I don't want to choose between them, but the best is to find objective criteria.

AD: I agree the best is to find objective criteria. I think that looking at who did the most within the JAS WG.

AM: What the main objective for choosing the person is to look at who will do the most in this new roll. Why not ask them to discuss it between themselves? The benefit for us is that we can move on.

AD: Sounds like a great suggestion. Is there anyone against it?

EL is in favor. AG signaled it was a good way forward.

AG: To look at what our text said and how the JAS interpreted. We are looking at going forward.

AM: We are going to be under pressure to make things work as opposed as to yes or no.

AD: The general tone I got is that Rafik and Cintra should be asked to speak to each other and sort it out. Dev's question re having both - I don't think so. However, I think if both are on, I see it as a sign of failure.

AG: Perhaps we should ask staff if there can be two.

AD: Ok.

TBJ: I don't agree with Alan. We don't need two people for three applicants. It is ridiculous. It is easy to find a compromise between two people.

AD: I'll put that through as first suggestion - that we ask them to settle it themselves.

AI: AI to ask the two applicants to settle who will be the leader between themselves.

#### 5. Extension of Applicant Support charter item to include:

AD: Read her draft letter to the ALAC on the At-Large New gTLD WG Charter Item.

TBJ: I read your proposal. Your proposal is very good. Perhaps we need to formulate it a different way, but the content is very good. The charter has to be updated.

AD: The editing should be opened up. I invite everyone to add their suggestions.

AG: Is this really the best time to do this? We know there will be a second round. We don't know how many applicants will actually make it through the application process.

AD: My personal view is that it is absolutely the right time. It will take time to study the reasons. It is the time to carry out research. If the developing countries are to be reached, they need to be reached out to now. To say to wait until the second round may be just wasting several years while everything gets sorted. Because of the low number of applicants, perhaps the issue of a special round for developing countries.

TBJ: I absolutely agree with AD. If there was a failure, it was because there was a lack of information last time. The problems of outreach last time. We were arguing. We need to find solutions. Why not a special round? If we don't do look at this now, we will fail again.

AG: I was not saying we wait for 5 years or so. I meant why 'right' now. If we need to consider the issue for a year, then ok to start now. Part of it will depend on whether the New ICANN is like the Old ICANN. Even if we start a new round, it would start after the current applicants have been accepted. To start the process, I have no problem. But to have the expectation that it will be the definitive work, than I think that additional information will come in the next year.

AD: Perhaps the write up needs to include that this is the start of the process.

AM: I would like to put myself on record that I think we should start this process now. The issue of applicant support is something that the community dropped the ball. One of the big complaints I've heard from the Emerging Markets people is that this process was forced on them without giving them enough time to consider about the process.

AD: Asked people to make comments on the Charter letter on the wiki. Will discuss this issue between now and the next meeting.

#### 6. Update on gTLD Issues - Updates from token Holders

Hong and Alan are working on them.

Token holders should work on their items between now and the next meeting.

#### 7. Schedule of meeting

AD: I suggest we meet monthly and that we have sub-groups that are working on specific issues. That we get status reports from these groups. As Toronto approaches, we can schedule more meetings.

#### 8. Pending issues

AD: Nothing really new.

9: AOB

EL: Brought up the issue of the "private" generic-word registrations. Discussed that some domainers have raised concerns of private companies (like Amazon) have applied for gTLDs of generic words. Should we stay neutral on the issue?

AG: It is an interesting question and I think we need to speak about it in a global sense. There is a potential issue here. ICANN has side-stepped it. Is there consumer confusion? Are we creating a consumer quagmire? I think we need to consider it before we say we are neutral.

AD: That means we should add this issue to our roll out list.

AG: I don't think we can't discuss it before the roll out happens.

EL: In terms of having the At-Large community aware of it, I have no issue with that.

AD: Will add EL's name to the issue of "private" generic-word registrations.

Meeting adjourned.