

New gTLDs WG 21-05-2012 Summary minutes

Summary Minutes and Action Items

Monday 21 May 2012

Review of the Agenda - AD reviewed the agenda. The agenda was adopted.

Roll call was made by staff.

Update on the Prague meetings

-Heidi said there are 2 meetings the first being Monday the second is a joint meeting between the gTLD WG and RG. Both meetings are 90 minutes each, require draft agendas today.

-Avri confirms for the first meeting there will be a discussion on the objection process overall and that there is a fair interest in it among the applicants. We will also discuss SARP and have a better idea of the number of applicants. Looking at the new gTLD rollout and issues also. Generally Statuses and Trying to take things further.

-Avri details the second meeting will be more fluid to ensure that the meeting is led by the RG.

Avri believes the two meetings will be similar to the regular calls of the new gTLD WG. No panels.

4. Update of new gTLD RG membership

Cintra - NARALO is currently voting. LACRALO has two. ALAC will ratifying the RALO members during the ALAC meeting on 22 May.

Heidi reviewed the RALO recommended nominees, the ALAC suggested members, and the next steps.

Dev - Pointed out that Eduardo was from ALAC and that he was from ALAC.

Heidi - Suggested that if Eduardo was not

AM: Could a person be on the RG and the CMR?

Avri - Didn't see a COI.

Cintra - Did see a potential COI.

Avri - The CMR are not picking the pickers. There is no connection.

Alan - Each of these groups have an intense workload. I don't think volunteers will join both. There are a limited number of volunteers and those who will volunteer for these groups. I don't think we should set up high fences given the limited number of people.

Avri - I would recommend that anyone who is planning on joining both, look at their schedule and see if there is any possible conflict of interest. I, personally, am not trying to build another wall.

5. Update on Charter issues

5.1 Update on gTLD Issues

Avri - In terms of the new gTLD roll-out issues, there is a new page with a table on it. Reviewed how the table would work. Would like to have a scribe for each issue and owns the reporting and further research, with others, and then notes.

Currently, we have digital archery and TAS.

Avri added Outreach program for New gTLDs and outreach for JAS to the table.

Avri asked everyone to send in their suggestions on the list and she will add to the table.

5.2. Objection Procedure for RALO

Avri asked whether anyone had any issues or problems to raise.

There were none.

5.3. Update on the ASP

Avri - CMR program was outlined in a meeting with Kurt Pritz. Avri distributed the document. She has not yet seen any further discussion.

The CMR - in terms of SARP member selection - the CMR is providing input. The CMR provides feedback. The CMR does not pick members.

The GNSO Council had a concern that the CMR would be involved in picking the SARP members. This is not the case.

Regarding training, the CMR provides input. This was a specific request of the JAS report that members of the JAS WG do this.

SARP operations - while the SARP is in operation, the CMR will be non-voting observers. Avri sees this as a quiet watcher. However, but this has not yet been determined.

Seven CMR volunteers - Cintra, Rafik, Alan, Tijani, Avri, ...

Avri - Within the GNSO Council, there is some concern of the role of the CMR.

AM - Wanted to get clarification on the concern of the GNSO Council on the CMR. To some extent, it seems like the GNSO Council doesn't understand the intent of the CMR is.

Avri - I believe it was partly due to Kurt having been unable to join the call which discussed this.

Alan - Process and chain of command is a very important within the GNSO Council.

Avri - Rafik will explain to them that the work was within the JAS WG. I think there is a contention that the work went beyond the Charter. Second, is the issue of the chain of command. I didn't know we couldn't speak to staff without first going through the GNSO Council.

Alan - I think it is more making a decision and carrying it out rather than just talking to staff without going through the GNSO Council first.

CLO - That is certainly my view.

Avri - I spoke with A. M. , VC of the GAC, re the SARP, views seemed adequate. I think there was real concern of the CMR i the picking of the members of the SARP. Perhaps one way to see the CMR in the third stage of their work is as silent observers. The SARP has the ability to bring in advisors. The advisors who are on hand to discuss process, is the SARP.

Observers in ICANN are fully allowed to speak. We may wish to have the CMR only able to discuss process. Avri continues to follow up.

CLO - As the ALAC has its meetings tomorrow, I'm wondering whether it might be appropriate to raise this issue with the ALAC to raise their awareness of it.

Avri -Yes, I would also be available in the second part.

6. Pending Action Items Not Yet covered

No AIs were recorded at the previous meeting.

7. AOB

None

The meeting was adjourned.