

New gTLDs WG 26-03-2012 Summary Minutes

1. Review of Agenda (5 min) - Avri

AD reviewed agenda. Agenda was adopted.

2. Roll call (5 min) - Staff

3. Times and Periodicity of upcoming meetings (10 min)

Continue with alternating times?

UTC vs DST?

Every one or two weeks?

UTC vs DST?

Discussion agreed to continue alternating times, be on DST and have bi-weekly calls.

4. Review of feedback from Costa Rica Sessions (10 min) - Avri

Applicant Support Process (ASP) session

AD - Session gave global figures. Outreach about the program was problematic. Outreach on the gTLDs to the audience we wished to reach was problematic. At this point, not sure what we can do. We do this last week to reach out to any applicants we know. Even though the deadline is 29 March, they could still do a joint application. However, if the other applicant didn't qualify for support, that would be difficult.

AM: Agreed that the session on applicant support wasn't great. Heard from some potential applicants that they didn't know about support. We should think about what we should do if there are not 14 applicants for support.

AD: There is some issue re the batching. Assuming that the review for support should take place at the same time as possible batching. How would the JAS WG react?

TBJ: Re the applicant workshop, I was disappointed. We made a lot of noise, but not much was done. I don't think there is more we can. I think that we have a duty to advise about the SARP application process.

AD: Great idea. I think we all need to reach out to people to be on the SARP. Word of mouth will be good. It is too late for applicant support applicants, but we still have a few days.

New gTLD issues sessions

TBJ: My main remark about this session re my question of the next round, they answered that it has not yet been decided re a second round.

AD: There are two things we've heard - 1) that there will be a next round; and 2) there will be a review of the first round before the second.

TBJ: The second point re the SARP

Objection Procedure

AD: The ALAC approved the At-Large process. It is now on our plate.

DLS: Have we heard of any application that has requested support?

AD: There is no information on applications until the application period is closed.

5. Starting implementation work on Objection Procedure (15)

From the Approved Plan:

Develop call for participants from all RALOs to join an At-Large new gTLD Review Group (gTLD RG).

The gTLD RG is tasked with

receiving the comments from At-Large either directly via email or via RALO conference calls.

creating/updating the gTLD wiki comment pages.

giving status updates of which gTLD received comments each week.

informing RALOs of deadlines for comments to be drafted during the ACP, and for objection statements during the 7 month objection period.

AD: COI issue - I for example a relationship with two possible applicants. Either of them, could be an issue for objections. I am only a consultant for them, but do have a material interest. Therefore, as the objection process gets started, I need to not be in a position to make a decision on the two applicants. We all need to review our activities for COI as we consider as we open the RG for members. We need to develop a letter. I have no problem to work with a few to write the letter to the RALOs asking for members. We need the RG formed and performing by 1 May. We need to think about the make-up of the RG. Do we want the RG to pick its own chair, etc. Who would like to help?

TBJ: We need to be clear in stating what the RG will do. 1 May is the really the last day on when the group should be formed. Our RG has to be trained by then as well.

AD: We will have two more meetings of this WG before 1 May. I don't know if two weeks is enough to come with volunteers. We'd have 23 April to start the RG. We can train the following week.

DAT: We need regional balance. Two people from each RALO. The RG would give updates would give updates to the WG, the RALOs and the ALAC. Given that the process will involve using the wiki, it would be good if the people on the RG were familiar with using a wiki. Also, the person would need to be fluent in EN.

AD: On the EN, reading and writing will be the most important.
Will just one or two people on the RG having familiarity with the wiki be enough?

DAT: I think everyone on the RG should be familiar with the wiki.
I also think there should be a two from each RALO.

HX: I agree with DAT. We need more people. Otherwise there will be a lot of work for a couple of people. This is especially true if there are thousands of applications.

AD: So currently, we have three from each region - 1 from the ALAC and two from the RALOs

CLO: Agree with Hong. However, if we have too many...We need to look at substitutes, etc.

AD: What about the RG is authorized to ask for more members if there is a lot of work.

AD and DAT to write letter. We also use the list to discuss the RG responsibilities. We have until the 23 of April to pick people.

AD: Re collaboration with the GAC, we can do this once we know more about the GAC process.

AD: Will try to have a draft letter for the RG in the next couple of days. Will post to the mailing list.

6. Update on other chartered work items (5)

6.1. Update on gTLD Issues - Cintra

6.2. Update on the ASP - Avri

7. Pending Action Items Not Yet covered (5 min) - Avri

8. AOB (5 min) - Avri