

# New gTLDs WG 06-02-2012 Summary Minutes

1. Review of the Agenda

2. Roll Call

3. Finalizing Letter

4. Finalize Draft Objection Procedure

Alan suggests that the flow charts be supported by documentation given their detail

Avri - agree that there is need for more explanation and is hoping that we send out for Ralo review without delay.

Alan states that "introduction" be changed to "draft", Dev agrees and suggests the title be- Draft ALAC Process and Comments. Alan recommends it be - ALAC Comment and objection process

Avri goes through the drafts asking for comments on each section

- Cheryl points out we look at definitions eg AGB, ACP be fully stated on first use. Avri agrees.

\*\*\* GAP TO CHECK RECORDING

- Change in wording "Each of the RALO then votes..."

- Change in hierarchy of Figure 1

- Cheryl asks if the Figures would be integrated into this document. Avri suggest that this happen for the final document process but not at this point. The publication of the objection process should be integrated and an annotated table of content is required. Cheryl continues that a slide presentation form could be linked to each paragraph. Alan clarifies that the flow chart be inserted after the text. Cheryl confirms that the figures be inserted either by a table of content or by slides. Avri agrees that this is important for the final work but not at this point.

- Alan recognizes that there is the need for a summary to assist in seeing the overall picture. Avri agrees that the summary needs to be embellished. Alan withdrew this comment but does feel that it does require clarification. Avri agrees that someone needs to talk through the process for someone to really understand.

- Hong is happy that the title is changed but questions the status quo of the relationship between comments and objections. What if no comments were received for an application but later on 3 Ralos agree to join in an objection against it. Must it be built on comments. Avri does not think so. Dev states that he does not think this will happen since the objection is premised by comments. The Ralo vote for objection would be based on the comments.

Hong also mentions that dropbox is blocked for her. Avri will look into another medium for sharing the documents.

Avri continues that there will be a mechanism for adding comments but would not like to put that in here. Cheryl agrees that it is important to note this.

- Cheryl notes that the relationship between the comments and the ALAC objection process. If we go straight into the overview and summary and also a paragraph on "grounds for objection" and "who can file", this makes the process clearer.

- Avri asks how soon these changes can be made.

- Alan agrees with Cheryl's suggestion to make the comments and objections relationship clear.

\*\*\* GAP TO CHECK RECORDING

Avri won't send to ALAC until the draft is approved, suggests a 48 hr last call on this before sending. Agreement on the call.

Dev notes there is no Figure 9, Avri suggests we give it a different title

4. Meeting schedule

Avri suggests we keep alternate meeting dates to facilitate participation up till Costa Rica. We will meet next week then go to alternate meetings

Sebastien suggests that we give 3 ideas that we would like to point out for him to discuss at the Board retreat. Avri suggests - outreach for JAS Applications, Raising funding and work of Subgroups to facilitate collaboration.

Evan notes that the Board is dealing with requests to have automatic objections, perhaps there is no need for this as we are doing such work on objections

Meeting adjourned.