

New gTLDs WG 13-02-2012 Summary minutes

1. Review of Agenda (5 min)

AD reviewed the agenda. There other no other business or addendums raised.

2. Roll call (5 min)

GG gave the roll call.

3. Complete Objection Procedure for RALO Review (20 min)

AD: Dev has revised the explanatory note. The cover note and charts have been translated into ES and FR.

CLO: We should note the issue on bandwidth. Also, on page 4, "then" should be "the".

AD: Please note the exact location, CLO.

AD: Re the explanatory note, Dev, please could you review it

DAT: Listened to the audio of the last meeting. I changed the text to take into account the comments. It flows better. It incorporates the questions and changes that were mentioned in the last call. Titles from 3 months onward. Changed this. Am happy to

YA: Paragraph 5 on page 3, not clear to me re community ground. My question, the previous paragraph, ALAC has

AD: There is ongoing discussion on At-Large's ability to comment/scope. I was wondering if there is one word that could be added there.

DAT: I could go into the explanation what the Guidebook says.

AD: I am hoping, Dev, you don't leave this meeting with more work. Also, it would mean that we don't get this out on time. Would it be clearer "as to the scope of ALAC's standing to object given that ALAC is responsible for..."?

YA: Yes, that is better.

DAT: So text is "With respect to "community" grounds, discussion is ongoing as to the scope of ALAC's standing to object given that the ALAC is responsible for considering and providing advice on ICANN activities as they relate to the interests of individual Internet users (the "At-Large" community)."

AD: Before the final publication of this document, we need to discuss the scope issue. I will talk to Olivier that the scope issue is on their agenda.

AI: AD to speak to OCL re the scope of the ALAC/At-Large objection for consideration during an ALAC meeting during Costa Rica.

AG: We don't need to worry re scope until ...there is plenty of time. Optimally it should be sorted y the time that we start asking for comments. Which is beginning of May. Slightly less optimal, buy the end of the ACP which is when we formally start working on objections. And even less optimally, some time later but before the end of the objection period.

DAT: I could append the flowcharts after the text.

AG: We talked last time that maybe the the text/charts should be interlinked.

DAT: Could add the text.

AG: Cover letter - should be part of the same document.

HU: Staff can work with Dev to put the text together and send. Only issue is that the ES/FR translations to the explanatory note are not ready yet.. So we could only send the EN full version of all three docs today.

AD: That is ok.

TBJ: Put the chart/charts text together.

AD: Adding them will be faster rather than interweaving.

TBJ: Yes ,post it to review immediately.

AD: We don't necessarily have to wait until all the comments are in. We can begin to look at them as they come in.

4. Planning for upcoming meetings

AD: We basically will have 50 minutes. The agenda will look much like our call agenda. By that time, we will have integrated the comments into the text. We will present the document to the ALAC for their approval during CR.

AD: Should it be sufficient to merely talk through the changes made that have been made since the comment period. Is that an appropriate and adequate item for the agenda?

CLO: Agree.

AG: Given the reality that not everyone does their homework, a quick run through would be useful

AD: other issues - ask the new gTLD staff number of applicants (confirm?); whether things are going well?

1. Review of objection procedure (30 min)
2. New gTLD stuff
3. Whether things are going well with the ASP
4. Time of new gTLD WG meetings

AD: I did the first analysis of the time sharing of the calls. Basically, equal numbers. A) look at the issue of continuing to rotate; B) whether the times we have picked are ok.

AD: Are there other items we need to prepare for the new gTLD WG meeting in CR?

AM: Slides would be useful. We could also have handouts.

HU: Staff will prepare a Dropbox with links to all of At-Large docs. We can add all relevant docs to this and give everyone the link to the Dropbox.

AD: If it is necessary to have mini-groups, we will be able to request a space to discuss.

AD: ALAC requests that we give them this to vote on by the end of the CR meeting.

5. Update on the ASP

AD: the announcement was sent. I spent the day with people within the GAC in Geneva and they are concerned that they have not seen any outreach through normal channels. I'll pass that message on to OCL so he knows who can speak to in the GAC.

TBJ: Karla Valente said outreach would be done. However, I don't see anything on outreach. Perhaps we need to do anything more energetic.

AD: I have been pestering people. What more energetic things can be done? Perhaps that is why it is good to speak to other people so perhaps something jointly can be done.

AD: I can send letters to OCL. Those of who are on the ALAC can take direct action.

AG: I think time is running out. I think direct contact with Board members would be useful.

AD: We should certainly inform Sebastien.

AD: The JAS Group made a recommendation and the Board adopted it. There were some who may have been asleep at the switch.

AM: This is an evolving thing.

AD: I'm almost quoting Marilyn Cade...but the JAS Group did come to a decision on this. The Board came to a decision based on the JAS Group. There are all sorts of points re the SARP

TBJ: The JAS WG recommended that a SARP should be composed both of external and community people. They are now only considering community.

AD: They also said they would consider external people as necessary.

TBJ: Experts from the community. It is not closed. It is not inside the process. They said perhaps a hybrid group.

AD: Does this WG wish to make more recommendations on this issue? Should we discuss it on the lists?

AG: I don't fully recollect it, but I thought it was a volunteers from the community, and paid expert advisors (non-voting).

AD: That is correct.

AG: Re Marilyn, she also noted that it was the duty of staff that there are not big gaps when they see the light of day.

AD: Correct. They should take their issue to the Board. If the JAS should reconsider, they should. If this WG comes to a consensus (after discussing on the lists), am happy to. Would prefer it is first discussed on the JAS list first, though. Marilyn is concerned that there won't be enough quality volunteers.

6. Update on gTLD Issues

CS: Asked that people post their comments on the wiki page.
As soon as she gets all the comments, she will go ahead.

7. Pending Action Items Not Yet covered

AD: Dev completed the revised explanatory note. Cintra created a wiki page for comments. Avri discussed the ASP issues.

8. AOB

No call next week. One more call before CR. It will be 27 Feb at 14:00 UTC.

Meeting adjourned.