

# New gTLDs WG 27-08-2012 Summary minutes

## MINUTES

Avri asked if there were any items that needed to be changed in the Agenda-none. Agenda approved.

Staff took the Roll call

1. Dev: The gTLD review group still is receiving comments. We received one comment on . **Book**, submitted on July 26th. We had a conference call to discuss and we decided not to submit formal comments. This is one of the items that was referred to the WG. The comment has been extended until Sept 10th, related to Evaluation panels and objection grounds.

Avri: Evan has already placed in our issues list an item on this issue.

Yaovi: If on the ICANN website, the link to the application, can we expect a correction on the list of strings.

Dev: Regarding where applicants can change any details regarding the application. There will not allow significant changes.

Avri: On ICANN student Kreis these issues came up. They are looking at corrections on strings by several applicants who indicated that they made a typo and that the indication I got is that there may be of a typo or clerical error. They are looking at some change in that respect.

Dev: Comment period is extended, but given that the issues are outside of the review group, I do not think they will be submitted on those grounds.

Avri: We have the letter, which has been submitted to OCL by submission and he acknowledged that this will be an item for discussion during the next ALAC meeting.

### Several Issues were brought up:

- 1) Dig Archery- Nothing happened on there
- 2) Not to pursue it
- 3) Outreach Program for applicant support new gTLD- Issues will be covered under the new charter
- 4) Trademark clearing House: Hong: I raised the Trademark clearing house in Prague.

Yaovi, re Outreach Program.

Avri: Assuming that the item gets approved it really depends.

We cannot change the outreach that was done here. But we will evaluate why there were no more applications from Africa and Latin America.

There was a comment: If you look at the # it corresponds to the number of gTLDs in the world so may be it is not that bad.

### • Hong: Trademark issue:

Before Prague 2 service providers were hired, but service providers appointed by ICANN, there is no apparent conflict of interest and I sent the comments to the list, very insightful. We should discuss if the users should pay for the trademark protection. They say the customers of the trademarks, but the real customers are the Registries. In a very competitive market they can transfer the cost to Registrants. These are the key points we can think about now.

Avri: In Brussels: New applicants meeting. I know that it does not matter if IMB or Deloitte have conflicts of interest because they will not work on their issues.

Rudi: The whole new gTLD program has been delayed due to the trademark issue and that during the meeting in Brussels there was agreement that there was no consensus.

Hong: There was a group to design the structure of the clearing house and I was on that group. There were discussions and there was no consensus on the model of implementation at all. Why so many people protested by not attending is because people are not happy at all. Nothing has been decided.

Alan: The implementation clearly is problematic. I find the connection to users and even registrants minimal. The process should have been done better but this is not an At Large issue.

Costing borne by users: There is no surprise that the trademark clearing house is going to be paid by the users. I do not think that there will be a lot from us to be putting a lot of time in it.

The credibility of ICANN is in question.

Alan: In the overall ranking of things is not up on our priority