

New gTLDs WG 23-01-2012 Summary minutes

Summary Minutes - New gTLDs WG
23 January 2012

1. Review of Agenda
2. Roll call
3. Finalize Draft of Objection Procedure (30 min) - Dev Anand
At-Large-ALAC-Process-for-considering-and-making-objections-to-newgTLD-Applications-v2-23January2012.pdf (partial)

AD : Aim is to get this document out to the RALOs or decide that more work needs to be done.

DAT: Took various comments into account. Has re-drafted the doc. Changes include: timing, introduced concept of a new gTLD group which will keep track of apps received, etc.

First page: 2 people - one from ALAC, one from the regions. Before the start of the application itself, the new gTLD group reviews. They have to hit the ground running. At the start of the application process, ICANN publishes the info. On that same day, the new gTLD group informs all the RALOs that the application has started. The new gTLD review group incorporates the info from the ICANN website into a dashboard.

AD: Is this work linked to the work of the GAC? Or independently.

DAT: Independently.

The dashboard contains four columns. The first - is the applied for string. The second column is an At-Large Confluence page tracks the info on the applicant. A wiki page is only created when an applicant is received. Third and fourth columns...

The idea is that you'll see the number of comments from the wiki page. Those receiving the most comments will be raised to the top of the page.

AD: Looking at the last two columns. There shouldn't be any numbers without comments., correct?

DAT: Correct

AD: Does the wiki

DAT: Confluence wiki. So instead of sending an email. Could have Confluence plugins.

AM: Email might be easier to add comments.

HX: 1) Commented the OCL is working with the GAC on the Objection tool. Would be good to have At-Large work with them. Useful to link up with the office offering advice on limited public interest.

HX: 2) Column 3 and 4 are two different processes, but it is reasonable to link them up as they are within the realm of At Large interest. But must show the true purpose is not only for objection but also for the evaluation panel objection to give clarification for RALOs.

DAT: Look at the comment period only then after look at what is posted by the GAC etc and then see if this can be put into a properly worded objection.

HX: 3) Agree that the objection procedure is going to apply to community based and limited public interest and can do this but perhaps the community based objection could be different comparing to limited public interest as it is an additional add on layer to the process.

DAT: AI from last call was to seek clarification from ALAC whether we have the standing to seek an objection on community grounds .

AG: Column 3 is number of comments received on the ICANN Comment site or ours?

DAT: On our wiki page

AG: is it a summary of the string?

DAT: Not creating all of them at the same time, for those without comments the dashboard will have a link and when the first comment is received (described on the 2nd page) then the wiki page is created

AG: As a commentor I will have to go to the ICANN page look at the string then go to the At large dashboard

DAT: Yes

AG: We won't index all of them

DAT: Those that have comments rise to the top. Should we have 1000 entries or should we segment

AG: Will the dashboard support At Large making a formal comment

DAT: At the end of the 4th week ALAC or this WG will synthesise the comment

AG: may want columns to track those comments and possibly the same thing for objection process

CLO: Any announce going to the list has a monitored email address that allows push out information.

DAT: Absolutely

CLO: Should a list of 3000 names come in we can sort and batch in alphabetical order

AD: How is it you're certain we'll only be doing comments and objections on a per batch basis?

CLO: Will be doing comments on all of them but the 60 days response

AG: Didn't capture

AD: AI: get definitive information on how the comment and objections periods work in terms of the batching process.

DAT: Goes through the flow chart.

AD: Not quite ready to send anything out to the RALOs for review. Just need to put in the completion of the process

DAT: Yes but the flowchart here is the majority of the process though. The ALAC could review the comment pages at one location and then decide how it will process it or it can be this WG.

AD: Needs to be there. How long a comment period do we need to give. Don't know the norm for RALO comment cycles

DAT: Have to respond within 30 days even when a draft comment is published.

AD: Won't go for both in this case with the plan you have been working on.

DAT: Think we have enough time, would be just before CR, can push hard within the next 2 weeks and publish for RALOs

AD: What is the deadline to publish information for CR?

HU: To check

AG: Current wording in 1.1.2.2 whole thing is done

CLO: Batches may be handled consecutively

AD: Will evaluate in sequential batch but will the comment and objection period be the same

AG: Applicant Guidebook is clear all the comments and objections may be raised years before the application

AD: will see what conformation I can get

CLO: If it were years then the indefinite comment period comes up

AD: Note the deadline for CR is the 17th February. Would like to get it out for review in the next week or so. Can start drafting the coversheet and talk about the parallel processes in the dashboard creation and what is going out in the GAC so at the next meeting we can say this thing is ready to ship to the RALOs

AD: Update on the ASP sent an email to Kurt and Chris and waiting to hear

Update on new gTLDs - Cintra

Nothing to report on this segment of the agenda, except to note an article written by Alexa Raad. To summarize, she discusses re the large number of new gTLDs coming to the root at the same time, there may be some issues. We should look at this. Also, a comment by ...Are there any other issues that anyone would like to raise?

AG: I'm not sure we can do much about this. The concept of three level TLDs is over...the concept of a 25 level TLD is ...

AD: Users tend to pick things up..

CS: Is this something that we should look at as a WG?

AD: I'd recommend that we start to build a list of these issues on the wiki and try to talk about them on the wiki and the list. We should add it to the list. There is a section on the wiki for the new gTLD issues.

AG: Haven't heard anything

AD: Goes through AI from last meeting.

OCL: Am in touch with the GAC on this and the first prototype is being built and will have a look at the system and will get Dev involved to share the work presented (the flowchart) and see if this can be integrated in the automated system.

AD: Among the things shown today are not only the map but also a dashboard and this is something that would be useful.

AD: CLO to work with staff to create wiki page on history of gTLD statements.

CLO: Dealt with 3 weeks back

AD: Great so we can talk through it on an upcoming meeting

AD: Will look at having a biweekly schedule and ask staff to look at the attendance over the past 6 weeks to see if the alternating time has been working.