

# New gTLDs WG 16-01-2012 Summary minutes

Summary Minutes - New gTLDs WG

16 January 2012

## 1. Review of Agenda

Avri reviewed the agenda. There were no comments. The agenda was adopted.

## 2. Roll call

Nathalie presented the roll call

Avri asks if anyone will be the secretary of the group and Cintra volunteers

## 3. Discussion of Objection Procedure

DAT reviewed his flowchart on the OP.

CLO: on the flowchart, the term "ALAC" should be replaced by "At-Large community".

Dev goes through the process with regard to Hong's questions-

The flow chart describes two distinct processes submission of application comments and submission for filing

Avri states her viewpoint is that the group should assert ALAC's objection right to the At Large. She states that informing our chartering organisation (ALAC) and having this confirmed, but we must determine if as a group we wish the ALAC to object on behalf of the community.

Cheryl confirms this presumption is valid and continues that when discussing in public forum if the cost of objection would be unreasonable. The GAC considered there would be tickets per each round which would provide no cost objections.

Dev Anand points out at the community objection during the comment window which is 60 days from the application comment period we could consider whether we wish to submit comments on the 4 objection grounds during this period. Not an objection in itself but the comments will be reviewed by dispute resolution or by the objector (to independently file an objection based on these comments). So this could be an alternative process for consideration.

With regard to Avri's comment there be a timeline, he expresses his agreement that there is only 8 weeks for comments. Suggests 15 days from the start of the application period, 30 days, 45 days etc . ALAC should then assemble all the comments and then start a vote on whether it wishes to submit it or not.

Avri notes there are two timelines 1. for the objecting comments and 2. for the filing of the objections (this is a longer period of time).

Dev agrees that for 1. it is only 60 days but for 2. up to 7 months.

Avri continues that during the 60 day comment period which is the same as the GAC advice period that the ALAC use the comment process to warn of an oncoming objection. She states it will serve as an early flag to the objection, so that we use those two periods in a complimentary way and this is an ALAC comment not individual. So it means further work will need to be done on a full fledged objection.

Cheryl builds on Avri's comment. in that anything that goes through such level of sanctions is something that the independent objector should take quite seriously and there is a nexus of what is stated and raised as comment should have considerable weight.

Dev states that the Independent objector can use the comments to act on those comments and then file an objection on limited public interest or community interest grounds. But this is not mandatory, like the GAC early warning. This brings up 2 questions on the timing-

1. Governments can post a comment during the 60 day window and/or the GAC can publish advice. The Applicant will then be notified and may respond or drop out from the submission to receive a partial refund (all of this will be published). So should there be a standing working group to actively comment for the RALOs to discuss.

Alan states that the comments get factored in by the independent objector depends on what types of issues we have standing to object to. He agrees that Cheryl is right that we have a very wide ranging one. The other thing is if we make a comment to something that we have standing to to object, will the independent objector take the objection then?

Don't think it should come from a specific committee but anyone in the community. Also this should be a separate group.

Avri states that it is fine if there is another group.

Alan suggests a separate group because of the record keeping involved and the separate tasks.

Avri reviews the comments.

Alan asks if comments and questions are due on a round by round basis. Avri says after all the applications are put up. Alan notes that this has an implication of tight time lines and we need to be geared up to handle this.

Dev says it's two weeks after.

Olivier states he has asked Heidi to add this item to next week's ALAC call to discuss the setting up of operational groups for objections. He considers it will be good to be on the ALAC call to explain this.

Avri asks if Dev can finalise this draft package in this next meeting and take a look further by the RALOs then come back here for review and consideration by ALAC.

Dev agrees that the version 2 of the flowchart would be ready by next week.

Olivier states that we can mark out the parts of Dev's flowchart that can be automated or optimised.

Alan states he does not know how much it can be automated and there's not a lot of time left to delay the work we need to do.

Olivier states the GAC is working out some automated system with ICANN staff to reduce the amount of blind processing. ICANN staff has no time. Olivier suggests that he is hoping to piggy back on this, but he needs this group to point out the parts of the process that can be automated and then compare to the automated GAC system.

Cheryl agrees with Olivier, and raises that there is a need to have operational review groups in preparation to go.

Can also put concerns to the local GAC representative and let them deal with these concerns

Alan agrees

Dev says it is important to know how the mockup of the applications are and if the GAC has knowledge of how it will be published.

Avri notes we have several action items-

1 look at dove tailing with GAC automated system

2 Dev will submit his version 2 of the spreadsheet

4. Update on the new gTLD program's beginning

CS spoke on the new gTLDs beginning. A website available on the ICANN website gives a demo on an application.

There are 12 questions to be answered and an upfront fee.

Gave links to first 20 new gTLD applications.

The launch date was important. However, there will be additional important dates coming up when we will see how ICANN handles the application process.

CLO: Heard that the application process was relatively smooth. Perhaps could contact Annalisa from .Green to find out their view.

5. Update on the ASP

Avri gave update on the applicant support.

Alan notes that we have had a lot of the changes come on board during this period than previously.

Avri agrees and states that any issues on the SARP will be reviewed and the JAS recommendations will continue to be working to find acceptable training and in principle regular meetings are acceptable. The door is open. They did not change their mind on the \$2M reserve fund but this remains open for discussion. Sent an email suggestions asking for clarification before this meeting.

6. Pending Action Items not yet Covered-