

# 2019-03-13 ICANN64 Kobe - New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP

## ICANN64 – New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group

**DATE:** Wednesday, 13 March 2019 / **TIME:** 15:15-16:45

**ICANN64 Schedule link:** <https://64.schedule.icann.org/>

**SLIDES:** [SubPro F2F 9March2019.pdf](#)

## AGENDA

### Sessions 3:

1. Working towards
  - a. Final Reporting
    - i. Recommendation drafting
  - b. Implementation Guidance
    - i. Implementation
2. Address open items from Sessions 1 and 2
3. AOB

## NOTES & ACTIONS:

### **Session 3 of 3:**

Topics that Might Warrant Closure:

- Show how we have assembled the topic review.
- How to bring this to closure.
- Next steps.
- Still are some potential open topics that might need to go to the Implementation Review Team or do more work.

See the Public Comment Tool: <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/15zDdzlBwLCz5m2sNXui6N6pporbUq-IDFEwfh4rKi4A/edit#gid=1093601017>

### 1. Applicant Guidebook – Slide 20:

- Information on the slide is conceptual, not recommendation language.

### 2. Systems – Slides 21-22:

- Question: Which of the recommendations are implementation guidance and which are policy? The first bullet (adequate time) would be more specific than policy; second bullet suggests implementation guidance. Also, change to “real-time technical support” (delete “better”).
- Both bullet points seem to be implementation guidance.
- Prioritization would be key (such as identifying field requiring non-ASCII characters).

Christopher Wilkinson: <COMMENT>I have a general reservation about language which would facilitate multiple applications from a single applicant. Particularly with regard to Geographical Names<COMMENT>

Christopher Wilkinson: <COMMENT> permitting portfolio applications will result in further concentration, more warehousing and speculation and threaten the interests of international communities <COMMENT>

- Creating multiple identical applications doesn't seem to serve the Applicant Guidebook Process. Comment from Business Constituency was to be able to respond to multiple applications with the same question. That this answer applies to multiple applications.

- Sections in some applications may be pretty much the same, so the ability to copy text over would be beneficial.

-- Should encourage clarity of what is expected in the answers. Would be helpful to know in advance what is expected of applicants.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): COMMENT: Answers to Question 18 should not be rote fill-in identical answers. COMMENT

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): COMMENT: +1 to Justine 's request and to Kathy's observation re Question 18. We don't want to encourage super general language that is made more vague so that it can be applied automatically in numerous applications. COMMENT

-- Should allow copy and pasting the same answer to purpose and mission, but how can we prevent that? Could do so by setting expectations.

-- The discussion was around efficiency and ease of use for applicants. We didn't consider what to allow for which questions.

Christopher Wilkinson: <COMMENT> boilerplate replies from multiple applications will facilitate gaming to avoid substantive comments from other stakeholders and interested parties<COMMENT>

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): COMMENT: Re public comment on applications, cookie cutter answers are contrary to the principle of transparency. Applicants might easily construct such answers for the purpose of avoiding public comment. Justine's request is important. COMMENT

-- The more complex we make the system the more costly it will be and difficult to use.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): COMMENT: It's demeaning to the comments to say they are "in the weeds" and they are not "high level". It just means you oppose them. COMMENT

-- To address the issue you'd have to have a policy recommendation that you can't submit the exact same information across applications or within applications.

-- What is the problem we are trying to solve, at a high level? If you can cut and paste you will do it, but don't know if that will avoid the issues being raised.

-- Seems that the problem is the pace the submission outpacing the ability of the community to review the volume of applications received.

-- New Idea: Maybe prohibit duplicative language if you are a portfolio applicant.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): COMMENT: It is not about solving a problem, it is about creating a new problem by making this recommendation. Jeff's suggestion to use language that excepts the practice in relation to questions that go to Mission and Purpose. That is not a policy change. COMMENT

Christopher Wilkinson: <COMMENT> one of the objectives of having several specialised rounds or batches is precisely to limit the volumes of applications to the capacity of the evaluation resources, over time <COMMENT>

### 3. Communications – Slides 23-24:

-- Bullet 1: Minimum of 4 months – shouldn't be summarized; there was a variety of comments.

-- Bullet 2: Know what is in the GSE toolbox.

-- For the two bullets – not a lot of mention of studying of objectives and holes for applications; what are we looking to achieve by communications and outreach. Would be good to measure.

-- When we were talking about applicant support there were comments on how to measure success in future.

-- Communications is different from applicant support, but we need to look at both.

-- Open topics: The WG could do it, give it to an IRT, or recommend that ICANN Org do it.

Christopher Wilkinson: <COMMENT> communications periods will be critical for geographical names because very few of local stakeholders world wide have been participating in Wt5 etc. <COMMENT>

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): QUESTION Was there something in the public comments related to making real-time chat available for applicants? QUESTION

### 4. Universal Acceptance – Slide 25:

-- UASG has been successful in promoting UA – getting several major email providers to be UA ready. The question is whether the Registries/Registrars are using those email services.

-- Might be too much to ask to expect Registries/Registrars to do what the major email providers do.

-- This sounds like more of an issue with all TLDs – why would we just put it in as a condition of a new TLD if it isn't a condition for legacy TLDs?

-- ALAC – suggesting UA if the Registry/Registrar are owned by the same entity.

### 5. Application Submission Periods – Slides 26-27: Start on the next WG call.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): COMMENT: Re Topic 5, how do we take into account the Neustar proposal re windows within an application period? That should be captured. COMMENT

