

# 2018-11-29 New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP - Sub Group C

The call for the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Group C will take place on **Thursday, 29 November 2018 at 21:00 UTC for 60 minutes.**

13:00 PST, 16:00 EST, 22:00 Paris CET, (Friday)02:00 Karachi PKT, (Friday)06:00 Tokyo JST, (Friday) 08:00 Melbourne AEDT

For other times: <https://tinyurl.com/y9mx259c>



## PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Agenda review/SOIs
2. Discussion of Public Comments: 2.8.1: Objections (**starting with 2.8.1.c.2**)
3. AOB

## BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

For agenda item 3, please find the relevant public comment review document: <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1MQmo1B6zBqGXYFRF2pKZXPhGmz0JfZhlaMxKIdVsT1g/edit#gid=0>



## RECORDINGS

[Mp3](#)

[AC Recording](#)

GNSO transcripts are located on the [GNSO Calendar](#)



## PARTICIPATION

[Attendance and AC Chat](#)

**Apologies:** Katrin Ohlmer, Magorzata Pk



## Notes/ Action Items

### Actions:

Objections

2.8.1.c.2:

#8 ALAC -- ACTION ITEM: Change from Concerns to Concerns/New Idea.

2.8.1.c.3:

#10 ICANN Org

ACTION ITEM 1: Staff will clarify what ICANN Org is asking for.

ACTION ITEM 2: In a summary to Full WG, we would say there is full support from the comments for expanding the Quick Look Mechanism. But some express concerns that the same criteria may not be applicable to all types of objections. So that needs to be considered.

2.8.1.c.5:

#10 ICANN Org -- ACTION ITEM: Come back to the ICANN Org concerns.

### Notes

1. Agenda review/SOIs: No updates.

2. Discussion of Public Comments: 2.8.1: See: <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1MQmo1B6zBqGXYFRF2pKZXPhGmz0JfZhlaMxKIdVsT1g/edit#gid=0>

-- This is only a preliminary assessment.

-- Green = agreement; blue = new ideas; orange = concerns; red = divergence.

-- Where there are contrary positions, it is for the full WG to weigh the comments -- the Sub Group is just identifying trends -- in agreement, concerns, new ideas, or divergence. It is for the full WG to debate.

Objections:

2.8.1.c.2:

#1 MARQUES -- Suggestion to change PICs, should this be a new idea/put in a parking lot? Seems to not be a new idea as we ask a question about PICs where MARQUES also commented.

#8 ALAC -- Concerns/considerations. Refer to the full WG. ACTION: Change from Concerns to Concerns/New Idea.

From the chat:

Jim Prendergast: ok

Steve Chan: I thought we had asked a question to that effect...trying to locate it. Definitely asked about amended PICs in relation to GAC Advice /GAC EW

Steve Chan: Looking now

Steve Chan: 2.8.1.c.5: Provide applicants with the opportunity to amend an application or add Public Interest Commitments in response to concerns raised in an objection.

Steve Chan: And Marques comments actually applies to 2.8.1.c 2-5, so it is already there actually

2.8.1.c.3:

#7 ALAC

-- Agreement/New Idea (in this case, an additional consideration/suggestion); refer the New Idea to the full WG.

-- Suggest marking this as "Concerns" also.

#8 INTA -- Agreement/New Idea; refer the New Idea to the full WG.

#9 RySG -- Agreement/New Idea (suggested clarification as text); refer the New Idea to the full WG.

#10 ICANN Org -- Concerns (or more accurately clarification provided and request for additional detail in the recommendation); refer to the full WG. ACTION: Staff will clarify what ICANN Org is asking for.

From the Chat:

jeff neuman: So, in a summary to Full WG, we would say there is full support from the comments for expanding the Quick Look Mechanism. But some express concerns that the same criteria may not be applicable to all types of objections. So that needs to be considered.

2.8.1.c.4:

#7 INTA -- Agreement/New Idea (additional guidance if implemented); refer to the full WG.

#8 ALAC -- Agreement/Concerns (question for consideration); refer the concerns to the full WG.

#9 MARQUES -- Umbrella comment for 2.8.1.c.2-5.

2.8.1.c.5:

# 6 INTA -- Concerns (condition for support)/Agreement; refer the Concerns to the full WG.

#7 RySG -- Concerns (condition for support)/Agreement; refer the Concerns to the full WG.

#8 IPC -- Concerns (considerations if implemented); refer the Concerns to the full WG.

#9 ALAC -- Concerns; refer to the full WG.

#10 ICANN Org -- Concerns; refer to the full WG.

ACTION: Come back to the ICANN Org concerns.

From the chat:

jeff neuman: This is another concept that seems to have full support from the comments although there are some concerns around some of the details

Steve Chan: Staff comment: clarification might be needed for the ALAC comment since as far as I recall, withdrawals / refunds were available after losing in an objection.

Steve Chan: @Justine, not sure what you mean. I think you're saying there was no appeal mechanism? If so, agree.

Justine Chew: Steve, yes, since staff comment for 2..8.1.c.5 only pertains to refunds - which indicates that refund 'rules' exist. so I was just confirming whether appeals were available or not.

Justine Chew: Sorry, it's too early for me so I may not be making myself clear enough in the first instance.

Steve Chan: Clear enough Justine, just wanted to make sure. Thanks!

2.8.1.d.1

#10 Brand Registry Group -- Agreement/New Idea; refer the New Idea to the full WG.

#11 RySG -- Agreement/New Idea; refer the New Idea to the full WG.

#12 GAC -- Divergence/Agreement; refer the Divergence to the full WG.

2.8.1.d.2

#8 RySG -- Concerns/Agreement; refer the Concerns to the full WG.

#9 INTA

-- Concerns/Agreement/New Idea; refer the Concerns and New Idea to the full WG.

-- Also stated that they had no objection to advice being issued against groups of TLDs which share common factors, but the TLDs to which the advice relates out to be identified to allow for certainty for all parties.

#10 GAC -- Divergence/Agreement; refer the Divergence to the full WG.

3. AOB: None