Terri Agnew:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 1 - Overall Process/Support/Outreach Issue call on Tuesday, 13 June 2017 at 03:00 UTC for 60 minutes

Terri Agnew:agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_x_ERLfAw&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpCIgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIgn-H4xR2EBk&m=0K10mBy4jHOg4U63DDMB9i2OJDzQPAjdwQ_XR_iXpo0&s=TboFt15bK3-_i0YzzjTYnNIqYT3s-07POfSIxz1tnsk&e=

Sarah L:No different Sarah :-)

Terri Agnew:everyone can turn the slides themselves

Michael Flemming:We can all scroll.

Michael Flemming:Multiple logins!

Michael Flemming:or multiple users.

Michael Flemming:exactly

Michael Flemming:What are all the portals or systems that could centralized?

Michael Flemming:Sorry that goes back to the previous topic.

Steve Chan:please go donna

Michael Flemming:So we will leave these at recommendations and allow it to be decided in implementation. Well understood, thank you!

Steve Chan:@Michael, the WG can develop recommendations around systems or communications. it can also develop implementation guidace as well. or, as you said, some specifics can be determined during implementation.

Steve Chan:Just to be clear, I wasn't trying to cut off discussion in any way.

Michael Flemming:Thank you, Steve.

Jeff Neuman:Adequate outreach can also mean language support as well?

Jeff Neuman:Those who want to file objections or public comments may need to be communicated with as well

Jeff Neuman:could that be a distinction

Donna Austin, Neustar:I think we need more clarity around what this is supposed to address

Jeff Neuman:In other words the "knowledge base" was not only for applicants, but for the whole community of participants

Jeff Neuman:We should update this with the tie from the discussions earlier in the full group on the model

Jeff Neuman:(FCFS vs. Rounds)

Jeff Neuman:@Donna - Agree. It is amount of fees vs process to make payments

Donna Austin, Neustar:right

Jeff Neuman:Point a relates to the latter

Christa Taylor:Its annotated

Christa Taylor:#annotated

Michael Flemming:Legal contingency as in projected legal costs for litigation?

Jeff Neuman:The $185,000 was based on 3 elements and assuming only 500 applications. (i) cost of evaluation/processing of applications, (ii) Historical costs and (iii) legal contingency fees. Do we have agreement these are the same types of fees we should be paying for going forward

Jeff Neuman:In otherwords, is that the formula we should apply moving forward? Should we still reimburse "historical costs"? What does that mean?

Jeff Neuman:Deposit of $1 Million was only in the case of an auction.

Michael Flemming:As long as that is clear.

Jeff Neuman:I am not sure where this comment came from though

Michael Flemming:Thank you.

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Christa, so this is just a sample of the comments submitted?

Christa Taylor:yes it does not cover all of them but items that we may have not considered or discussed to date. The link has all of the responses

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Surely the Historical costs were cost recovered with the over subscription compared to the assummed 500 of applicant last round

Jeff Neuman:It sounds like some want to add a 4th element (and that is a floor)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):I believe it needs to include eval and legal contingency but the rest... hmmm

Jeff Neuman:eg., if the elements of (i) though (iii) is too low, then make the price the floor.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):agree with cost neutral yes

Michael Flemming:yes

Donna Austin, Neustar:a

Donna Austin, Neustar:Agree on that it should be time bound.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Fair point Jeff I can support that

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):yes it did Jeff

Michael Flemming:My question is whether or not historical costs included unexpected delays in the program. I am for time bound costs as Jeff suggests, but I don't think there is a garuntee that a cost neutral would allow for unexpected delays.

Michael Flemming:Registry level fees should pay for compliance.

Michael Flemming:yes

Terri Agnew:finding the line

Christa Taylor:we can hear it

Sarah L:It seems like there is an established mechanism within ICANN for dealing with excess funds but I am not sure there are mechanisms in place for dealing with scenarios or projects that are under-funded.   Like Alan I would rather see a transparent active and robust compliance department and ensure there is funding in place for that.

Donna Austin, Neustar:My compartmentalisation is consistent with Jeff's

Alan Greenberg:I am still not sure how we reconcile the two opposite positions of 1) ultimately a TLD should not be more expensive than a 2nd level name; and 2) you are buying a core part of the Internet, a finite resource, and this should not be be cheap.

Jeff Neuman:Sarah brings up a good comment that we have not addressed....which is what if the program is underfunded?

Jeff Neuman:lets make sure we do not lose that question

Donna Austin, Neustar:I don't believe the first dot point is within the purview of this group either.

Michael Flemming:Jeff, Sarah does bring up an important question, but we did consider that didn't we? That was our entire base for considering cost-recovery in the first place, no?

Steve Chan:@Jeff, there is a question in CC2 about excess or deficient funding

Steve Chan:1.4.5 - Should the WG seek to establish more clarity in how the excess or deficiency of funds are utilized/recovered? If so, do you have any suggestions for establishing that clarity?

Jeff Neuman:@Steve - thanks.....but I just want to make sure we as a group discuss it too

Jeff Neuman:I havent read all the comments yet, but I am curious to see if anyone addressed the concept of underfunding. My guess is most people assumed overfunding

Jeff Neuman:But I could be wrong

Michael Flemming:I think as Jeff suggested, that there is a tendency that 1) That either the program was overfunded so fees should be lower or 2) In the event that expenses did not occur that, then those should be refunded. The problem here is that the consideration of refunding of fees in the current round have come to late in the game. I think what would satisfy many people is that if the floor was set at a

similar price/model to what we have now with a promise for return of fees not occured once a contract is signed.

Michael Flemming:Tendency in how people are responding.

Michael Flemming:How do most registries feel about excess funds being used for community outreach rather than being returned in some way to the registry?

Sarah L:ICANN could channel funds into increasing trust of the industry

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Sarah L: that's a nice idea but how do you do that and what would the metrics be?

Michael Flemming:If registries are happy to allow excess funds to be used in some way other than being returned to them, I feel that it would be important to perhaps have a separate PDP for determining excess funds? Or is this a necessity to have something in writing before we finish our PDP?

Sarah L:@Donna I must admit I hadnt thought of it in that level of detail - iI agree there are alot of divergent opinons on this

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):That would be helpful Christa

Michael Flemming:Thats a good question Donna, but I think that those fees are different to those paid in auction.

Michael Flemming:I mean auction fees vs excess applicant fees.

Michael Flemming:The principle behind them, I mean.

Edmon:one thing useful to bring up is that the outreach and funds supporting applicants and as donna said for universal acceptance, etc. should not be confused or punted completely to the auction proceeds fund

Jeff Neuman:ICANN Bake Sale ;)

Alan Greenberg:Would be some mighty expensive brownies!

Michael Flemming:Further to the point, if we are going to have excess fees for Universal Acceptance outreach, then there needs to be a clear cut plan for outreach. An actual piece of marketing that works.

Jeff Neuman:The reality is that we can never de-risk any program completely. Some level of risk has to be taken on by ICANN

Sara Bockey:thank you all

Alan Greenberg:Indeed Jeff!

Jeff Neuman:Thanks all!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Thanks everyone... Lots to discuss still... but for now ... bye...

Donna Austin, Neustar:Thanks Christa and Sara