

ADOBE CONNECT CHAT

Jeff Neuman: @Chris - the GAC said a couple of weeks ago that it would post a short list to guide applicants to see whether a pic spec should be filed. But the GAC did not meet that timeline.

john toland (dot irish): +1 Bret - very practical suggestion - and let's get some feedback from GAC please re their latest concerns - we were operating in good faith and expecting GAC responses on a deadline

Rubens Kuhl: @Craig: Good point. What could be done is, if an applicant files a PIC, objection period starts for that application again.

Krista Papac: Can't the GAC withdraw it's advice at any time?

Avri Doria: Krista, I do not see why the couldn't withdraw, or change , it at any time.

Kristina Rosette: Do we know if ICANN is going to post a draft PIC DRP for public comment or just announce one?

Rubens Kuhl: @Kristina: the fact that you need to ask this implies that ICANN announcing one is far more likely.

Avri Doria: In some sense, withdrawal or change, seems to be part of the wpoint of the require by-laws discussion when the Board does not accept their advice.

Keith Drazek, RySG Chair and Moderator: Fadi suggested that we should all be wise about the government perspectives and the PIC Spec. The wise course of action here is to better define all of the unknowns and to allow for the PIC spec to accomplish its goals -- to address specific government and/or GAC concerns.

Amadeu Abril i Abril (CORE): what can we comment on something we know nothing? ;-)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): what is warring is that also PIC DRP can rule out - any remedy ...how could we estimate any in terms of financial damage?

Rubens Kuhl: Does anyone know of any PICs submitted so far ? There is good chance none.

Kristina Rosette: (speaking personally) @Jeff: Let's not overstate the extent to which PPDRP is acceptable to the community outside the RySG

Avri Doria: Rubens, it is not the last minute yet.. I bet many have written and are just trying to find out what others will do before the send it in.

Jeff Neuman: @Kristina - True....it is not supported on all sides...both applicants (both brand and generic) as well as IP Owners.....which I guess actually makes it a fairly effective compromise.

Alexander.gay: ICANN already said that PICs that change the application need to be followed by an application change request.

Amadeu Abril i Abril (CORE): quickly as in.... some hours?

Amadeu Abril i Abril (CORE): this is what is left to file the pics...

Craig - fTLD: PICs are due tomorrow...how will new information from ICANN fit into the timeline?

Alexander.gay: And of course the PIC has only standing AFTER the application change has been granted.

Jim T: This is Jim Trengrove, Communications Director at ICANN. There will be an Applicant Webinar on Tuesday 6 March covering PIC and several other issues. Details on the new gTLD microsite and here as well - Applicant Update Webinar Date: 6 March 2013 Time: 00:00 – 01:30 UTC (4:00pm – 5:30pm PST on 5 March 2013) Adobe Connect: <https://icann.adobeconnect.com/newgtldwebinar> Dial In: US Toll-free 1-877-941-2059 | US Local number 1-480-629-9656 Conference ID: 4603970 International numbers available here

Jeff Neuman: March 5th?

Bret Fausett, Uniregistry: The Webinar comes one day after ICANN has asked the applicants to submit their PIC, so a March 6th webinar isn't helpful on PIC.

Ray Fassett: Thanks Jim...note the 6th is after the 5th

Craig - fTLD: +1 Bret

Rubens Kuhl: ICANN Webinar: "How you should have done your PIC"

Peter Green: I'd like to know when the notice of this RySG webinar was posted?

Jim T: I copied the misprinted information. Rest assured it is March 6. Thanks. You all are quick!

Peter Green: I'd like to know when the notice of this RySG webinar was posted?

Avri Doria: Clever, hold the applicant webinar on PIC, right after the deadline for PIC is closed.

Jim T: Hi Peter - I believe it was last week

Jon Nevett (Donuts): 6th in Europe and 5th in North America -- either way, it's after we need to submit our PICs

Peter Green: Thanks Jim

Ching Chiao (DotAsia): here in Asia we are very confused -- whether to submit or not

Ray Fassett: will the icann board be able to unilaterally change pic commitments?

Rubens Kuhl: I like referring to Prisoner's Dilemma, and the one here is all applicants with early warnings committing with one another not to file PICs.

Rubens Kuhl: @Ching - Are applicants without early warnings considering filing PICs ?

Avri Doria: Some will file them, I am sure. And I believe those who file will have an advantage with the GAC. Just a guess, but my guess nonetheless.

Alexander.gay: "Moving target", that's the right description....

Rubens Kuhl: Amadeu and briefly on the same sentence - Dr. Crocker tried that as well, Keith...;-)

Ching Chiao (DotAsia): @Rubens -- I am confused on that too -- thought PICs are for those string in closed-generic nature (definition??), with or without EW...

Rubens Kuhl: @Ching - We have advised our clients not to file PICs because they don't have early warnings. PICs give them higher risk instead of lower risk.

Keith Drazek, RySG Chair and Moderator: ALL: Following today's discussion, please post here in chat any SPECIFIC and CONSTRUCTIVE questions that we as a community want to submit to ICANN. Or send them to me directly via email at kdrazek@verisign.com

Rubens Kuhl: @Ching - If a registry wants to express commitment, something that is binding under national law would probably be better.

Ching Chiao (DotAsia): @Rubens -- i do not disagree -- but it's the ICANN process / multiple govs we are talking about here...

Rubens Kuhl: In our jurisdiction, a company can do a "behavior commitment" with state prosecutors.

Rubens Kuhl: @Ching, if filing a PIC gives better community (small c, not AGB definition) support, than the risk might pay off. But it is a risk.

Rubens Kuhl: I would rather buy front page ads at relevant newspapers to state such a commitment.

Rubens Kuhl: (which could be from more than one country)

Ray Fassett: not only publishing a list of changes which is one thing...but to simply redline a legal agreement w/o providing any specific rationale is not a good faith approach, reasonably speaking

Amadeu Abril i Abril (CORE): antony: sure, but belonging to rysg or adhering to best practices is not mandatory

Amadeu Abril i Abril (CORE): as usual, the folks ahering would be the guys not creating problems.

EnCirca - Tom Barrett: Good idea Antony!

Mikey OConnor: can the chat transcript get sent out along with a link to the recording?

Krista Papac: @keith: it would be helpful to have a discussion (similar to this one) once we receive icann's responses to questions from this call.

Henry Chan - HKIRC / .MTR: Thanks

Evan Leibovitch: by all

Amadeu Abril i Abril (CORE): ciao

Alexander.gay: Great call! Thanks. Bye to all....

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks to all the team that put this event into action.

Becky Burr: good job all

Keith Drazek, RySG Chair and Moderator: thanks everyone!

Atsushi ENDO (JPRS): Thanks All.

Alain Artero (EBU .radio .eurovision): thanks all, bye