ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP - Sub Group A
Thursday, 10 January 2019 at 20:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-sub-pro-sub-group-a-10jan19-en.mp3

Adobe Connect recording: https://participate.icann.org/p98ujyfabhf/

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/pYIWBg

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Julie Bisland: Cassandra, can you start the recording for me?

Cassandra: Yes, Julie, this is Cassandra. I've started the recording.

Julie Bisland: Great, thank you. Well, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Subgroup A call held on Thursday, the 10th of January, 2019. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge at this time, could you please let yourself be known now? All right, thank you. And just want to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this, I'll turn it back over to you, Robin, to begin.

Robin Gross: Thank you very much, and thank you to everyone who showed up today for today's Sub-Team A call. Let me do a quick review of the agenda. Admin issues, including updates of statement of interest, and in terms of what our substantive discussion will be on today, we're going to discuss the public comments on sections 2.2.4, which has to do with the different types of top level domains. And then, if time is permitting, we can move on to 2.2.5, which deals with applications submissions limits, and then any other business, and that'll be it today. Any questions on this agenda, or comments? Okay. I don't see any.

I see -- excuse me -- I see in the chat Jim has asked, "Do we have five people?" We do, actually. Anne just joined, and we do have five people who aren't on the leadership team. And also, Donna Austin noted that

she'd be joining later, so that would be a sixth person. But I also want to point out that we decided we had -- so we needed to be a little bit more flexible on not holding meetings when we don't have that many people, because we are split up into so many individual subgroups, and there's a lot happening right now that we need to go forward anyways.

But in that event, we do have more than five people, so I don't know if anyone has any questions or comments on that, or on the agenda in particular. Okay. I am not seeing any hands or hearing any voices, so if anybody would like to update their statement of interest, now would be a very good time to do that. Okay, doesn't look like there's anyone to do that, so let's go forward with our discussion of the public comments.

So, I would encourage folks to take a look at the Google doc that -- there's a link to it in the agenda box, the top-right corner agenda box, where we've gone through and taken out, as you know, some of the key points that are made in the public comments from various groups and submitters. And we're trying to categorize them, are these in -- generally in agreement, are they disagreement, are there some new ideas. So, at this point, we're trying to -- basically just get accurate characterizations and categorizations of how people are commenting, and then we'll, of course, take that back to the group to debate the merits of some of these issues.

So, with that, let's get started with -- again, we're doing 2.2.4, the different types of TLDs. And let me just get that one open myself here. Here we go. Okay, so these are just going to be -- the first few comments are just general comments on the issue. The first comment, on line four, is from Google. And this comment is generally in agreement with the recommendations in the report, and says it has support for existing categories and no additional categories. They support the working group's position that further application processes shouldn't be kept -- or should be kept open by avoiding restrictions based on applicant type, application type, or by volume. And so, they agree that the working group -- they agree with the working group that the application categories established for the '12 round were appropriate and no additional sub-categories are needed. So, this one gets categorized as agreement. Anybody have any thoughts or comments on that? Okay, I don't see any, and I do think that one's pretty straightforward, so let's go on to the next one.

Okay, line five, which is the second comment, depending on how you want to number these. This one is a comment that was submitted by the Government of India, submitted by IN Registry. And this one is categorized as having concerns about our recommendation. So, this comment was in favor of support for different TLD categories with different processes, requirements and fees. Developing explicit TLD

categories should be seriously considered, as it can help simplify the process for applicants by creating diverse categories that provide structure, hence allowing for a smoother application process. Okay, so this one is really advocating for -- it looks like more types of categories, so this one gets categorized as concerns from the recommendation. Anyone have any thoughts or comments on this one? Okay, I don't see any. And again, this one seems pretty straightforward.

So, let's move on to the next, which is the sixth line in the section 2.2.4, and this is also a comment from the same submitter, the Government of India, the IN Registry. And this one is characterized as a new idea because it suggests that ICANN lower the application fee for a string in multiple IDN scripts. India proposes that ICANN lower the application fee for a string in multiple IDN scripts, particularly where simultaneous IDNs are required in countries of great linguistic diversity. Okay. Anyone have any thoughts on the characterization of this comment? Okay. I don't see any, so let's move on to the next one.

Okay, this is the seventh line in the document, and it is a comment from the GAC. It's also characterized as a new idea, although it's -- the idea is not entirely new because they're reiterating previous advice. So, in this comment, the GAC has support for further categories of new gTLDs and a cost-based structure of fees appropriate to each category of TLD. So, the GAC is trying to reiterate the importance of fully exploring benefits of further categories in simplifying rather than adding complexity to the management of TLDs. Okay, so does anyone have any thoughts or comments on the characterization of this comment from the GAC? I see Donna asks, "Where are we at," and we are on the seventh line on section 2.2.4, which is the different types of TLDs. And this -- we're discussing a comment submitted by the GAC, which is the fourth comment in the category, but it's on the seventh line of the spreadsheet. Okay, any comments or thoughts on the characterization of this one?

Okay, so that wraps up this initial section on the general comments. And now, we drill down into some more specific questions that we asked of our commenters, and so let's go to line eight on the spreadsheet. Again, we're in 2.2.4, different types of TLDs. And this is actually 2.2.4.c.1, and the question here is the working group recommends that each of the categories recognized by the 2012 application guidebook both explicitly and implicitly continue to be recognized on an ongoing forward basis. These include standard TLDs, community-based TLDs, TLDs for which a government entity serves as the registry operator and geographic TLDs. In addition, the working group also recognizes that spec 13 .Brand TLDs should also be formally established as a category. The ramifications of being designated a specification category are addressed throughout this initial report as applicable.

Okay, so that's sort of the general recommendation and issue here in c.1 part of 2.2.4. does anyone have any questions on this, or should we just go into the first response under this category? Okay, I don't see any, so let's go forward with the first response here, which is on line nine on the spreadsheet and is from the ALAC, is in agreement with this recommendation. Says the ALAC has and continues to express their support for existing categories. I also note that the next several comments are also very similar to -- they're all generally supporting here and saying that they agree with the existing categories. We've got one from the ALAC, one from the Brand Registry, one from Neustar, one from LEMARIT, and -- gosh, some of these are a little bit too (inaudible) -- I was thinking we could treat many of these as together, but as I look at them, I think there's just too many. So, let me just stop there with the ALAC. Sorry about that.

Okay, so does anyone have any thoughts, then, on line nine here and the agreement from the ALAC on the recommendation? Okay, I don't see any, so let's go down to the next one, which is on line 10 and is from the Brand Registry Group. And again, this is agreement with the recommendation that we just mentioned. The Brand Registry Group supports the recommendation, and in particular the need to recognize .Brand registries as a distinct category, as these accounted for a third of the applications in 2012 and have a significant different standard to -- standard TLDs. So, I think this is clearly on point for agreement, but let's see what others think. Any comments on this one from the Brand Registry Group in its characterization? Okay. I don't see any, so let's -- some of these are actually pretty straightforward, so we might not have a lot of controversy.

The next one, line 11, is from Neustar. And this one is also characterized as agreeing with the recommendation. Support for the .Brand category, but not for the -- not for additional TLD categories. So, Neustar supports this preliminary recommendation and the former establishment of .Brand TLDs as a category. Neustar does not support the creation of other additional TLD categories. Okay, any comments on this one, or thoughts about the Neustar characterization? All right. I don't hear anyone, see anyone trying to break in, so let's plow forward. Okay.

The next line, line 12, from LEMARIT, is also characterized as agreement, and in particular their support for keeping the five defined categories in that brand, but not for additional categories. So, LEMARIT says we support the recommendation for keeping the defined five categories - standard TLDs, community-based TLDs, TLDs for which a government entity acts as the registry operator, geographic TLDs, and .Brand. We believe no additional categories need to be established. Okay, that seems pretty straightforward. Any thoughts on this comment characterization? Not seeing any. Let's continue to go forward.

Line 14 is a comment from the .Trademark TLD company hold -- excuse me, holding company limited, and this is characterized both as agreement and as presenting a new idea. So, this comment says there's support for community and brand categories. Applications representing communities should be given special consideration. But here's where the new idea comes in, "But a clearer standard definition is needed on what kind of community is worth such special consideration. The definition of community in the application guidebook was sufficient and shall be optimized." Brand TLDs shall still be a part of the future round, although it is better to establish an independent category for brand TLDs. So, again, this is characterized both as agreeing with some aspect, presenting a new idea, and also noting that it's relevant to section 2.9.1 on community applications. Anyone have any thoughts on this comment? Okay. I don't see any, so let's go forward. You all can hear me, right? I'm not just talking to myself?

Unidentified Participant: Could someone verify that (inaudible)--?

Robin Gross: --Okay, just want to be sure. Okay. So, going forward, line 15 from the geoTLD group. This one is categorized both as agreement and as a new idea. The support for the recommendation, and they don't see any value in additional categories. They think the current TLD types are sufficient, nevertheless, provide greater clarity for applicants. The gTLD group supports the preliminary recommendation 2.2.4.c.1, this one, in addition to the brand TLD category. There's a new idea thrown in here, where they say if there was a demand in later rounds to differentiate TLD types and therefore create new categories of TLD types, we recommend discussing their creation within the framework of a bespoke PDP. Okay. So, here we've got agreement with the general recommendation and also a new idea to consider. Anyone have any thoughts on that? All right. I don't hear anyone.

Let's go down to the next line, which would be line 16 on the spreadsheet, and it is from dotBerlin. And it's characterized both as agreement and as new idea. So, there's support for the recommendation, and they don't see any value in additional categories. But they do say, if there was demand in later rounds to differentiate -- oh, this is the same point that we just heard from the geoTLD group. Yes, because it was -- it's sort of two comments that made the same point, so if there was demand in later rounds to differentiate and create new categories, they would recommend discussing creation within the framework of a PDP. Okay, so this is very similar, if not identical, to the last, so it's characterized as agreement and a new idea. Any thoughts on that? Oh, I see Steve's pointed out in the chat that lines 15, 16 and 17 are identical, so perhaps we should have done these altogether. Yes, I see they're all identical, so I think we can

consider them together, and they all present agreement on one aspect and a new idea on another. Any thoughts on that?

Okay, I don't hear anyone, see anyone raising their hand, so let's move on to the next line, which is going to be line 18. And this is a comment that was submitted from the Council of Europe. And here there was both agreement with the recommendation, as well as a new idea. The ideas presented here are not entirely new. It may be helpful to consider them with other comments on community. Okay. So here, the community TLD category should be maintained, but they think it should be formulated, and the precision of the scope of the community serving the global public interest that could benefit from preferential CPE tracks be narrower than it is today, and so some ideas about how to do that. Again, this is a comment that we might want to also make sure gets included in our discussion of section 2.9.1 on community applications, because it's certainly relevant there. So, again, this has been categorized as both agreement with the recommendation, as well as a new idea. Anyone have any thoughts on this particular comment from the council of Europe? Okay, I don't see any.

Let's go on to the next one, which is the comment from the Business Constituency. Again, it's both agreement and new idea, so there's support for the .Brand recognition and possible creation of a Global South-type category. And the new idea that is suggested is one of the ways that the Global South actors from the business community may participate is through associations, whether trade association, sector associations, and other mechanisms. So, we may also want to explore some sort of additional category for them or research on their needs as part of this process. So, again, this has been categorized as both agreement with the existing recommendation and a new idea to consider, going forward. Okay, anyone have any thoughts on this?

All right, let's go on then to the next comment, which is from Valideus, and it's line 20 on the spreadsheet that I'm looking at, which is also number 12 under this particular section, or the 12th comment in this particular section, so it's depending upon how you are viewing the document. Again, this is the comment from Valideus, and it's characterized both as agreeing with the recommendation as well as presenting a new idea. This proposal has been previously discussed, and so would consider moving under the string similarly discussion. So, in particular, they agree with the existing categories, but then they say, in addition to the extent that there are currently verified TLDs now and in the future, and the community is able to define which TLDs are considered verified, we are in favor of the proposal to allow translations of those verified TLDs unless those new TLDs have the same or similar restriction as the existing verified TLDs.

Okay. So again, this one has been characterized as agreeing with the general recommendation, but also providing a new idea to consider, going forward. Anyone have any thoughts on this one? Okay. So, everyone is in agreement so far. 2019 is off to a good start.

Okay, so let's go on to the next line, which is going to be line 21 under the document -- the spreadsheet I'm looking at, or line 13 under this particular category. And this is the comment from INTA, and this one has been characterized as agreeing with one aspect of the recommendation but disagreeing with another aspect of the recommendation. So, INTA agrees with the recommendation with respect to specification 13 .Brand TLDs. Where they diverge, however, is that INTA does not agree that geographic TLDs constitute a separate specific category, okay, and that work track 5 may impact the work that's being done on geoTLDs.

Okay, so does anyone have any thoughts on this particular characterization as both agreeing with one aspect and diverging on another? Yes, I see Anne has her hand up. Please, Anne, go ahead. You have the floor.

Unidentified Participant: Anne, we're not able to hear you.

Robin Gross: Okay. I see Anne has typed into the chat. She says sorry, I must type in chat. This needs to be discussed by the full working group. Okay. I wonder what you mean, like which aspect needs to be discussed? The characterization (inaudible) as being some agreement and some divergence? Because I think the working group will discuss the new ideas and the divergent opinions that are put forward, so I'm just wondering if you could clarify which -- what specifically needs to be discussed by the full working group. I see Anne's typing. Okay. While we wait for that, is there anyone else who wants to weigh in on this comment? Okay, I see Anne has typed, "Yes, I think new ideas may go to the parking lot. Divergence on geoTLDs (ph) should be noted as needs to be discussed by the full working group." Yes, I think that's absolutely right, and certainly one of the areas that will be amply discussed, I imagine, in the working group, going forward. And I note that Jim Prendergast has also agreed with Anne's comment. Anyone else have any thoughts here on this?

Okay. Not seeing any, let's just move forward, then, and let's go down to the very next comment, which is from FairWinds Partners. And this one has an aspect with agreement and another with concerns and (inaudible) of support. So, FairWinds says they support the recommendations that formalized types of applications and that those continue to exist. However, the applicants and future registry operators should not be precluded to apply for and be granted spec 13 status during or post-contracting even if they did not establish themselves as a brand applicant

during the application period. Okay. So, again, this is agreeing with the recommendation, but expressing a concern with respect to their condition of support. Anyone have any thoughts or comments on this characterization? I see Anne has her hand up. Is that an old hand or a new hand? Oh, the hand just went down. Okay. Thanks for that clarification there. Anyone want to weigh in on this one? All right, then let's go forward.

The next comment, the last under this point-C, is from ICANN Org, and it has concerns, or at least characterized as suggestions for further work. So, in particular, the ICANN Org says that it would be helpful if the final report could explicitly state the requirements of each TLD type, e.g. whether there are specific evaluation criteria; what, if any, additional requirements must be met prior to contracting; and what, if any, requirements are to be imposed on the TLD via the registry agreement. Additionally, it would be helpful if the PDP working group could provide its views on whether the applicants must declare the TLD type when submitting the application and whether changes to TLD types are permitted during the application process prior to signing the registry agreement. All right. So, this, again, has been characterized as some concerns or suggestions for further work from ICANN Org. Anyone have any thoughts or comments on this comment?

Okay then, moving right along, we can go down to the next subsection in 2.2.4, which is e.1. And on the spreadsheet I'm looking at, that's line 24, and the question is the working group did not reach agreement on adding any additional categories of TLDs. What would be the benefit of adding a further category, or further categories? Should additional categories of TLDs be established? And if so, what categories? Why or why not? Okay, so the first comment under this subcategory is going to be in line 25 in the spreadsheet I'm looking at, but it is labeled the first comment under this particular question. And it is from MARQUES, and it is noted as agreement, support for maintaining the existing categories and adding no new categories. Anyone have any thoughts or comments on this? We've got a number here that are generally agreeing with this that I think we can probably pretty quickly go over.

All right, then let's look at the next one, which is from ALAC, the second comment under this subcategory. And again, this is support for maintaining the existing categories and adding no new categories. The ALAC doesn't see a need for or a benefit of adding further categories TLDs. Okay, so that's pretty straightforward. Any thoughts on this one? No? Okay.

Let's go down to the next one, which is the third response in this subcategory, and it's from the Brand Registry Group. And again, this is agreeing with the recommendation. It does not support adding further

categories except as new and distinct models are introduced. And they say, beyond the categories already specified above, the BRG does not see any benefit to adding further categories at this stage. Okay. So, again, this one seems pretty straightforward. Any thoughts or concerns on this comment categorization?

Okay, let's look at the next one, which is from FairWinds Partners, the fourth comment under this subcategory. And again, this one is expressing agreement with the working group's recommendation. FairWinds supports the formal establish of spec 13 brands as an applicant category. It would remove additional step of applying for a .Brand status during the contracting process, which would increase efficiency. FairWinds does not have any additional information to support the creation of additional categories beyond the .Brand within the application process. Okay. Any thoughts, comments on this characterization?

All right, let's look at the next one from LEMARIT. And again, this is agreeing with the working group's recommendation. They say we support the recommendation for keeping the defined five categories, and we believe there is no additional categories needed to be established. Okay. Again, that's pretty clear and straightforward agreement. Anyone have any thoughts, comments, concerns?

All right, let's go on to the next one. This is from the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, and this comment is characterized as presenting a new idea, essentially adding a verified type of TLD. So, the NABP recognizes that granting priority to verified TLDs over unrestricted TLDs would necessitate the recognition of verified TLDs as a distinct type of TLD. Thus, in response to the question, the benefit of adding a further category, namely verified TLDs, would be to protect consumer safety, where consumers are defined as end users. Okay. So, did anyone have any thoughts on this comment?

All right, let's go down to the next one, then, which is the seventh comment under this category. And it was submitted from the Council of Europe, and it's also presented as a new idea in its response. This comment says part of the larger comment fairness supports creating a not-for-profit type of TLD, and not-for-profit or nonprofit gTLDs could be considered. Anyone have any thoughts on this comment's characterization as a new idea? Okay, I see we've got a hand from Anne. Anne, please go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, thank you, Robin. It's Anne. I'm finally connected. A little bit too much going on here, where I'm just trying to keep up. I wanted to make a comment about the Board of Pharmacy thing about -- I'm not sure exactly where we are, but there seem to be some kind of correlation

between verified TLDs and some of the GAC advice on safeguards, I think it was. And I just -- it seems like is there any really -- any difference between what they're suggesting here as a verified TLD and what we know as the GAC safeguard advice TLDs (ph)? And I think that's something we have to try to clarify. I realize that safeguard TLDs are not a separate category, but we have the existence of GAC advice on certain specific means that involve these types of issues that are being raised by the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy. And I'm not saying that we need another category, and I know we're not discussing substance here, but I'm just trying to correlate how one deals with this type of public comment with the expectation that we could have additional GAC advice on safeguards, depending on the strings that are applied for, and how we would handle that. So, it's not clear to me what we're talking about to be the action taken with respect to these verified -- the suggestion of verified TLDs in light of the fact that GAC safeguard advice already exists as a type of treatment of TLDs. What's the action to be taken? That's my question.

Robin Gross: Thanks, Anne. Oh, thanks very much for your comment, Anne. I note there's a comment in the chat box from Donna Austin, which says, "Anne, I think you're right in the sense that verified TLDs adopted the GAC advice requirements. And furthermore, many registry operators are also abiding by the same GAC advice requirements but don't consider themselves to be, quote, 'verified TLDs'." And I also note that Jim Prendergast has his hand up. So, Jim, you have the floor.

Jim Prendergast: Yes, thanks, Robin. So, yes, definitely something for I think the plenary to discuss and chew on. The one thing I would just note is that, even though there was GAC advice related to these, I don't think it was ever formally adopted by the Board. I mean, there was some magic words that were required to be put into the registry agreements, but GAC advice is pretty clear about the need for verification on the corporate identifiers, and that's not in place for them. So, that's just something to note, going forward. Donna I think points to voluntary adoption by some TLD operators, but it wasn't mandatory requirements by the ICANN Board. Thanks.

Robin Gross: Thank you, Jim. Anyone else want to weigh in on this point, this comment? Okay, I see Anne's got her hand up again. Please, Anne, go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, only just to agree with Jim, that I think that it should be referred to the full working group. I mean, I guess ideally we don't want to create a new category of verified TLDs, but we do want to understand what the safeguards issue is going to be and whether it will hold up processing of applications. And I should probably say that, generally speaking from an IPC standpoint, there's always been this question about

consumer protection as well. And so, I think that the pharmacies, they are the ones that are expressing a lot of kind of life-and-death type issues, but I just want to, I guess, agree with Jim that this idea of safeguards and verified and everything should be discussed by the full working group, and -- but appears that we may or may not want to make any kind of further recommendation about it. But I think we can expect some GAC advice about safeguards again. Be nice to work it out beforehand. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Thank you, Anne. I think that's really helpful. Jim, is that a old hand or a new hand? Old hand, okay. All right. Any other thoughts or comments on this point, or shall we go on to the next comments? Okay.

Not seeing any, let's go down to the next comment, which is from the Registrar Stakeholder Group. And it's categorized as a new idea, and notes that a .Brand category is not a new idea, but this comment seems to indicate that additional new categories might be beneficial. So, in particular, the Registrar Stakeholder Group sees a benefit of categories to be better clarity in definitions. It supports the .Brand. It believes types might make sense in certain circumstances. The new idea that comes in here is that additional categories could be established, e.g. brand TLDs, to encapsulate current spec 13 brand TLDs with potentially ascribing application requirement characteristics on a per-category basis, e.g. generics only in rounds, brand TLDs as first-come, first-serve, et cetera.

Okay, so this is, again, from the Registrar Stakeholder Group, has been characterized as a new idea. Anyone have any thoughts or comments on this particular submission? Okay. Not seeing any, let's move forward to the next comment, which is from INTA and is also categorized as a new idea. The new idea is that consideration should first be given to whether any TLD type requires different treatment or contractual provisions. Only if so is there a need for a separate category. Okay. So, any thoughts or comments on this submission characterization?

Okay, let's move on to the next one, which is a comment from Google, and is also categorized as a new idea. In particular, they're talking about incentivized restricted models. Restricted TLDs that align with user expectations present a major opportunity for increasing innovation utility. So, incentives for these TLDs, such as sliding scale for registry fees that accounted for the prospective registrant pool could encourage a more diverse set of TLD business models. Okay. Again, this has been categorized as a new idea. Anyone have any thoughts, comments on this submission? Okay, Anne's got her hand up. Anne, please go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks, Robin. It's Anne for the transcript. I guess where I'm -- my head is starting to spin on the number of calls in which we're talking about this is a new idea, that's a new idea. I think in one of the groups we

are referring all new ideas to something called a "parking lot." I'm really, I guess, trying to stop for a moment and ask whether leadership knows for sure how everything that's categorized as a new idea is going to be handled, because they seem really to occupy a substantial place in the public comments. How will they be handled? What will be the action taken on new ideas?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Do you want me to jump in there, Robin? It's Cheryl.

Robin Gross: Thanks, Anne. Yes, please go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I was just (inaudible) it, but I may as well say it. It's Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Anne, all new ideas will be going through, along with, in fact, everything, just some of them will be bundled together with over-arching comments, such as there was overwhelming support, or not, from the following PC supplicants (ph) to the full working group. Regarding the new ideas, they need to be looked at again, either by us or in preparation for the working group, or just by the working group. That hasn't been decided upon as yet. Really depends on how fast everyone gets through their workload. But the review, again, may allow us to see certain trends, in which case we can cluster those trends or similar proposals together, and then we can say to the full working group, this particular suggestion, whatever it is, with these three or four variations on the theme, have been made, and then we discuss it in full.

So, this is sort of a staged thing. The aim was to ensure that all of us had a good opportunity to make sure things were being categorized accurately and any clarifying questions had time to be answered. We could have done every single thing through just with the full working group, but it certainly -- well, it would have taken us at least three times longer because breaking it into three (ph) and running in parallel allows us to plow through more questions. Does that help?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, thank you, Cheryl. So, it kind of sounds as though that leadership is going to take a look at all these new ideas and see whether any of them kind of gel into something that the full working group should address, and that the full leadership will be doing some kind of screening of these to begin with, or is that a good summary?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, in terms of screening (inaudible) any -- if any -- don't assume that any will be screened out. That's not the role of the leadership.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Or summarized, I guess, summarized.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Yes. So, it's not screening out. It's, dare I say, packaging for the ease of the full work group's consideration.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I see, okay. So, at least they're not going to be new ideas considered one-by-one by the full working group where, I mean, it just would be, like, exceedingly time-consuming to do that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, we darn well did a damn complex set of recommendations and questions, but I think, Anne, it is an enormous job we were given in the first place.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Right. Right. Okay, so it just -- it sounds like that you guys will try to figure out how we should -- recommending on how we should be processing all these new ideas and letting us know.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Rest assured, nothing is going to be deliberately dropped through a crack. That's for sure.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay, thanks.

Robin Gross: Thanks, Anne and Cheryl, for that clarification about how these will be -- new ideas will be handled, going forward.

Okay. Going back to the spreadsheet, the next and the last comment under this particular subsection is really just a placeholder, if you will. The Registry Stakeholder Group weighed in on this, but it was discussed a few minutes ago in the c.1 discussion, just a little placeholder for that. Okay, so any other thoughts or questions on this particular -- was it e.1? Or can we move on to the next, e.2 questions?

Okay, then let's go on. The next issue, sub-issue under 2.2.4, is e.2, which asked, "To the extent that you believe additional categories should be created, how would applications for these TLDs be treated differently from a standard TLD throughout the application process, evaluation process, string contention process, contracting and post-delegation, et cetera?" Okay, so we've got a few responses on this sub-question. The first one is from the ALAC, noting agreement, in particular their support for maintaining existing categories and adding no new categories, which we've noted again, we have noted above. And the comment directly underneath that also, from LEMARIT, is basically -- it's also agreement and saying the same thing that we discussed above in c.1, that they support keeping the four defined categories and the .Brand, but not for additional categories. So, I think we can pretty much deal with those together here. Any thoughts or comments on that? Okay, I don't see any.

So, let's go down to the next line, which is, again, from the National Association of Board of Pharmacy. And it's the new idea, suggestion that verified TLD types be given priority. That's the new idea given here. Any comments or thoughts on this particular submission or characterization?

All right, let's go down to the next one, which is from the Ming Ltd. Group. And again, this is a new idea, which is support for making it easier for brand owners to apply for brand IDN TLDs. They say we also believe that ICANN should adjust the application procedures to make the local brand owners more easily able to apply for the IDN TLDs of their brands. All right, any thoughts or comments on the characterization of this submission? Okay, I don't see any.

Let's go down to the next comment, which is from the Business Constituency, and is categorized as a new idea, or rather a question for the working group to consider. And it's about the .Brand process difference. And in particular, the BC says can we anticipate any different treatment for a .Brand category other than spec 13? Okay. So, again, I think this is -- we say a new idea, but really I think it's a question that the full working group will certainly consider and answer in the course of its report. Any thoughts or comments on this? Okay, I see there's a hand raised. Anne, please go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, it's Anne for the transcript. I just wanted to mention as to .Brand, there is a proposal in play from Neustar related to rounds and .Brand that we were all asked to go (inaudible) constituencies on and stakeholder groups. And so, I don't know if that should be noted in this question from the BC, that this is probably the one kind of new idea or -- about .Brands that is in play right now that is coming to the full working group level, is the Neustar proposal. I don't know if it should be cross-referenced somehow. Thanks. And I know you're -- I'm sorry to take up so much time. I know you're trying to wrap up. I'm sorry.

Robin Gross: No worries at all. No, that's a really good point, and we will absolutely give that some consideration to how that'll be done. Okay, anybody else have any thoughts on that? All right, I'm not seeing any.

Let's go on to the next line, which is from the Registrar Stakeholder Group. And again, this is characterized as a new idea, a suggestion to treat closed .Brand differently, e.g. a fast track. This new category of brand TLD closed to the public could be reviewed on a fast track. However, if the trademark on which the application is based isn't renown on a worldwide basis or is objected to, then the application should have to follow the regular application process. Okay, so this is -- again, this is a new idea from the Registry (sic - Registrar) Stakeholder Group. Anyone have any thoughts, comments on this characterization? Okay. I don't see any.

We've got two more minutes, so let's see if we can get through the next one, which is from FairWinds Partners, and it is a suggestion that, if .Brands are treated differently, if spec 13 is eligible, some registrant

protection/registry continuity elements may not be needed. It's suggested that this comment may better fit under the topic Registrant Protections, which is something in -- being discussed in Subgroup B. Anyone have any thoughts, comments on asking Subgroup B to take a look at this particular comment, this point? Okay. Well, I don't -- okay, see Cheryl has typed in the chat to send it to the Subgroup B. Great.

And I note that it is maybe 30 seconds before the hour, so I think this is probably a good place to stick a pin in it and come back next time. And then, we will certainly get into the next -- 2.2.5, applications submissions limits, as well next time. And again, that's next Thursday, the 17th of January, at 1500 UTC for 60 minutes. And I thank you all for joining and participating in today's call. We are adjourned.

Julie Bisland: Thank you, Robin, and thanks, everyone, for joining. You can disconnect your lines, and you can stop the recording. Thank you.