ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP - Sub Group B
Tuesday, 11 December 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-b-11dec18-en.mp3**
Adobe Connect recording: https://participate.icann.org/p494rbhuu7h/
Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/hgbuBQ

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

Operator: Recording has started.

Julie Bisland: Great, thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Subgroup B call held on Tuesday, the 11th of December, 2018. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect Room. And if you're only on the audio bridge, would you please let yourself be known now? And I just wanted to remind all to please state your name before speaking for recording purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. And with this, I'll turn it back over to Christa Taylor. Please begin.

Christa Taylor: Thank you. Good afternoon, or good evening to everyone. This is Christa Taylor for the record. I'd like to thank everyone for joining us. And as you can see from the agenda that was sent out I guess last night Pacific Time, we have four items to cover. The first topic is review of the agenda. Are there any other items that we should add to the agenda? And as always, if anything arises during the call, we can always add it to the end in the Any Other Business. Seeing no hands and no comments, I'll move on to topic number two, which is whether anyone had any updates to their SOI, and if so, please let us know now. Seeing no hands, a couple people are typing, not related to the topic, so I'll keep going.

Third item on the agenda is discussion of the public comments on sections 2.5.2, which is the Variable Fees, and it'll be a continuation from the last call, along with section 2.5.3, Application Permission Period. We'll then conclude with any other business, and the next meeting date. So, with all that said, I'll jump right into topic number 3A, which is section

2.5.2.e.2. And I'll -- going to give everyone a second to get there. It's line 36 if you're on the online document. So, hopefully everyone's there.

The question is, "Should there be any exception to the rule that all applicants pay the same application fee regardless of the type of application, what exceptions might apply, why or why not. The first comment is from the Council of Europe, which agrees with a focus on community applications, and also notes -- they make a comment on their -- on string contentions also related to community application. And finally, in the third paragraph, they relate to, quote, "All subsequent fees and costs, such as those including the cost of filing or responding to a community objection. These fees and costs should be established at the level accessible for the GPI-orientated communities." And I'm going to go through all the comments first, and then I'll refer back to the chat and any -- I'll open up the floor.

Second comment is from the brand registry group. This is similar to an item that we already reviewed in 2.5.2.c.1, with the reference to the 20% cost differential. Then, we have the government of -- sorry, and they seem to agree with having the different application fees, or yes, there should be an exception to the different application fees. Next, we have the government of India. They do agree, and then they go on further to suggest multiple IDN scripts to do great linguistic diversity. We then have the Ming Limited Group, and they agree with special focus on ASCII and IDN TLDs. And I believe there was a comment on brand in there, as well. Yes, TLDs of the brands (ph).

Then, we have INTA, and they agree with a focus, different fees for brand owners. We have LEMARIT. They agree with focus on brand owners. They also have the other idea that isn't really directly related to variable costs, suggesting that, quote, "Clear rules that the purpose of the TLD cannot be changed to avoid gaming." And so, I went back and added that to the other section, which is 2.5.2.d.2, which is relating to I guess a fee for changing the applications. And I'm going to hop back to that because -- at the end because I didn't have that in our initial pass in that section.

Then, we have the ALAC, and they say only applicant -- support applicants should have different fees. And then, finally, we have the registry stakeholder group which disagrees, saying that the fee should be the same regardless. Comments? I see no hands and no comments, so I'm just going to go to the next section, which is on line 45, section 2.5.2.e.3, is different types of applications result -- if different types of applications result in different costs, what value, i.e. amount, percentage, other, would justify having different fees? How could we seek to prevent gaming of the different costs? Again, this is tying into section 2.5.2.d.2 regarding the different -- regarding gaming.

And we only have, I think, three comments here. The first one is INTA, which we already reviewed in section 2.5.2.d.2, which is the same section I just referenced. We have LEMARIT saying that the rules of the category

should be strictly defined, switch from one to the other type of TLDs should be an exemption.

So -- and then we have the registry stakeholder group. Doesn't really seem to answer the question directly, and it's hard to kind of put it all together. But they're saying there's no evidence the different types and costing, but we didn't have any o the evidence so far to date, which we noted earlier. Says the application fee is supposed to be revenue-neutral, not per-application, and variances within plus or minus two standard deviations from the mean should have been considered in setting prices. Then, they go on saying it contradicts with the minimum fee floor amount and would certainly encourage speculative behavior and gaming of the different fees. Again, game use more referring to -- also refers to the other section -- and further argues against increasing a type -- the number of types of categories of applications and supports charging the extras as per the original applicant's guidebook. So, it's divergent to the idea with a bit of a mix of everything else in there for other ideas.

So, I'm going to open up the floor for comments, and Michael, I see you have a comment, so please go ahead.

Michael Casadevall: So, on this particular comment, specifically referring to what they say on Work Track 1, a major point was that Work Track 1 was not able to get exact numbers on what the costs of ICANN was. I think this needs to go back to the registry stakeholder group and figure out what on -- if (inaudible) suggestions and exemptions in general, but they don't -- they seem to have issue with the -- I'm sorry, I'm having trouble getting my thoughts together. Come back around to me.

Christa Taylor: No problem. I think I know where you're going with that, and it sounds like, and feel free to correct me, is that you're looking for more -- or they might change their opinion if they had exact costing, but feel free to adjust. Kim -- oh, go ahead.

Michael Casadevall: Michael Casadevall for the transcript. Yes, that's kind of where I was going. A lot of the work is that there are simply no hard numbers to go with on what the cost of ICANN was to evaluate a new top-level domain. And this also ties into their previous comment on exemptions that are such -- although there's the general belief that the -- they also expressed belief that the program should be cost-neutral. So, this one's a little hard to figure out. Basically, if there's no significant cost for us to evaluate multiple strings in -- of the same word, then it still stays revenue-neutral, still (ph) discounted. So, I feel like this one needs to go back and have clarification on whether they support exemptions as long as it keeps the program price-neutral, or so forth and so on. I'm hoping that came out and articulated.

Christa Taylor: Better, yes. Thanks. Anyone here from the registry stakeholder group who would like to provide any clarification? I see no hands. Add that maybe to an action item. I'm just reading in the chat. Susan says -- sorry, skipping here -- sorry, can we know what LEMARIT means by

exemption comment? So, in 2.7.2.e.2, they did quote "TLD cannot be changed," end quote, to avoid gaming. I'm not sure if that answers it exactly, but just I did note that myself because I think I went back to make sure I understood that. Jim, I think Kristine drafted the registry stakeholder group. Too bad she was not able to make it. Trying to keep up here. And I think that's it. Oh, Jim, you have your hand raised. Please go ahead.

Jim Prendergast: Yes, thanks, Christa. Yes, I think we divvied up the comment drafting amongst different members of the stakeholder group, so Kristine I think had the action item on this one. So, maybe next call, we can come back to it and she can give further insight into exactly where it was going.

Christa Taylor: Great. Maybe I'll make a little note to her, as well. Okay. Seeing no other comments on that, I'm going to jump to 2.5.2.e.4, and the question is, "If fees are imposed for changing this type of application, again, what is an acceptable percentage, and how should that -- how should the percentage be determined?" The first comment is from INTA, referring to a difference in application fee plus a 15% admin fee. Then, we have the second one, which is the registry stakeholder group, that believes the applicant should not be charged for a higher fee for making any changes to their applications that are, quote, "permitted changes under the applicant guidebook." It's a little bit different twist there. And then, finally, we have the NCSG, which doesn't really -- it's not really directly related to the question, but they want a comment on the changing of fees midway would result in non-commercial and nonprofit organizations having to drop out of the round. And I think we kind of -- or hopefully will be able to address that in the comment that we referenced, or I referenced to in the last call, which is in cell G12.1, application fees for the accurate, transparent, and accountability of cost.

So, those are -- that's the entire section, and opening up to the floor. Michael, please go ahead.

Michael Casadevall: Just one minor comment is -- and this may have been a problem with the way this was worded in the initial report -- the INTA comment does not refer to the case where if they make a change to the type of application, and the change would be to a discounted. How is that handled specifically? Because it's possible that, due to a change in the application, they qualify for lower applicant fees, are they refunded or whatnot. So, that may be referred back for further clarification.

Christa Taylor: I'm not sure where you're referring to discount. What do you mean by discounting?

Michael Casadevall: I shouldn't say discount. We have the entire section that certain application fees are reduced, and if the type of application changes, is there a scenario where the application fee would have been lower than it would have been originally?

Christa Taylor: Are you referring to applicant support, maybe? So, if not, then I'm a little confused, because the costing method shows that we should be revenue-neutral, so there's no discounting unless it's applicant support.

Michael Casadevall: I am saying it would be with applicant support. I guess how -- what would happen in the case -- so we -- basically, something that was brought up was applicant support, or reduced fees for applying for multiple strings in IDNs and/or brands. And if an application changes to have -- to fall into one of those categories, how is that handled.

Christa Taylor: Okay.

Michael Casadevall: This whole process -- maybe I'm not on my game today, so I will--.

Christa Taylor: --Well, circle back, because -- and I don't want to keep going in circles. We're just evaluating whether or not we agree with the question and the feedback on it as opposed to the multiple strings and discount, because I don't think there was really -- we haven't either got to that section, or it hasn't been described to that level, I guess, due to -- sorry I'm not saying that correctly, but it hasn't been articulated that that was an item, and in Work Track 1, people disagreed with that. So, I don't want to say agree or not on that.

Michael Casadevall: Fair enough. Sorry for any confusion.

Christa Taylor: Oh, no, all good. We all learn (ph). Couple comments. Justine says I have a couple of questions which I posted to subgroup B, and I suppose (ph) last call they are, one, pertaining to text in (ph) working group call. In many instances, I see work group response. The work group will -- start of (ph) a new idea of concerned divergence to the full work group. Is this meant to be a subgroup's proposed working group response, as in the subgroup is proposing that the working group's response to the contributor see this, or just meant to be a subgroup's response to the comment for the full working group's consideration? So, it's for the -- oh, it's for the full group's -- stop -- working group's consideration. I'm a little confused on these, the working group response, working group, and full working group in this column two.

                      Okay. I will clarify that a little bit, going forward. It was just an idea while I was reviewing it, to hopefully kind of speed things up for everyone to quickly review it and for discussion purposes. And then, sorry, question 2.5.e.2, while I understand the brevity in no cap equals agree, entries under the comment column, I just wanted to reconfirm that they actually mean no -- go up -- they actually mean no cap beyond stability and operational constraint consideration. Yes, that was the idea. And Susan commented, changing later to something which would have been a higher price of trying to game the system, proposing a disincentive to that.

                      Okay. Any other comments on this section 2.5.2.e.4? Seeing nothing, I think we are done this section. And then, I will turn it over to Rubens to do the next section. So, Rubens, it's all yours.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks, Christa. While -- I'll wait while staff loads the next section into Adobe. They're going to 2.5.3, which is the application submission period topic that was dealt by Work Track 1, which is the next, just after 2.5.2, which was application submission period. Well, since most of you have the link, we'll go through that, but if you'll soon load into Adobe.

The first question of 2.5.3 was 2.5.3.c.1, for the next round of new TLD applications, applicants should have a minimum of three months from the time in which the application systems open until the time in which applications would become due, known as application submission period. This recommendation would apply if the next application opportunity is structured as a round.

For this comment, we have four agreements with no new ideas or concerns from the brand registry group, from INTA, from FairWind Partners, and from Valideus. But if you go to line five, we have a comment from the registry stakeholder group that agreed with the suggestion, but added -- and most of the new idea, while possibility that the period could be extended to six months, as such an extension would be beneficial, only allowing latecomers for the program to participate. So, registry stakeholder group, while not disagreeing with three months, suggesting that six months could be beneficial.

Next, we have comment from business constituency on line six. Well, this have concern with three months not being long enough in some parts of the world, so while the -- they haven't said, so just the extend for applicants for some parts of the world. That could be one reading of this comment. Another reading would be to extend for everyone. So, for this section, we could ask their representative if they were suggesting to -- actually that -- increase more, increase the application period for more than three months for everyone, or just on a geography basis, which could be one reading of the comment. I have a feeling that they are not saying that, that instead of having a feeling, having confirmation would be better for the overall (inaudible) process.

And still in this comment, there was one ALAC comment that actually referred to other comments, so we will look into those when we get there. So, any comments or issues in 2.5.3.c.1? I see some people are chatting, but not something that would prevent us from then (ph) going.

So, we'll now go to line 11, item 2.5.3.d.1. In section 2.4.2 on communications, Work Track 1 has recommended communications period for the next round of new gTLDs should be at least six months. One possible recommendation is that no more than two months of the communications period for the next round of new gTLDs shouldn't overlap with the applications submission period, leaving at least one month after the closing of the communications.

But before going to this item, we had a hand raised in the room. So, Jim, please go ahead.

Jim Prendergast: Yes, thanks, Rubens. Just going back to that BC comment, my sense is they didn't mean that only certain parts of the world get more time, but I guess it wouldn't hurt to get clarification from them. That's all. Thanks.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks, Jim. So, moving back to 2.5.3.d.1, we had one agreeing comment from the brand registry group, but we had a more diverse series of opinions from other stakeholders. We had a divergence from INTA, that they do not support an overlap with the application window at all, period, so no qualifiers simply do not overlap, so we need to forward that divergence to the full work group.

We had the comment from the registry stakeholder group with at least two new ideas. One was actually comment about the effectiveness of the communications period in time payment to external consultants on that communication period to some success metrics. So, I don't recall if this has been discussed in the usual reporting where -- so either way, you will need to take this to the full working group, but it's not a (inaudible) item, because we can't even refer to that discussion. It's simply a new discussion that needs to refer to the work group.

But coming back to the point of vendor application period, the registry stakeholder group does not seem so favorable, so no overlap, although allowing for a maximum of 30 days overlap. So, they would prefer no overlap at all, but would allow some overlap. This is something that we could also refer to the full work group, possibly merging the two comments in that one stakeholder didn't even want an overlap. Some like (inaudible), but not as large as suggested in the initial report.

Then, final comment in this item was to recommend initial three-phase application window, comment from Neustar. And this is possibly something that might be -- might need some better understanding. There is a link in the comments to a comment that Neustar previously sent, so we could probably look into this to get more details on this idea. But either way, it's a new idea for us to refer to the full working group.

So, on 2.5.3.d.1, any comments, questions, concerns? Not seeing any hands. Let's go to 2.5.3.d.2, which (inaudible) already reminded that the line 16 in this spreadsheet, that it says that in the event of -- following the next round of new gTLDs, application opportunities could be organized as -- if application opportunities organized as a series of applications windows, windows steps relate to application process and delegation should be able to occur in parallel with the opening of subsequent application windows. We had three comments agreeing with this, one from the ALAC, one from the brand registry group, one from the registry stakeholder group.

We also had an agreement from INTA, but they provided some conditional sort of (ph) agreement that INTA supports this approach provided the various windows as clearly identified and that controls are in place to ensure that a later application for a TLD, or one confusingly

similar thereto, is not given priority to an earlier one, which looks more like an implementation note, not as a policy disagreement. So, they seem to not disagree (inaudible) in this. Any comments or issues on 2.5.3.d.2? Going once, going twice.

Let's go to 2.5.3.d.3 then, line 21. In the event that -- following the next round of new gTLDs, application opportunities are organized as a series of application reviews. The application submission period may be shortened to two months. We had agreement from that on the brand registry group and from the registry stakeholder group. But we had two disagreements on this, on opposing shutting the window for -- from INTA and from Neustar.

But one of the things that sounded to me, that some of those comments might not be -- having taken into account that this would be for a series of application windows, so more of a regular process that is happening frequently and periodically. And the responses seems to be more tuned to a round (ph) system that's a round of (inaudible), and then a long time passes by, and then an application comes again. So, what we could do for those two would try to ask for clarity. We have participants from both organizations frequently in our meetings, so perhaps one of those could clarify us. I don't know if that's Anne is going to do or not, but Anne, please go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you, Rubens. I'm sorry that actually this is a comment related to the earlier section. I tried to get my hand up as fast as I could, but -- this relates to cell 20 and INTA's condition for support of the windows that follow on one to another. And they're saying that, as long as one is not given priority to an earlier one or something, if there's a different string, it's just a note that this way of proceeding I think would have implications for something that's in a different subgroup, and that is for the objection procedures, like string contention and string confusion and everything else that, once you establish the windows like this, it has to be clear.

I mean, normally, those procedures apply within -- those objection procedures apply within just the one window. And if we have a series of windows that are each two months long or whatever, we'd have to clarify whether those objection procedures apply in exactly the same way, because they -- I can't remember the deadlines for objections, but, I mean, you could end up with a situation where somebody files a timely objection, but then also applies in the next window. It just -- it's kind of complicated, but it's just a note that this could affect the objection procedures and would need to be looked at a lot more carefully in terms of recommendations from the final working group. Thank you.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks, Anne. And if I can make a comment in my personal capacity, one of the implications of that would be from -- for string confusion objections, there is a difference between outcome, if the objector is a current registry operator, or an applicant, if it's a current registry operator, if the objection succeeds, the application is terminated. And if it's an

applicant, the application goes into contention. So, that could be some of the complications that you are foreseeing. But either way, this is -- looks more like a implementation quirk that needs to be looked into. But it's possibly something more substantive than we are looking at this point. But we have some chat in this, so this is an interesting discussion that we can go back later.

So, let's go back to 2.5.3.d.3, where we're talking about some divergence from INTA and Neustar, that the idea was to ask them for clarity. And then, we have a comment from ALAC that implies that this would be -- discourage or disadvantage first-time applicants. And I really have a hard time applying that comment to this specific section, so if someone can think of where we should move this comment, or we need to take into account that this session I welcome that. But, just for that, we'll go to Susan, which she'll probably comment on a previous topic. Please go ahead, Susan.

Susan Payne: Yes, hi, it's Susan Payne. Thanks, Rubens. And I may have misunderstood you, but I think I understood you to be saying that you were planning to go back to INTA and Neustar to ask for clarification of their opposition in this 2.5.3.d.3 section. And I just wasn't really sure why that was necessary. I mean, it seems to me that their responses aren't -- there's nothing sort of ambiguous about either or the responses that I can see. And the question envisages that this is in subsequent -- there's a next round, and then in subsequent applications periods it might be shortened. And both of those two groups are objecting to that shortening, and I -- can you just clarify for me why you think those two responses are ambiguous or that need clarification? Because it doesn't seem like they need it to me.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks, Susan. It's not that they are ambiguous. They seem to be very assertive about the different topic, which was the application window size for a more -- not so frequent position. So, the idea was to clarify if this indeed was a response for this specific scenario, which is a frequent application window scenario. Just because the response doesn't go in too much detail of this exact scenario, so it looks a bit like a previous response that was meant for -- on a round basis for next round issues. So, it's just for confirmation that this is not that it looks ambiguous, but might look out of place. So, that's the -- yes, that's the motive (ph). Does that answer your question?

Susan Payne: Yes. Well, I guess it does. I just -- again, I guess I disagree with you. I don't think -- I mean, I think the question is very clear that was asked, and the responses, I certainly know from -- in the relation to the INTA response, the responses were submitted question-by-question in a tabular format, very similar to this, as you can see if you go back and look at the comments. So, it's another question of were they answering a different question by mistake. I mean, I think INTA was very clear which question it was answering.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks, Susan. Even though sometimes we might just think (ph) it's clear, I still prefer to err upon an abundance of caution. So, as a general principle, not only in this specific case. So, you can answer -- INTA can answer exactly that, then there will be no doubt about it. Unfortunately, Donna Austin from Neustar, the other comment that we'd like some clarity on doesn't have audio right now, so we'll follow this up by e-mail with her or some other representative from Neustar.

      Then, we can go back to the ALAC comment, where the doubt (ph) was that that really means something about this specific question was (inaudible) target should be moved to another one. Does that -- does anyone want to take a shot on this one? Seeing no hands and no comments, we have to record this as an action item for later. But not to be taken with ALAC, to be taken with ourselves just to be sure we as a subgroup are on the same page on this item.

      So, let's move to 2.5.3.e.1.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I'm sorry, Rubens, to interrupt you. It's Anne again. But we're having a problem with going on to next sections while hands are up. So, may I ask to be recognized?

Rubens Kuhl: Please go ahead, Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, thanks very much. I just wanted to support, I think, both what Susan had said and then what Donna said in the chat, and that I don't think for -- that on cell 24, 25, that asks for clarity is the correct next action. I agree with them, that these comments are clear, and so I don't think that staff would want to put -- ask for clarity in those boxes. Thank you.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks, Anne. Your comment is noted. And we'll now go to 2.5.3.e.1. For the next rounds, having the application submission period set at three months, sufficient, and we have agreement comments from the brand registry group, from business constituency, from INTA, from Neustar, and from FairWind Partners. But we had comment from Jamie Baxter that has -- was in agreement with the concern. And what he mentioned is that he could provide conditional support for three months based on data. So, if -- but if data point collect from the questions in 2.4.2.e.2, so that application status submit as they're (inaudible) period, those are period -- then he could not support the overlap of these periods.

      But looking at those comments, I think that they should probably be more tailored to 2.5.3.d.2, but our task is looking to this anyway, including this call. And it seems that there is a concern here, so that -- also there is an agreement. There is a call for more data to date (ph) that decision from the working group and from the organization. So, we need to refer that concern to the full work group, as well. The only question is that if we forward (inaudible) or the other, but we have to forward this anyways.

Besides that, we had some -- we had one comment from the registry stakeholder group that's very similar to a previous comment, possibly something to be merged, suggesting that three months would be adequate, but extending to six months could be beneficial. Which, by the way, is something that was compatible with the divergence from another group. I believe it was UTA (ph), but I'm not sure. So, that's one angle that the full group could look into that could merge these concerns.

We had new idea from the ALAC that would support for conditions, improving the number of community-based applications and benefiting underserved regions. So, we will favor conditions that would improve the number of community-based applications, particularly ones made by community (ph) support applicants, so ones which are considered to benefit underserved regions. If they see an appropriate application (inaudible) function, how well such applicants can be expected to comprehend the requirements, prepare the applications, and submit those applications.

So, this is more not a call for data, but a call for reasoning, so if taking the need of those applicants into account, if (ph) the application (inaudible) reasonable. So, in some parts, this is possibly something that we need to duplicate (ph) the discussion at applicant support at least on these underserved regions, but they have one angle that's not covered by applicant support, which are the community-based applications. So, is there time enough for -- from which based (ph) application to be developed and submitted. So, this could actually take more a concern than a new idea, but one thing that could be taken out of this, even if it was not ALAC suggested, but something the full group could consider would be a different submission application period for different application types, which is possibly something that we could also look into application type. So, that's something that full group will have to digest on our behalf.

The registry stakeholder group -- registrar stakeholder group had a comment that it depends on the prior notice length and the complexity of the application process. And both this comment and the next comment from LEMARIT, can shine a light on us, that some of the comment were made based on a level of complexity that either what was seen in the 2012 round or what they are foreseeing in this round. But depending on how the work group changes the application process, for instance if the application becomes so much easier and simpler than 2012, then some aspect of the process, including the submission period, could be changed. The comment below, which was from LEMARIT, said that they believe that three months was not sufficient, then they mentioned some required documents that took a significant amount of time. And while they haven't said in those words, this probably refers to continue operation instrument and some other pain points of the 2012 program that we all know about and we're probably going to do something about it. And the initial report already foresees changing that aspect anyway.

So, one of the comments that we could include so the full work group decides that those two new ideas and divergence, that they are -- the

comments are actually basing their comments on the last round, or assuming the next round will be similar to the last round. And that might not be true, and in that case, the full work group might have to circle back into the question for more realistically matter, saying, oh, if the process is now simpler, can this period be shortened, or not, when rules could apply or not. It's something that will -- probably needs to discuss at time.

And although I -- not seeing any hands on this, I think this is a good point for us to stop going to 2.5.3. You have more item in the application submission process to go over, and we have just five minutes before our time ends. So, it's probably more useful now to go to item four in our agenda, which is to see if someone has any other business.

I'll take this opportunity to note something that Susan noted in the chat, changing her SOI that we couldn't captured during the beginning of the call, that she's now Secretary of ATA (ph). Congratulations, Susan. And is there any other business? Oh, she's corrected me, Secretary of the IPC. Sorry, Susan. But in your chat record it was correct, and now audio is corrected, as well. So, if anyone has any other business they would like to raise? While people think, there is one thing that is part of our work plan that we could look into. There is a proposal that -- it's fine by me, but just make the subgroup know and see if anyone has any concerns.

So, after we end application submission period, we start with terms and conditions, and then application queuing instead of going to applicant support, which would be in numerical order. But subgroup coordination feels that this would make more sense in the discussion. So, in our next meeting, December 18 at -- and now I don't know -- I don't remember which is, and perhaps our helpful staff might remember, which time December 18th would be our next meeting, but just to signal that the work plans to move ahead terms and conditions and application queuing and go back to applicant support at later date. Emily is typing, probably -- yes, to inform us that 1700 UTC on December 18, our next meeting. So, is there any other business, or do people want their three minutes back? It seems so, so we can end the recording. Thanks, everyone, for your participation today, and talk to you all December 18. Bye-bye.

Unidentified Participant: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

Julie Bisland: Thanks, Rubens. Thank you, everyone. Today's meeting's been adjourned. You can disconnect your lines, and have a good rest of your day.