

ICANN Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Sub Group B
Tuesday, 15 January 2019 at 2000 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Sub Group B call on the Tuesday, 15 January 2019 at 20:00 UTC. 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/gns0/gns0-new-gtld-sub-pro-sub-group-b-15jan19-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p5iux5x0dbn/?proto=true>

Attendance is on the wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/7YIWBg>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:

<https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Operator: Julie, this is the Operator. The recording has started here on this end.

Julie Bisland: Okay. Great. Thank you so much.

All right. Well, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Sub-Group B call, held on Tuesday, the 15th 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, would you please let yourself be known now?

All right. Hearing no names, I just want to remind everyone 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.

And with this, I'll turn it over to Christa Taylor. Please begin, Christa.

Christa Taylor: Thank you. Good afternoon or good evening to everyone. This is Christa Taylor, for the record. Thanks for joining us today.

As you can see, we have four items on the agenda. The first topic is review of the agenda. Are there any other items that we would like to add to it? And as always, if anything arises during the call we will add it to the end in any other business.

Seeing no hands and no typing, next item is updates to statement of interest. Does anyone have any? And if so, please let us know now.

Seeing no hands and no chats, I'll move into the third topic, which is the discussion of public comment on Section A, which is 2.5.3, Applicant Support. And we will pick up where we left off on the last call, and that is on Section 2.5.4.e.6, and that is on line 97 of the Google doc.

And Steve has already put the link there for easy reference, and I'm just going to jump into that. And at the end – I'll read the different comments, and at the end I'll pause and look for any comments or hands and then continue on.

So, the question on 2.5.4.e.6 is, "How can we improve the learning curve and what ideas are there beyond mentorship?"

We have several new ideas here. The first one is from the ALAC, suggest "devoting resources to identify and address barriers to applying" and that "more resources be applied systematically to identify and address barriers to application."

We have the BC suggesting to "develop regional discussion hubs which would foster discussion hubs composed by regional players in which collective strategies can be devised and common concerns gathered."

We have Lumerit saying, "creating suggesting training mailing lists and webinars would be useful."

And then we have the Registry Stakeholder Group suggesting to "improve outreach and publication of the ASP, including timely outreach to business associations." They also have the concern that "in the 2012 round the ASP was rushed and not well publicized. So, those who may have benefited from the Applicant Support Program may not have been able to take part due to time constraints or a lack of knowledge of our ICANN and gTLDs, in general." They go on with a new idea which I think was (inaudible), that "reaching out to business associations such as national and regional chambers of commerce to disseminate information to the members to increase awareness might be helpful."

Any comments to Section e.6?

Seeing no hands, I'm going to move on to the next subject, which is 2.5.4.e.7. The question is, "How do we penalize applicants who may try to game the system?" And that's on line 102.

The first comment is from the ALAC, suggesting that rejecting – suggests "strategies to discourage gaming and making a component of the evaluation methodology by the SARP to determine if the application was the subject of willful gaming and rejecting such application outright from the current round and that the applicant, including its representative, should be disallowed from participating in any application or Applicant Support for a specified period of time."

Then we have the Registry Stakeholder Group suggests – proposes consequences for gaming but suggests that "setting up a system to root out gaming would be costly and problematic." They go on to have a concern. "It's more likely that attempting to set up a system to root out gaming will create additional accountability problems for ICANN and increase the cost of a new gTLD program. Parties found to be gaming by the Application Support Program evaluators should, one, have the application rejected without any refund; two, withdraw all applications affiliated with the named individuals who are party to the ASP gaming application; three, should ban all named individuals who are party to that application from applying in any round for at least a reasonable period of time, up to forever."

And I believe there was one other document – one other line item from 2.5.4.c.3.4. I'm sorry. Let me just capture the line here. I have it in a different document. Apologies. And that line was from ICANN.org on the implications of potential increase in volume in Applicant Support. And as brought up before, we should perhaps bring that up to the full working group. And the comment was we might want to "consider the impact of program costs to process applications and to fund applicants who do qualify as well as the impact of program timelines due to the increase in Applicant Support applications."

Any comments to Section e.7?

I see, Rubens, you added a comment there regarding the 2012 system. Seeing no other comments – Steve, I see you typing.

I'll move ahead in the meantime. On line 107, we have the next section, which is 2.5.4.e.8, with the question, "Are there any considerations related to string contention resolution and auctions to take into account?"

We have four comments. The first one is from the ALAC, suggests that "applicants who qualify for ASP should be given priority in any string contention set." And then they have the new idea that "any applicant who qualifies for ASP should be given priority and not subject to any further string contention resolution process."

We have Neustar with the – saying, suggesting "ASP applicants could change their string," with the new idea that "consideration should be given to ASP applicants the opportunity to change their string to avoid the contention set. The new string would need to be similar in meaning to the original applied-for string."

We have the Registry Stakeholder Group, supports the ICANN creating "a list of resources, organizations, or agencies that would be willing to assist the applicant." And they go on to suggest an auction due to costing would be a concern and would level the playing field. Then they have the new idea, "The initial report discussed by the Work Track (inaudible) better outreach to client partners throughout the process" and believes the working group should recommend that "ICANN cultivate a list of resources, organizations, or agencies that would be willing to assist the applicant." Sorry. The part with the auctions, suggesting we add it to that section, as well, when we get to auctions. I'm not sure what section that is, but it's been noted, too. I'll make sure that we review it there.

The last comment is from the GAC, again suggest that we move this comment also to Auction, suggesting they "do not support auctions between commercial and non-commercial applicants. And the auctions of last resort should not be used to resolve contention between these different parties," as I just mentioned. "As to private auctions, incentives should be created to strongly disincentivize that instrument."

Any comments to this section? Kristine suggests, to be clear, "the Registry Stakeholder Group understood that the list of resources was part of the initial report. We didn't think we were creating anything new there." And correct.

And Rubens suggests – makes the comment regarding gaming and Applicant Support Program. "I think the comments encompass what I heard in the community throughout the years."

Okay. Seeing no hands and no further comments, next section, 2.5.4.e.9, which is on line 112, the question is, "Should there be a dedicated round for applicants from developing countries?"

We have three parties who agree, which is the ALAC, Lumerit, and the NCSG. ALAC has – supports it with some support within at-large for a dedicated round in developing countries or in indigenous communities. Lumerit, "it should be limited to geographic TLDs only." And then we have the NCSG, who agrees on "the implementation of exclusive round of applicants from developing countries" and that "that would raise awareness and have the potential to result in an increase in the number of new gTLD applications."

We then a divergent point of view from the BC, who say, "No, there should not be a dedicated round for developing countries"; along with the Registry Stakeholder Group saying that "it could be easily gamed to make applications not really from those countries get preference in that round over applicants unwilling to make false representations."

Any comment to that section?

Seeing nothing, I'm going to jump to the next section, which is 2.5.4.e.10, and that is on line 118. And the question is, "What should the source of funding be for the Applicant Support Program? Should those funds be considered an extra component of the application fee? Should ICANN use a portion of any excess fees it generates to the next round of new gTLDs to fund subsequent Applicant Support periods?"

We have the ALAC who agrees with it, suggesting possible sources of funding for the ASP, including excess funds and auction proceeds. "The excess application evaluation fees generated from the 2012 round and, two, proceeds from the auctions undertaken to resolve contention sets from the 2012 round" would be potential sources of funding. They further go on to suggest that "funds be considered an extra component of the application fee for the upcoming round" and " a portion of any excess fees it generates through this next round of new gTLDs to fund subsequent Applicant Support periods."

We have the Registry Stakeholder Group with a divergent point of view, saying that "funding should be a cost in a revenue-neutral model" and that "rather than rolling over excess funds from one round to pay for the Applicant Support Program in a subsequent round" and that it should be – again, the budget should be – "the cost of applications should be revenue-neutral for subsequent application periods."

And then, finally, we have Neustar, which has a similar comment to their prior responses, with nothing really directly answering the question at hand.

Then I believe we added one comment from above, which was from the Registry Stakeholder Group, from Section 2.5.4, Item #6, saying with the question of "the Registry Stakeholder Group would like to better understand how the Applicant Support Program is funded or, more specifically, where the money comes from for the reduced fee."

So, we have a couple of comments that kind of answer that indirectly, and we have addressed it kind of before in the actual funding part of it in (inaudible) and Application Fees. So, I'm not sure if that's sufficient or we would like to take that to the larger group to discuss, but I'm putting it out there.

Rubens has the comment, "I think the RSG could be called a concern."
Correct.

Seeing no comments, I'm going to move into the final section – hooray – which is on line 123, Section 2.5.4.e.11. The question is, "Are there any particular locales or groups that should be the focus of outreach for the Applicant Support Program (i.e., indigenous tribes on various continents)?"

The first comment is from the ALAC, who agree, suggesting "targeted developing country, regions, middle applicants, or native people" and that "there was some support within the at-large for ASP outreach to be targeted at communities based on developing countries or regions or middle applicants with one particular group to be prioritized, that was the native peoples indigenous tribes on various continents."

We have Jamie Baxter of dotgay LLC, saying it should be extended to "locales and groups that may have declined consideration based on costs and general application support and that focus on case studies that can help inspire innovation and creativity within populations, initiatives, communities in sectors that may not be a common or productive link to new gTLDs."

And finally, we have a divergent point of view from the Registry Stakeholder Groups, saying that they are "not aware of any data that identified a particular underserved community or locale in need of special outreach" and that "ICANN should not single a group out for special treatment without more data."

Any comments?

Or is anyone still awake?

I see Justine and a few people typing. And in the meantime, if you'd like to prep for the next section, which is 2.6.1.

Justine Chew suggests – makes the comment, "How would we find data if there is none?" Great question.

Cheryl says "the unknowns of the unknowns."

"What kind of data are they referring to?" I guess we're looking – I guess the question is, do we have data on people who didn't apply because they didn't know about it or didn't have sufficient time on it in underserved regions or locales?

A bit of a circular question, I think, but maybe I'll let everyone chat on that to see if they have some ideas or if anyone would like to take the floor?
And maybe...

Jim Prendergast: Hey, Christa?

Christa Taylor: Yes.

Jim Prendergast: Hey, sorry. It's Jim. I stepped away from my computer. So, I'm on the phone only for a moment. Not specific to – it's Jim Prendergast, by the way, for the transcript. Not specific to this question, but one of the things as we were walking through this that jumped into my head is at the plenary level or higher what do people envision as the next steps on Applicant Support? Is there going to be another JAS Working Group type body that's going to take a look at these rules again and implement what we come up with? Just I'm curious to see what people think about that, because that's a question that's hanging out in my head on this particular topic.

Thanks.

Christa Taylor: Thanks, Jim. I don't know if – I don't know if there – I don't know any knowledge on that as being a next step. Jeff, Steve, anyone else want to take a stab at that? Cheryl? Apologies. Not to put you on the spot.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl, here. I'm always happy to be put on the spot, Christa. Don't worry. And I did serve on the JAS Working Group along with a number of others on this call. I think the JAS Working Group of course had the – if we were to look at their work and the outcomes of their work, next steps if we were going to explore them and make any comment or recommendation regarding it should look at what they were recommending, what their report on the shortfalls of the program was, and I think, most importantly, look at the implementation suggestions that they had on how they were to manage and review. Remember, they did have put in place an additional team whose job it was to minimize the risks of gaming and ensure bona fides and statements, etc., were as accurate as possible, blah, blah, blah.

So, I don't think we'd necessarily need to go back to square one, Jim, should we even decide as a plenary group to make any recommendations on it. But it would be an additional, albeit small, piece of perhaps a subcommittee working, in my very biased view, anyway.

Thanks.

Christa Taylor: Thanks, Cheryl. Any other comments?

Rubens says, "And this is not the only topic like this" and that "the initial report has much guidance on that."

And Cheryl notes that was her speaking in her personal capacity, of course.

Okay. I'm going to skip to the next topic, which is 2.6.1, which is Application Queuing. We did Section 2.5.5, Terms and Conditions, in December. So, we didn't actually skip it. It was just done earlier.

So, the first question in 2.6.1.c.1, which is on line 3, is, "ICANN should not attempt to create a skills-based system like Digital Archery to determine the processing of applications."

And don't fall all over in surprise, but everyone agreed with this: the ALAC, the Brand Registry Group, the BC, Neustar, the Registry Stakeholder Group, and FairWinds Partners.

The next question – actually, I'll wait to see if anyone has comments. "Make Digital Archery great again."

Seeing no comments, I'm just going to keep going. And if I need to I'll come back to that, but I'm going to guess we're all okay. Next question, c.2. "ICANN should apply to (inaudible) appropriate license to conduct drawings to randomize the order of processing applications."

We have three parties in agreement with this. We have the ALAC, the Brand Registry Group, and the BC. Any comments on this?

Okay. I'm moving to the third question, which is 2.6.1.c.3. "If ICANN is able to secure a license, applications should be prioritized for initial evaluation using a prioritization draw method similar to the method ultimately adopted in the 2012 round. Namely, applicants who wish to have their application prioritized may choose to buy a ticket to participate in the draw. Applicants who choose not to buy a ticket will not participate in a later draw – will participate in a later draw to be held after the prioritized applicants. Assignment of a priority number is for the processing of the application and does not necessarily reflect when the TLD will be delegated."

We have one, two, three, four parties who agree with this. This is the BC, the Brand Registry Group, the Registry Stakeholder Group, and the ALAC.

A couple of comments. The BC suggests that "applicants should not be required to buy a ticket" and "they should have the option to participate or not to participate in a draw."

We have the Brand Registry Group. "As to a suitable alternative, the BRG supports it."

Registry Stakeholder Group again just approves it.

We have the ALAC, who also adds the concern that "provided always that the cost of the ticket is not prohibitive to some applicants; for example, those who apply for Applicant Support."

And then we have MarkMonitor, who has a divergent point of view, suggesting that "ICANN should redeploy random prioritization for applications in the next round to avoid applicants gaming the system. Priority determinance should be non-transferable amongst applications." And we're going to see more of that in the next section.

Comments on Section c.3?

Rubens says, "I believe MarkMonitor concern is more c.4." Agree. I think they duplicate that in a second.

Going to c.4, "If an applicant has more than one application, they may choose which of their applications to assign to each priority number received within their portfolio of applications."

We have some different point of views on this one. We have the Brand Registry Group and the BC who agree with it.

We have the NCSG who agree, but that they add the comment that "IDNs should be given first priority." They also add on, "We have no objection to allowing an applicant to choose which among their applications they would like to receive..." Okay. They agree with it. "With the lowest priority number."

We have the Registry Stakeholder Group. Its position should be to "avoid prioritization of particular categories over others," and with one minor modification to "allow applicants to choose which of their applications to prioritize in the queuing process."

We have ICANN.org with a concern. They (inaudible) that "the preliminary recommendation may result in unintended and undesirable outcomes that the PDP Working Group may want to consider. Request to clarify what is meant by 'portfolio of applicant applications'. Request to clarify the length of time each applicant has to assign the priority numbers to the application." And then they give an example. "Allowing for applications to choose which of their applications to assign to each priority number received within their portfolio of applications could create a secondary market for priority numbers, such as in the case where a consultant is the applying entity on behalf of multiple clients. It would also be helpful if the PDP Working Group could clarify what is meant by portfolio of applications (i.e., the applicant legal entity used to determine the makeup of portfolios or are all applications that fall under a parent company considered a portfolio?). Additionally, it would be helpful to understand the length of time each applicant has to assign the priority numbers of the application, as it may delay the process."

I'm going to do two more responses, and I'll go to the comments. We have three divergent responses. One is from MarkMonitor, suggesting that they do not support priority numbers to be transferable.

We have Alexander Schubert saying, "No, there is no cherry-picking in the queuing process within several applications from one applicant" and that the whole idea is "ridiculous."

And that we have the final comment, with the Registry Stakeholder Group, who suggests, "Any applicant with an application in contention set should not be permitted to reassign a draw number to that contention set application. Additionally, where a parent company has multiple companies in play during a draw, assignment of numbers between affiliated companies should not be permissible." This comment was also copied down to another section, although I don't have it right in front of me.

Comments? Justine and Kristine say that it supports ICANN's great question and it needs more questions and clarity as (inaudible) pointed out.

Perhaps if everyone agrees, maybe this is one of the items we take to the full group. Question?

Cheryl, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. I've got a bird chorus in the background. I do apologize. It's Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the record. I agree taking it to the plenary is the way forward, and I also agree that these are excellent points to raise when they were raised from ICANN.org. But I do see that it's getting extraordinarily close to details that I would be suggesting belong in the implementation part of a work plan. And I'd just want us to remember where our work can stop – not necessarily has to, but can stop – and where other work can start. That's all.

Thank you.

Christa Taylor: Thanks, Cheryl. Jeff, please go ahead.

Jeff Neumann: Thanks. And I support what Cheryl just said. I think there are some detailed questions in there that are much more appropriate for implementation. But also I think the full group would first need to agree that – on the principle of being able to reassign your draw numbers before it could answer some of the detailed ICANN questions. Because if the group does not decide that that's the proper way forward – and there's certainly several comments that oppose that – then the full group doesn't really need to address those other issues that they raised. So, it is – it's really two parts. To the extent that any of it is policy, as opposed to being

reserved for the implementation, the full group would have to determine that the policy was appropriate – would be appropriate policy to allow those to reassign numbers.

Thanks.

Christa Taylor: Great. Thanks, Jeff.

As Cheryl points out, the carts in front of the horses is the correct order.

Okay. So, that one we'll take (inaudible).

Moving to the next group, seeing no other hands or comments, the next question, which is line 29, Section c.5, the question is, "To the extent that it's consistent with the applicable law to do so, ICANN should include in the application amount the cost of participating in the drawing or otherwise assign a prioritization number during the application process without the need for a distinctively separate event."

And we have everyone in agreement with that, including – four people agree with that, four parties; that is, the ALAC, the Brand Registry Group, the BC, and the Registry Stakeholder Group all in agreement. One part in the Registry Stakeholder Group has the same approach as in c.5, which is this one. I'm just going to ignore that comment.

Seeing nothing, I'm going to jump to c.6. The question is, "All applications submitted in the next round regardless whether they're delegated or not must have priority over applications submitted in any subsequent round's application windows even if the evaluation periods overlap."

We have pretty much everyone in agreement with that. We have the ALAC, the Brand Registry Group, the BC, INTA, and Valideus who agree, and we have one concern from ICANN.org.

Those who agree, the comments are pretty much just straightforward. INTA and Valideus add in a little bit more language that, in the INTA comment, "Where a TLD has been applied for by one or more applications in an earlier application window but has not yet delegated, then it should not be possible for an applicant in a future application window to apply for that TLD string or any string which would be considered confusingly similar. This would be consistent with the recommendations which have been made on string similarity and would avoid the risk of multiple applicants across more than one application window being held in limbo for potentially protracted periods of time."

This is a similar flavor of Valideus, and I don't think I need to add really anything there because the sentiment is exactly the same.

And then we have one concern from ICANN.org that, "It would be helpful if the PDP Working Group could clarify what is meant by 'must have priority over applications submitted in subsequent round's application windows.' For example, must all applications in a current round complete contracting prior to any application in subsequent rounds being able to sign a registry agreement? In further deliberations on this topic, it should be noted that priority number is also used in other program phases to prioritize applications (i.e., contracting and RST)."

Comments?

Jeff, please go ahead.

Jeff Neumann: So, on ICANN's concerns, I think that's really related to – or we can add that to the related topic of what it means to have closure. The full group is talking about the closing of one round. I think that's kind of one of the offshoots of that. So, I think that if we could just put a note basically saying that this needs to tie into that conversation, I think that would address ICANN's – or hopefully will address that concern.

And just to respond to Justine, I had made a comment you were trying to interpret the Registry comment from the previous section. I think it was line 33. And I had just made a recommendation which has already been done, which is basically – I think that row was copied from another section, which is why, Christa, you were a little bit confused, because then it says the same thing as 2.6 – basically says the same thing as its own section. So, I think Steve just, or Julie – one of them – deleted that. I think we're good.

Thanks.

Christa Taylor: Thanks. That might have been me, just making sure we covered it all.

Okay. We're in line 41, Section e.1. The question is, "If there is a first-come, first-served process used after the next application window, how could ICANN implement such a process?"

We have three comments. The first one is from the Registry Stakeholder Group that believes, "ICANN should transition to a first-come, first-served by allowing Spec 13 brands to proceed on this basis immediately. Spec 13 brands should not need to wait for rounds. And this would allow ICANN staff to initiate the shift to a first-come, first-served process more seamlessly after the next application window."

We have a divergent point of view from the NCSG that they believe, "There must not be a first-come, first-served process, and a sub-pro working group early in this report already said that it favors clear, specific, and designated rounds for new gTLDs."

And the ALAC is making a suggestion we're referring to preliminary recommendation 2.2.3, which I believe opposes this. I don't – which is opposition to the first-come, first-served.

Comments?

Jeff, please go ahead.

Jeff Neumann: So, like I said in the chat, when we summarize the answers to this, it's really just going basically say that no one answered this question. They just either reiterated their support or objection to first-come, first-served. So, it's a shame – but this question is pretty much a wash – that nobody really answered it. I guess nobody wanted to think about how it would be done.

Thanks.

Christa Taylor: Thanks. It's Christa again.

Seeing no questions, I'm going to go to the next question, which is e.2 on line 45. The question is, "In subsequent procedures, should IDNs and/or other types of strings receive priority in processing? Is there evidence that prioritization of IDN applications met stated goals in the 2012 round and they serve the public interest in increased DNS diversity, accessibility, and participation?"

A few comments here. The first one is from the Public Interest Community, that it "supports the larger goals of the program to open new gTLDs for new languages, scripts, populations, and communities" and that "the new gTLD application queuing process continue to place IDNs at the top of the list for technical, operational, and financial review."

We have the NCSG, which has a concern that the working group should have collected this data instead of asking for it in the initial report. It says, "Prioritizing IDNs made a big difference by allowing them to proceed first. Additionally, it brought diverse new groups and regions into the gTLD system." They go on to say, "The first 108 processed new gTLD applications in the round were IDNs, and while some came from well-known DNS participants the vast majority were from groups and participants largely new to the DNS, and that's exactly what we were hoping for."

We have a divergent point of view from several, including the RrSG, that they don't believe IDNs should get priority.

Neustar says – it also has a divergent point of view, in that it's no longer a justifiable need to prioritize IDNs.

And then we have Lumerit saying no prioritization of IDNs is necessary.

Jeff, hand raised. Please go ahead.

Jeff Neumann: Sorry. Give me a second there. I'd like to just, I guess, respond to the NCSG and ask them for the data behind their statement saying it made a big difference in the first round of new gTLDs. I'm just not sure what that's based on or what that means. It's not just the fact that we had 108, but what difference did – what data do they have behind their assertions to say that prioritizing made a big difference? I know that they're asking us for the data in the sense of saying that NCSG believes a sub-pro working group should provide the ICANN community with this data.

What we're asking for is evidence that it met the stated goals. We're asking for it because there is no data that we have that supports a subjective statement. So, we know the number of applications there were. We know the number of IDN TLDs we now have. We know the time it took to get through the application process to sign a contract. What we don't have is data on its usage, how long it took to get some sort of – for those that were commercially based – commercial advantage. That's not data that we can collect.

So, I think we do need to kind of respond to the NCSG concern, but also I'd question them on just the statement of that it made a big difference. I'd like to see what they have in terms of data behind that one.

Thanks.

Christa Taylor: Great. Thanks, Jeff.

Okay. Seeing no – Rubens has a personal comment. "If the program wants to prioritize IDNs, it needs to go much further than application priority. It's just a small part then can be only taken as a token of appreciation not as something delivering real value." And "investigating."

Okay. Going to jump to the next section, which is on line 51, Section e.3. The question is, "If ICANN is unable to obtain a license to randomize the processing order of applications, what are some other mechanisms that ICANN could adopt to process applications other than a first-come, first-served process?"

We have one comment from the NCSG, suggesting that IDNs should be prioritized; reiterates really the answer from above.

We have the RrSG, with the idea that "ICANN should utilize or create a randomized system that excludes the show that accompanied the last drawing. The additional cost associated with the pomp and circumstance is unnecessary and unwarranted."

And the last comment is from Alexander Schubert, suggests that this time, "We do know that we have to have a queue. So, why not simply including that task in the application process? With any entity that doesn't wish fee-processing would indicate already at submission of the application. Secondly, every application will receive a random, many-digit-long queuing number assigned by the application system. Yes, computers can create random numbers (inaudible) already." And point three, "The applications are then queued by these numbers." And finally, "Actually no need to start complicated processes like auctions."

Any comments on that section?

Steve, I see you have your hand raised. Please go ahead.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Christa. This is Steve, from staff. And it's actually a comment on the previous section, or a clarification. So, I guess maybe I could hold, I guess, if in the event someone has a comment on e.3?

Christa Taylor: I think you can talk while people comment. How about that?

Steve Chan: Great. Thanks. Steve, again. So, as Justine noted, it looks like the ALAC comment was omitted from Section e.2. So, that has actually been added in the appropriate section. You can see is as Comment 1 under that section. And it's essentially agreement. So, the ALAC comment says that, "Yes, the ALAC believes that IDNs and community-based string applications should receive priority in processing." So, as noted, it's been added. And apologies to Justine that that comment was omitted.

Thanks.

Christa Taylor: Great. Thanks, Steve.

Okay. I'm just not seeing any comments to e.3. So, I'm going to jump to e.4 in the meantime. The question is, "Some members have suggested that the processing of certain types of applications should be prioritized over others. Some have argued that dot-brands should be given priority, while others have claimed that community-based applications or those from (inaudible) should be prioritized. Do you believe that certain types of applications should be prioritized for processing? And if so, please explain."

ALAC suggests – agrees with this, suggesting that "prioritized community-based applications which are considered to serve underserved regions and/or underserved communities regardless of their location."

The NCSG suggests IDNs should be prioritized.

Jamie Baxter of dotgay LLC suggests prioritizing "community-based applications and that the contention set during evaluation be prioritized to

begin initial evaluation early." He goes on to say, "even with prioritization, the contention set is almost certain to be passed by a majority of other applications because of the additional four to nine months required to conduct CPE, and this would help to reduce disadvantages to market entry speed."

Brand Registry Group, responding or makes a comment referring to 2.2.3.g.1, which is smaller, more targeted rounds.

We have the RrSG, suggests that priority "having different types of applications on different tracks could make sense" and the concept of "multiple parallel tracks of applications should be considered, in which case some tracks may have fewer encumbrances and would, therefore, move through the process with greater efficiency."

Neustar is referring to 2.2.3, which is a three-phased approach.

And we have a divergent point of view from the Registry Stakeholder Group, believes the "default position should be to avoid prioritization of particular categories over others."

And we have Alexander Schubert, suggests caution that "the (inaudible) can be gamed by international presence, such as global (inaudible) tax havens like the Seychelles, where it can be gamed."

Any comments to that section or to that question?

And we have two more which I'm hopefully going to squeeze in here quickly.

Seeing no comments, and finally – I'm not sure what line these last two comments are. Line 66, we have a comment from the Registry Stakeholder Group, which we already moved to Section c.4. And actually, we have the Alexander Schubert comment, which we already moved to Section e.3.

So, any questions, comments, suggestions, feedback on 2.6.1, on Application Queuing?

Cheryl is typing. Everyone else has fallen asleep.

Rubens says, "just unsure what we decided regarding the last two comments." I think we – those two comments were reviewed above. Going back to them. So, the comment was support for "program reviews to run in parallel to program operations. Applicants should not be able to reassign numbers, including to a parent/affiliate relationships," which I think we already agreed to take to the plenary.

So, I guess the question is what would we like to do with program reviews and to run them in parallel to program operations. And the second one, which was Alexander Schubert, on the ordering process into application process.

Comments?

Does anyone think we should take this to the larger plenary for discussion? And if so, which parts?

Kristine is typing. "I feel like these last two fit in above. I didn't actually see anything new. Just me?" I don't think so. I kind of was on the same page as you, Kristine.

Perhaps – there's three minutes left. So, I'll let everyone perhaps think about that. And if we would like to add that or change it, bring it to the full plenary, we can bring that up on the next call, or please bring it up at the beginning.

And on to the fourth item on the agenda, any other business?

Thanks, Cheryl.

I see multiple people are typing.

People are dropping off.

Phil says, "I would like to take the prioritization issue to the full group." Which part? What question?

Okay. In the interest of time, Phil, maybe you could bring that up for the next call or – that's probably the easiest thing. And then we can specify what exactly we're going to bring to the full group, if it all ties in, I guess, and makes sense, and we can add it then.

And Steve suggests the next call we will start on Section 2.7.1, on Reserved Names.

Steve, sorry. I see you have your hand raised. Go ahead. I didn't see.

Steve Chan:

Thanks Christa. A real quick clarification in regards to Phil's suggestion. So, without presuming to read Christa's mind, I think what she means by bringing it to the plenary group is bring it to the plenary group in an immediate fashion. Every comment that we're looking at will eventually be provided to the plenary group in some fashion. But when she says bring it to the plenary group I think she means in an immediate fashion; so, something that's worthy of discussion at this point, because it might be of an overarching nature, for instance.

So, hopefully that's helpful. Thanks.

Christa Taylor: Thanks, Steve.

Okay. Thank you, everyone. The next call is next week, at the same time. And thank you, everyone. We're getting there. Have a great day. You can stop the recording.

Julie Bisland: Thanks, Christa. Thank you, everyone.