ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP - Sub Group C
Thursday, 15 November 2018 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/new-gtld-sub-pro-sub-group-c-15nov18-en.mp3
Adobe Connect recording: **https://participate.icann.org/p6xjqcj95gi/**
Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/XQDVBQ
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: All right. Well, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone.
                    Welcome to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures, PDP Subgroup C
                    call held on Thursday, the 15th of November, 2018. On the call today we
                    have Michael Flemming, Jeff Neuman, Jamie Baxter, Jim Prendergast,
                    Jessica Hooper, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and Susan Payne. And looks like
                    Kristine Dorrain just joined. I have apologies from Katrin Ohlmer. And
                    from staff we have Steve Chan, Julie Hedlund, and myself, Julie Bisland.
                    I just want to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking
                    for recording purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones
                    on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise.

                    And with this, I will turn it back over to Michael Flemming. Please begin.

Michael Flemming: Thank you very much, Julie. And I am happy to have everyone here on
                    this lovely hour. And let's get started. Can we go ahead and show the
                    registry agreement 2.10.1 at the question -- the last question, I believe, of
                    the -- yes, scroll on down there, scroll on down, a little bit more, little bit
                    more. That's it, the one, public interest. That's where we left off. All
                    righty. So, welcome, everyone. Before we jump into here, I'd just like to
                    take an opportunity to ask if there are any SOI updates. Seems that we
                    are all on the right page. The document that we will be referencing has
                    currently been pasted in the chat by Steve Chan. And once again, our
                    exercise for this is to go through the comments that have been posted
                    and review for clarity, see where these comments -- what these
                    comments are saying, if they're in agreement, the versions offering new
                    ideas or suggestions that offer more clarity in regards to what the
                    question is proposing specifically, or if there are concerns being
                    addressed.

                    We have taken the opportunity to do a pre-review, if you will, and to mark,
                    as efficiently as possible, what these comments are saying, and making
                    sure that we can do this in the time allotted. Now, I think we took a little
                    bit different route on the objections discussion that we'll be reviewing

shortly after we finish up the last question of this, of the registry agreement topic. And where we kind of reorganized the comments in a pattern type of a situation, so we have agreement, divergence, concerns, and new ideas, all jumbled in the nice area together. So, it should make it much easier for us to get ready and -- yes, as Cheryl just pointed out, Emily has been a very big help in getting us prepared. And I do not see her on the call today, but I wish her a lovely hour at this time, probably late over there. But still, let's get started with our first question of the day.

All right, what is the question of the day? So, this question states -- I'm in the Adobe Connect document for -- just to make sure I can better facilitate. So, I'm going to -- this is a big question. So, if I have to pause a little bit, that means I'm scrolling between words for efficiency. So, what I will do here is I will read the question aloud. I will not read in full each comment if avoidable, because some of these comments can be very long, but I will give my best interpretation, or my best summary of the question, and that's where we will jump in to see if there are opinions -- if there are -- is there anything to say after the question. And I think, when we go through the objections, what would be very nice is if we could just go through each pattern. Like, for example, we'll just go through all the agreements responses before we have individual input in regards to some of the questions and to some of the responses, unless the question -- the response itself is rather large and has a lot to say in its little packed message. Some of those can be sometimes -- cover a lot of material in addition to what the question is asking.

All right, then let's go ahead and jump into the first one. Sorry about the way. Okay. The public interest commitment, PIC, standing evaluation panel --sorry, Standing Panel Evaluation Report dated March 17, 2017, in the case of Adobe Systems Incorporated et al vs. Top Level Specter Inc. dba -- sorry, I cannot remember what the acronym is at this point -- registry LLC et all states the following: second, the panel notes that PIC 3A of specification 11 imposes no obligation on responded as the registry operator itself to avoid fraudulent and deceptive practices. Third, the panel finds that respondent registry operator agreement contains no covenant by the respondent to not engage in fraudulent and deceptive practices. The question itself, 2.10.1.e.2, states, should this work track recommend that ICANN include a covenant in the RA that the registry operator not engage in fraudulent and deceptive practices? Please explain.

So, our responses are, first is from the registrar stakeholder group, and this supports this suggestion for the whole chain. This would make sense to have the same requirements for the whole chain. INDA (ph), Chris Frons (ph), saying that it's important for an additional take (ph) of the covenant not to engage. And they do state that -- sorry, not to engage in fraudulent and deceptive practices. They also state that our preferred option would be that this would be addressed by means of an additional PIC, since that could be enforced by ICANN compliance itself. What else will give recourse to an aggrieved third party via the PIC ERP?

And then, the IPC provide a similar comment supporting for an additional PIC with the development not to engage in fraudulent and deceptive practices. And this also bring up another comment that I regret mentioning, saying a suitable amendment to the contract must be adopted for any future new gTLDs. So, it appears that we have only received three comments specifically for this question, all sharing support. Is there anyone that would like to offer clarity or address some of the content that has been brought up on the answers, aside from giving opinion to whether or not on the content of the question we're looking at specifically? Okay, I've got Kristine and Jim. Go on ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine Dorrain. Real quick, I was just going to note that I don't necessarily think that the text in blue on either of those sort of agreement with new ideas were actually a new idea. It's just an implementation. Is it the same PIC with additional words, or do you have 3.a.1, 3.a.2? I think that's just implementation. It goes in the PIC and in the contract, and where you put it is implementation. So, I would assume that all three of these are in agreement and what not necessarily have to go back the full working group or some new idea discussion, except you might want to flag them someplace for an implementation, like where in the PIC contract would it go. That's my only suggestion. Thanks.

Michael Flemming: Kristine, I think that's well worth mentioning. I mean, I think that's well worth taking under hand in putting forward. Jim, is that your hand? Please go ahead.

Jim Prendergast: Yes, thanks, Michael, Jim Prendergast. So, this comes back to a central question I think we faced in a few other topics, and that is what is the scope of this group. Is it the 2012 round, or is it going forward? And if it's in fact going forward, which I believe we've heard on multiple occasions, then anything that addresses existing contracts probably is out of scope for any work that we're doing. Thanks.

Michael Flemming: Thanks, Jim. So, this is, going forward specifically, but adding something like this to the registry agreement for future applicants I think is what we're trying to say here. Jeff, you've got your hand raised. Maybe you could offer a little bit of input to that.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff. Actually, I was more addressing Kristine's comment, but you are right. This is only -- although we used a past case for those units to apply (ph) the discussion point, this would only apply this point as a recommendation, going forward, for the future for the next -- so next round.

The one -- so I mostly agree with Kristine. The one difference that makes this just a little bit more than implementation is whether we would recommend, or a comment. The comments to recommend that it be a PIC versus just a general contractual requirement. And where that becomes important is whether it's only enforceable by ICANN compliance or whether it's enforceable through a PIC ERP, which in theory has the

ability of a third party to at least initiate the PIC ERP, although ultimately it would be brought by ICANN.

So, the one thing we may want to discuss about this is with respect to whether we recommend to the full group that they -- it seems like their support to basically have a requirement of the contract not to act in a fraudulent manner. The question is whether it becomes a PIC, meaning it's subject to the PIC ERP, or whether it becomes a contractual requirement only enforceable by ICANN. So, that's the one difference where it's a little bit more than implementation. We could decide to leave it up to ICANN, but we may as a full working group want to opine on that. Thanks.

Michael Flemming: Thanks, Jeff. All right. Susan, I've got you next. Go ahead.

Susan Payne: Yes, thanks. Hi, it's Susan Payne. Yes, just with respect to the comments in here that are out of scope, that may well be correct. I think -- I don't really know what the process is, but I think there's real concern from parts of the community about the fact that there appears to be -- according to this, there appears to be no obligation on a registry not to engage in fraudulent and deceptive practices.

And the concern that -- this is something that ICANN legal should look at and give -- take a view on whether in fact that is indeed the case is something that I think it would be nice to find a way to flag that. I'm not necessarily suggesting that should be in the final report, but it would be nice if there were a way to bring this to the attention of ICANN legal, that there's been real concern expressed about this, and there's a feeling that this should be looked at, one, to assure themselves that in fact the contract doesn't contain any such obligations; and two, if that is indeed the case, to think about what should be done, if anything, about that.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, Susan. Steve, you've offered a bit of input in regards to this area that I think might be helpful to flag at the top, like it on the audio as well here. Could you jump in about that? I'm not sure what FWIW is, right?

Steve Chan: Sure. Thanks, Michael. This is Steve from staff. It's just in reaction -- I guess not in reaction, but just in relation to what Kristine mentioned about leaving nothing to ICANN, about leaving some things to implementation. It was just to note that FWIW, for what it's worth, it's just that implementation would be done in conjunction with an implementation review team, so it would not be ICANN doing things on its own, but in association with the associated community input.

And just a caveat, just to say that this was not intend to persuade or dissuade you from going one way or the other. Thanks.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, Steve. All right. I do want to also respond to Susan as well, but I'm not sure I have the best thinking cap on the right moment. So, I do think, Jeff, you also raised your hand in regards to that. Jim, should I

	let these comments directly respond to Susan? I think Jeff might -- I was thinking maybe letting him go first if that (inaudible).
Jim Prendergast:	I have what's called the two-finger, so it is a direct response to Susan.
Michael Flemming:	Okay. All right. I'll let you go on ahead then.
Jim Prendergast:	Yes. So, I guess I don't have the contract memorized, but I am kind of surprised that there isn't some other language somewhere in the contract that prohibits deceptive and fraudulent practices. And Susan, I don't disagree that there are people in the community that feel strongly about this, but I don't think this is the vehicle for them to express those concerns. If there's nothing preventing them from sending a letter or raising it at an ICANN meeting about the lack of these provisions in a contract, and then if ICANN decides to, as part of the registry negotiation process, raise those, then that's a bilateral negotiation between the contracted parties. But I don't think this particular process can or should be used to retroactively make changes on the existing registry agreements that are realized (ph). Thanks.
Michael Flemming:	Thanks, Jim. Were you able to do the two-finger response there?
Jim Prendergast:	Yes.
Michael Flemming:	Okay. Okay, good, Jim. Wanted to make sure you got everything you wanted to say out. Okay, Jeff, I've got you. Please go ahead.
Jeff Neuman:	Yes, thanks. I was jumping back to Steve's point actually, which is that -- sees (ph) this correctly. You could leave it to an IRT and ICANN. I would think, though, that it may be more of a policy question as to who should (inaudible) enforcing the requirement, or not who should be, who should be the only one. I should say should it be an option for a third-party to be able to enforce that provision, I think that's more policy than just leaving it to the implementation team to decide. So, I do think it's kind of important for us to -- not because I want to take it out of ICANN's hands, but if this group does have a view that it should the enforceable by a third-party through a PIC, then we should express that. If we truly don't care, then it's fine to leave it to an IRT. So, I will leave it at that, but probably (inaudible).
Michael Flemming:	I lost you there, Jeff. I think we got the gist, the majority of what you're saying, so thank you for that. All right then. I do want to kind of jump in on the comment, Susan, that you brought up about existing registry agreements, as well. I agree that this is the vehicle and not the manner to address those areas. I do feel that one of those actions that we could do if we do pull up some of the comments about existing registry agreements. And knock me down if I'm wrong here, send that over to the -- (inaudible) I can -- now's not a good time for me with acronyms, but the review team for the new gTLD program itself. They are -- starts with an R, I think. There is the one -- the group that did the new gTLD program review on a whole -- I don't know if they're still active. CCRT is done.

Okay. Then, that would have been great to send it over to them. But, if we can't do that, then perhaps we need to think about other ways to make sure that feedback goes to where it needs to go.

So, all right then. Let's -- until November 27th, yes. I don't know if we'll be able to do that, get all that into the right direction. Bute, we do have a material to cover, so I'm going to go ahead and go past this. Thank you everyone for your responses in regards to this. We have collected that there is only agreement on this and no other responses. And we'll provide that to the full working group.

So, let's go ahead and go down now. We do have this section that I wanted to kind of introduce here to the group called Additional Comments. This is an area that we have received some feedback and some specific commentary that was kind of outside of the public comment itself, but didn't really go into the process of the normal group discussion that happened in the work tracks to produce the proposals out of this. But at the same time, we felt did have a connection to what we were talking about here, and we wanted to flag to make sure we were able to pick it up and to view it.

Now, we have a lot of additional comments on this one topic, and it was actually an email exchange that I am not going to cover in full. I did highlight one comment that I felt was worth reading specifically, one email that was worth reading specifically here. And if anyone else is aware of what this email exchange is talking about, then feel free to go ahead and use it. We feel that you want to bring up another specific e-mail that was sent, please feel free. If you feel it's necessary to bring up that email, then please do so.

But, the e-mail talks about pricing, premium pricing for TLDs. And this was kind of a hard one to find the right topic to relate to. We had two that I think we could have done. One was the registry agreement. Another was -- one was the compliance one, if I am correct, but -- that kind of relate on the bare minimums with premium pricing specifically. It might be a gray zone to put it here, but all the same, let's take it with what we have now. And if we do feel it necessary to move it to another topic, we will do so.

So, let me read -- basically, an email was raised some time ago about whether or not there was an issue with premium pricing and whether or not -- I'm just reading the initial email in my head right now -- is that it's something that we need to address if there were actually any issues. And I don't want to go over each, like I said, specific comment, but one thing that I think Volker Grimmen (ph), apologies if I'm not saying the last name correctly, did say that I think was worth mentioning, saying that I think the main issue is that with an endless variety for pricing models, for especially premium names, it can be sometimes a bit difficult to discern the renewal pricing of a particular domain name. In the previous world, one only has to look at all the standard pricings of a registrar -- (inaudible) all this at the standard prices of a registrar, look for a TLD, and find your renewal price.

If you do that now, you may find a bad surprise down the road when you've noticed that this price does not apply to your premium name no matter how big the letters on the website of the registrar presenting (ph) out the possibility of differential pricing between names in the same TLD word. It has become somewhat consumer unfriendly.

So, this basically highlights that I think, if I'm interpreting this correctly, within the registry agreement, ICANN doesn't really like to get into the aspect of pricing itself. And I can understand why. But, in some of the issues that have come up with -- for some end users is that premium names might introduce an initial price, and the ideas is for a lot of registries that'll go back to standard pricing the second year or third year for renewals. But, for some TLDs, that premium rate might not be subject to change to that standard pricing. And that has been that consistent, and I think that's what this e-mail exchange is talking about. I just wanted to make sure we highlight this to say that this was -- some did feel this was an issue and that there were important exchanges brought up about it.

Jim, you've got your hand up. Please go ahead.

Jim Prendergast: Yes, thanks, Michael, Jim Prendergast. So, what are we supposed to do with these comments? Do we just discuss them and that's it? I'm not sure what we're supposed to be doing with this particular section. Thanks.

Michael Flemming: Good question, Jim. I'd like to kind of pitch (ph) that over to Jeff or Cheryl about why we put this here in the -- again. But Cheryl, you've got your hand up. Go on ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: All right. Now I'm going to -- back to answer your question, Michael, as opposed to give my opinion. Rush (ph), two things. This exercise is a way of demonstrating that we are as working group taking due care and consideration on all relevant comments that have come in, and that's an important exercise in its own right. But then to Jim's question, what the hell do we do with this, well, the hell (ph) target from me, that that's my (inaudible) is coming in, obviously. I would suggest not a whole lot in terms of even being capable of trying to wrought out any sort of direction advice, let alone recommendations. These should all be noted, because (inaudible) what they are. There is no belittling of the concerns, but it is not within our scope to -- in my view, at least -- be dealing with this. What may be worthwhile doing, however, is mentioning or suggesting to the full working group that we should mention in some cover note format, or in some preamble to our final report, that during our public comments, a considerable number of permits were received on this matter, and leave it at that. So, we're not ignoring the situation, but I personally don't think there's anything we could, let alone should, do about it (inaudible) of ICANN, other times different answer. That's my obviously very biased view.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, Cheryl. Jeff, I've got you in the queue. And let's just try to close this topic up as well as to (inaudible).

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So, I have a little bit different view than Cheryl, which is good, because it's good to have some diversity. I think that Volker's comments, and knowing Volker, I think they fall into two areas. One is with clarity in the registry agreement on -- or putting something into the registry agreement that requires a registry to be more clear in its pricing to end users. I'm not saying we should do something about this. I'm just saying I think that -- I believe that's one. But, the second part of it, again because I know Volker, I think is -- actually fits into the registrar standardization topic, which is that where there is -- which really doesn't have to necessarily do with -- well, yes it does, sorry -- with premium pricing, but it's providing a standard way that registries can interact with registrars in some sort of standardized way so that registrars would be able to know not only the initial, but also the renewal pricing of a particular domain within the TLD for some standardized process.

Now, I know that there's some work on this already with a voluntary -- what do they call it -- registry ops, or registrar ops group. So, they're working on that. But, to the extent that this relates to the registry agreement, and we have a comment in here about ensuring that pricing remains clear to the registrar and to the end user, that is something we could recommend. I'm not saying we do, but we could put in a recommendation to the full working group if that's something we thought was a good idea. Or we could view it as out of scope, but this group should be deciding on, as Cheryl said, reviewing each comment and then deciding if there is something we can or should do about it. So, I think there are a couple ways we could if we wanted to go about it, but it's up to the group to decide what, if anything. Thanks.

Michael Flemming: Thanks, Jeff. I'm not sure if specifically recommending the action -- well, I'm not going to at this point. What I do think was worth doing is basically punting this over to that topic and then bringing it up to the full working group and letting them decide specifically how we -- I think it needs more discussion outside of this group specifically more because we need that representation and that input, as well.

Jim, I'm going to let you have the last words on this, but then we need to move on, so thank you.

Jim Prendergast: Yes, thanks, Michael. Jeff, I hear what you're saying, but I don't agree with it. I think that this is not a policy issue. This is a customer experience, a customer relationship, a business practice experience. This is not a policy issue. So, maybe the middle ground is similar to what Michael just said, and that is without recommendation or prejudice, we just bump it up to the bigger group for more discussion. But my inclination is that this is definitely outside the policy remit that we have. Thanks.

Michael Flemming: Thanks, Jim. And I do offer a little bit agreement. I'm not sure that we are supposed to be making those decisions here, at least that's my understanding. And again, this is a comment that's brought outside of the public comment as well, so perhaps this isn't necessarily the platform, so -- either. Still, it is worth highlighting and making sure that we did cover it. We have covered it. Let's move on at this point.

Another additional comment that we had which is outside of the e-mail exchange, but we do need to cover, was from the CCTRT -- thank you. That's the acronym -- that was a comment that needed to be addressed about some specific action in regards to this topic. I am not going to read it in -- maybe I do need to read it in full since it's additional comment, but let me go through it as quickly as possible, and then we can figure out how to -- what to do at that point.

So, recommendation 15, ICANN org should, in its discussions with registrars and registries, negotiate amendments to the registrar accreditation agreement and registry agreements to include provisions aimed at preventing systematic use of specific registrars or registries for DNS security abuse with a view to implementing this recommendation as early as possible. And providing this can be done, then this could be brought into effect by a contractual amendment through the bilateral review of the agreements. In particular, ICANN should establish thresholds of abuse and which compliance inquiries are automatically triggered with a higher threshold at which registrars and registries are presumed to be in default of their agreements.

If the community determines that ICANN itself is ill-situated -- sorry, ill-suited or unable to enforce such provisions, a DNS abuse resolution policy, a nice new acronym, DADRP (ph), should be considered as an additional means to enforce policies and deter against DNS security abuse, furthermore, defining and identifying DNS security abuse is inherently complex and would benefit from analysis by the community. And thus, we specifically recommend that the ICANN Board prioritize and -- some important (ph) community work in this area to enhance safeguards and trust due to the negative impact of DNS security abuse on consumers and other areas, other uses of the Internet. Yes, sorry, and other users of the Internet. I lost my (inaudible) ending of that sentence wasn't natural. But, okay, I've got Jeff, and then I've got Kristine. Jeff, please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. And this one I will take off my co-chair hat on and just state that this one involves so many unique policies that I don't think it was appropriate for the CCTRT to issue this to our group. This, if anything, should be a recommendation through GNSO for a completely new PDP if the community wants to take it on. We've had several PDPs within the GNSO community on DNS abuse that the first one was something like fast-flux years ago. But this is -- I think this is something that we as a group, we recommend to the full working group that we acknowledge this comment and that we basically say that this is for the community to take

up separately. And if they want to go forward with it, it would be a separate PDP.

And as Steve says, this was -- oh, this was not just directed at our PDP alone. This was directed at others, but we should definitely say that this is -- and I don't remember, Steve. Maybe you can help us. Did it say that this is a prerequisite, or this is high -- I can't remember what they said about it. If they said it was a prerequisite, then maybe our group might want to disagree with that, or at least discuss whether we should -- sorry, should now put my co-chair hat back on -- we should discuss -- if they did say it was a prerequisite, then I think the only real issue this group should discuss is whether we agree or disagree with the notion that it should be a prerequisite. But at any point, I don't think this group has the experience or -- within our charter to go into this difficult issue. Thanks.

Michael Flemming: Thanks, Jeff. And considering the 90 comments we have to get through for objections this morning, I'm happy to punt to collect that, as well. It's prerequisite, okay. Jeff, you want to jump back in there, then?

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So, two things on that. We should probably -- number one is maybe the full working -- we should punt this to the full working group to discuss whether we believe it should be a prerequisite. And number two, there is a -- although this is dealing with the registry agreement, it is probably more appropriate in the security topic as opposed to the registry agreement topic, if anywhere. So, that's what I will offer, but maybe this group wants -- the full working group wants to discuss whether we agree it should be a prerequisite or not.

Michael Flemming: Thanks, Jeff. I think that's a good action, to send over to the full working group. Is there anyone else who wants to jump in? Going once, going twice, sold to the full working group. Okay. Can we move on to objections, please? We'll have to change what's on the screen. Okay, perfect. Thank you.

Okay. So, we have a lot to get through in this next 15 minutes, but we're not probably going to get through all of it, and I do want to go back to bed. So, all righty then. And could I get the ability to scroll, please? Perfect. Thank you so much. All right. I think Steve is going to probably provide the link to the document as well for your viewing pleasure. And there's a lot of green in here, as Kristine has pointed out. And like I said, we're going to -- for this practice, we're going to go through all the -- we're going to go through a whole pattern at once, so if there's only agreement lined up, we're going to go through all the agreement, and then we'll try to pick out some specific ones if we need to. If the comment is offering a lot to bite up, to chew on, then we will then stop at that point to kind of review that specifically we need to.

I am going to go as quickly as possible here, but feel free to raise your hand if necessary. Okay, let me go ahead and read the first question, and then we will go through the comments. Okay. Oh, and again, I just want to make sure, this is not a topic that I had covered in the last

working track, so I may not have some of the background knowledge necessary to give background in regards to the question itself. So, I will probably turn it over to Cheryl or Jeff at that point if anyone has any questions about that.

So, the first recommendation or question is 2.81, 2.8.1.c.1, transparent process for ensuring that panelists, evaluators, and independent objectors (ph) are free from conflicts of interest must be developed as a supplement to the existing code of conduct guidelines for the panelists and conflict of interest guideline for panelists. And for the first round here, we have agreement from the ALAC, stating that support for -- across it with a lot of words -- saying that support for a process to address conflicts of interest. We have support from the Council of Europe, stating that part -- with a lot of words -- saying that part of a larger comment on fairness, they support for stronger safeguards against conflicts of interest. The BRG supports this as well. Intel also supports this recommendation. I do want to make sure that we review each specific comment just to make sure we have said that we've reviewed as, as this is the practice we're inputting here.

New parts -- I'm sorry, Neustar. I read Neustar and support as one word. That's kind of funny -- Neustar supports these preliminary recommendations, and sorry, that was my reading error eventually -- initially, but FairWinds, also support this recommendation. The registry stakeholder group supports this recommendation, highlighting a previous comment that was raised during their comments to the working group in June 9, 2017. I don't think it's necessary to read it in full. We can go back to it if necessary. Validais (ph) also supports the recommendation. IPC leaves it conflict of interest. Guidelines should be adopted, and a screening process should occur prior to the commencement of the objection process. And the business constituency provides a suggestion that, if there is independent objector, include multiple ones that can be from emerging markets. So, if there are -- yes, basically what their comment says. So, it's a new idea. Sorry, that line actually was new idea, is marked as new idea.

Okay. Well, we have concluded the question. Is there anyone that wants to raise their hand in regards to what has been brought up in here? Hearing none, thanks, team. That's the best -- right, Michael, go ahead. Michael, you might be on mute. Sorry, Michael, I am not hearing you. But, if you -- okay, perfect. We'll make sure we get your comment and review it since it's typed out. Jeff, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I was wondering if we can go back to the BUC and asked them a question on why they are recommending that. I'm trying to think of the grounds for filing -- and objector filing objections, and they're community-based and/or what we used to call public morality. I would like to -- I mean, it sounds good. It sounds great, but why? What is so important with those two types of objections that it is worth recommending that one be from an emerging market if there are multiple.

Michael Flemming: Thanks, Jeff. I do think that's one that worth making it to-do. Would anyone else like to jump in on that? I don't think we have anyone from the BUC here. Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Michael, Cheryl for the record. I'm happy for the to-do, but I'm also not sure what we would do with the answer, because it's a "if there is." This smacks of implementation to me. What we have is overwhelming support for a transparent process for ensuring that panelists, evaluators, and independent objectors are free from conflict of interest, et cetera. And that's the thrust of this question.

   In addition, there's this "and if there are multiple independent objectors." Here's another nice-to-have. Note (ph) to have, absolutely, but I'm not sure it makes one iota of difference, at least in my opinion, on what we are likely to be telling or advising. The full working group is the reaction to that question (inaudible) on 2.8.1.c.1 from our public comments. Thanks.

Michael Flemming: Cheryl, Kristine raises a question to you, as well, in the chat. I thought maybe you might want to address it. Do you want to address it via audio or via chat?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Happy to do so. Sure, I'd have no problem at all. New ideas can all go to the full working group. I certainly wouldn't prioritize that. I think we should collect them and send them to the working group as a bunch rather than dribbling them in. I think the priority of the full working group is to address the questions that have been raised. It's a nice-to-have, and not all new ideas may be deemed as worthy as others. We'd have to then probably go through as a full working group to analyze where new ideas are complementary versus conflicting with each other. If we're not going to do that in the full working group, then we would need to do that as staff or subcommittee or leadership or something. So yes, no objection to that process, but it's the priorities will have to be designed and managed.

Michael Flemming: Okay. Thank you, Cheryl. And I think we have Kristine saying that she agrees with the collecting. Steve, I have a comment from you, and I do want to make sure that we stop today at 5:58 -- sorry, 5:58 for me, but two minutes from the top of the hour to bring up any other business from myself and if there is any from anyone else. But, for now, Steve, go ahead.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Michael, this is Steve from staff. So, if I recollect -- I can't speak -- recollect correctly, that comment from the business constituency, that was made specific to .c.1. But I would note that there's actually a question that asks about the independent objector. It's 2.8.1.e.7. And I was just thinking that it might be appropriate for this particular comment to actually be moved to this section so that .e.7 question asks about whether or not there should be -- well, it notes that there was only one independent objector, and it asks whether or not there should be multiple. And then, so I think that input from the BUC might make more sense to

be moved entirely to this section. Yes, actually, that's all I was going to say. Thanks.

Michael Flemming: Thanks, Steve, and my apologies for the barking dog. But, yes, let's -- Cheryl, you make a good point. Let's just bring it up. Let's call it quits here (inaudible). But, that's a good point, Steve, and I think we can move that to that section, to that question.

All right, team, we've gotten -- I think we've made progress in this meeting. And I think the objective will be here to get through objections on -- within November. I think we only have -- let's see, we have three calls this month. So, no, wait, maybe we'll need a little bit into December. So, I think we'll probably need two more calls to get through objections fully. Oh, Cheryl, you have your hand raised. Go on ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Happy to wait (inaudible).

Michael Flemming: No, I was just going to say that that's the objective here. And then, after that, we have a lot of smaller topics with a lot less comments that I think that we'll be able to get through maybe two a meeting. So, hopefully we'll be able to do some things when we get to that point. I do just want to -- yes, Kristine, yes, we do -- I think (inaudible) is expected that people have gone through the comments before we talk about this specifically, before we review them. And so, everyone knows, we don't have a view (ph) with many details with the (ph) comments. Cheryl, I'll let you go ahead and speak before I get into AOB.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. Yes, yes, I know you need your AOB. What I wanted to just raise at the close of today's meeting is I would like to see, if not somewhere on our spreadsheets, then perhaps a stand-alone document where, as we're going through, we actually collect and agree on some proposed text. Shouldn't be terribly complicated (inaudible). So, when we have things like a sea of green, we can write down what we'll be sending towards the -- as a full working group, in other words, in the matter of 2.8.1.c.1, the public comments were overwhelmingly in support of (inaudible). And if we capture that as we go through, we will make it easier for -- as we (inaudible). It's a lot of proposals (ph), and if we start doing that now, it means we only have to catch up on today's work and last week. Thank you.

Michael Flemming: Thanks, Cheryl. I think that's a great comment that will help efficiency for our reporting to the final working group -- to the full working group.

All right then. For AOB, I just want to address time news (ph) for future calls at 20 UTC to be done at 21 UTC. This is merely for -- this is my -- I'm sorry, this is kind of a selfish request, but for Asia-Pacific, rather than 5:00 a.m. calls, these 6:00 a.m. calls are much better for us. I think that gives Cheryl 8:00 a.m. specifically. But I was wondering if there might be any issues with that with this group, or if we could just go ahead and reschedule future 20 UTC calls to 21 UTC. Perfect. I'm getting good responses here. All right, I appreciate that, and I really, really appreciate

it. I'll take it as an early Christmas present since Thanksgiving -- since we don't celebrate Thanksgiving here. So, perfect. All right then. Thanks for the early Christmas present, and we'll do 21 UTC, and the -- sorry, Susan. I don't like 21. I don't like these early morning calls, either. Probably late for you. But we'll conclude there, and we'll pick up with the next question for objections next week. What's the timing of the next call? Could we bring that up before we close? Steve is typing. It's actually not scheduled yet. I thought we had one more call scheduled for November. Oh, that's right, because next week is Thanksgiving. All right, and Black Friday. So, I don't think we'll have a call next week, but I think the week of November 26th we will need a call. So, let's go ahead and do one for not 21 UTC if we can avoid it. We're having a rotation (ph) here, so I think we might be at 3 UTC. Okay, let's go ahead and invite out for the next call. And if we need to do -- if people feel that they're not going to be attending those late -- those 3 UTC calls, please let us know beforehand so we can kind of collect ourselves. But we are at the top of the hour. Cheryl, I'll let you go ahead and--.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: --Yes. My issue with the 3 UTC is the appalling turnup that's been happening at the other three UTC calls. If this group has no problem with 21 UTC, I suspect we may do no harm in just running all our calls at 21 UTC. But that's something you can take offline and discuss. But we are getting very little turnup at the 0300 UTC calls, so I would be most concerned that (inaudible). That's a big (inaudible) if we -- towards the end of the year, if we get only three people and we have to cancel.

Michael Flemming: Okay. Yes, let's take that offline. I'm not in favor of having all (ph) at 21 UTC, but maybe a mix of 15 UTC and 21 UTC. But, again, let's try to have a rotation between those two, since 3 UTC seems to be difficult.

But, all right then. Let's go ahead and drop it at that. We're at one minute over the hour, and yes, we'll send a note to the list so we can get full response. But with that, it's nice having everyone here, and have a lovely day. All right. Bye-bye. Thank you.

Unidentified Participant: Thanks, Michael.

Julie Bisland: uploading now. Thanks, everyone. Today's meeting's been adjourned. You can disconnect your lines. have a good rest of your day, or night.