ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP-Sub Group C
Thursday, 29 November 2018 at 21:00 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-gtlds-sub-pro-c-29nov18-en.mp3 [audio.icann.org]
Adobe Connect recording: https://participate.icann.org/p5kzhfw1ttu/
Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/TwDuBQ
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Operator:	Yes, the recording is started. Please go ahead.
Unidentified Participant:	Okay, thanks. Well good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Sub Group C call held on Thursday, the 29th of November, 2018. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room. If you're only the audio bridge, could you please let yourself be known now?
	Okay, hearing no one, I just want to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for the recording. 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 Michael Flemming. Please begin.
Michael Flemming:	Good morning, everyone, and welcome to another episode of Sub Group C. Today we're going to be talking about the public comments. We've just briefly got started on those last week. We only hit the first question, and hopefully we'll be able to make some good progress through that. In fact, we do have a lot (inaudible). So let's try to get as far as we can.
	I just want to take a brief moment to ask if there are any SOIs, updates, or if anyone has any AOB that they would like to propose for the end of the meeting. Hearing none, let's go ahead and get started where we left off last week. You will notice a few changes to the sheet, as staff has been working through this very well. And as trailblazers as we are, we have been able to have a few slight adjustments that you'll see that there's a lot green coloring going on.
	So let's just move over to the slide that we have -- the areas that we have agreement. And it shows the preliminary analysis at this current time. As we go through this, if we see that perhaps we need to make a few adjustments to the green box, then we are able to do so. So let's just keep that in mind as we move forward.

All right. As always, this is an exercise of reviewing the comments to see what exactly they're saying and to look for anything that we need to maybe clarify. And rather than discussing the material or if we support personally ourselves. And in order to do this efficiently, we'll go and look at all comments that are -- we end up in agreement. Then we'll look at a few that have new ideas or it might have a different opinion. And then we'll also look at those that diverge from the question itself.

So with that stated, let's begin. Steve Chan, thank you for providing the link to the Google document. I will be looking in the room in AC, just to make sure I'm able to capture everyone's comments as we movement forward. So I'd like to pause, to (inaudible), please to bear with me. Thank you very much.

All right then. I will read the question and then -- I will read the question then. So oops, so scroll was a little bit (inaudible) forward. Okay. Hold on. The screen is alive, has a mind of its own.

There we go, okay. So 2.8.1.c.2; for all types of objections, the parties to a preceding will be given the opportunity to agree upon a single panelist or a three-person panel, bearing the cost accordingly. Steve, is this hidden at all? Is all the text there? Let me just change over to the Google document to make sure that is everything. I feel like there might have been a little more text there.

No, that's it. Okay, good. Sorry. I'm just waking up right now. So I might be having some moments of just trying to capture the sunlight. Okay. All right then, so I hear a little bit of background noise. Please make sure to mute yourself if you're not speaking at the current time. Thank you.

So we're basically saying this is, as the question -- as the recommendation reads. And for those in the agreement, we have first MARQUES that is agreeing with us, briefly saying also that there should be options in all cases for one or three-person panels and PICs should be allowed to be amended in response to an objection. So it's adding a little flavor to the agreement.

And we also have the BRG that supports this recommendation. We have INTA that is offering support for the recommendation. We have Neustar that supports this preliminary recommendation, FairWinds Partners also support this. The Registry Stakeholder Group supports this recommendation, and adds their own comments on this. But -- again, if you're not speaking, please do mute yourself. Thank you.

And they do add a little bit more text to this. But Jim, we'll come back to that in just a minute. I'm not going to read the whole comment specifically. IPC also supports this. So good, and now that we have gone through the agreement, let us talk about the comments specifically, if there's anything we need to address. And Jim has raised the comment about saying if we need a changing PIC should be raised as a new idea or as what I like to call, new flavor, to this.

And I do believe that there might have been other areas that talked about changing PICs in response to objections. I cannot remember in my early morning wakeup. But let's see. For now let's just mark this as a new idea. And I think that we can -- there was a similar area as well. Sorry, there was an area, another specific area of the objections. If not objections, but another category of topics that might have actually talked about this a little bit. Steve's typing in, so perhaps he can help refresh my memory.

Yes. Okay. So Steve is looking now. So while Steve is looking for that, we can also look at the other comments that have been raised. The majority of these are just in support. I'd like to say of the recommendation -- or sorry -- the majority of the comments that are in agreement are basically saying that they support the recommendation. Does anyone feel that we need to talk about another comment specifically?

I don't hear any. So maybe we can move on to the next category -- to the last comment that was provided in response to this recommendation, which is also marked as a new idea. Hold on a minute. So it's from, yes, the business constituency. Oh, wait, no. That's the wrong -- okay, all right. That was from ALAC. Okay, sorry. Steve has come back to us with a response.

Let me -- before we jump into ALAC, let's just look at that, section 2.8.1.c.5. (Inaudible) provide applicants with the opportunity to amend an application or add public interest comments in response to concerns raised in the objections. So yeah, one of the things that I've noticed about a lot of these comments that have been provided here, is that it's the same comment in response to several different questions. So we might have some overlap in some of the ideas that are brought up. And we'll be reading the same comments probably a numerous amount of times. But let's cross that bridge when we get there. Okay, Jim? So we'll just put it there. So mark it at that one, that section 2.8.1.c.5.

Okay, so for ALAC, they have responded that they neither support this recommendation, but they offer -- they neither support nor oppose. But they offer additional considerations regarding cost, especially in the fact that they believe utmost attention must be given to one making overall cost of filing (inaudible) through objections much more affordable to communities and non-profit organization objections, and to disallow a wealthier party to a preceding from dictating terms to insist on a three-person panel and prejudice the challenge of its less wealthy -- pardon me. I'm reading that correct. That word just sounds funny to me. Okay, less wealthy opponent. Okay, thank you.

All right. So does anyone have anything they'd like to raise on this comment that has been provided by the ALAC? If not, we'll take it as is that they have concerns with the recommendation itself, and we'll include that in our report to the whole working group. Hearing none, I'll go ahead- - okay, Michael, you have your hand raised. Please go ahead.

Michael: Just on my reading of the ALAC comment, as it says, it neither agree nor disagree. But the concern about cost and wealthier opponents, I almost would put this as a disagree or new idea, instead of concerns. Because it reads to me as a way we need to phrase it when we address this. So I would change this from concerns to concern/new idea.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, Michael. That's a good idea to keep in mind. Sorry. That is a good suggestion. I do like the aspect of marking at as new idea, as well. I wouldn't put in disagreement, because it's not really jumping off that it disagrees fully. But as you say, raising new idea that some concerns need to be given in such situations. So we'll put that change, I think.

So anyone else that would like to jump in on this? Hearing none, I'll go ahead and move forward with the next question. All right, then. The next question is 2.8.1.c.3; ICANN must publish for each type of objection, all supplemental rules, as well as all criteria to be used by panelists when the filing of responses to and evaluation of each objection. Such guidance for decision making by panelists must be more detailed than what was available prior to the 2012 round.

And for our comments that are in agreement, we have the Internet-dot Trademark Organization Limited agreeing, supporting this publication -- sorry, supporting the publication of suggested guidance. MARQUES also supports transparent process for resolving conflicts. The Brand Registry Group also support this, Neustar supports this, FairWind supports this, the IPC supports this. And then we (ph) have agreement with the new idea, for his new idea through the ALAC, stating (inaudible) states that guidance for panelists should be substantial. And so far its decisions pertaining to definitions of community and public interest, allegations of conflict of interest on the part of objections; and especially (inaudible) in order to apply an examination of the purpose and use of an applied full string, as opposed to just the term itself are concerned.

They do raise the aspect of an interim conflict of interest or independent objector in another question as well. So I'll leave that out for now. But here is sitting with a new idea -- let me just

turn my screen up a little bit, so I can write. Okay. Yeah, so the guidance for panelists should be substantial pertaining to definitions of community and public interest. I feel that this is just highlighting the aspect of conflict of interest, rather than any new idea specifically or just giving such guidance to the panelist. I don't necessarily feel that it's something that hasn't been done already.

So does anyone have anything they'd like to say on this comment? Steve, go ahead?

Steve Chan: Thanks, Michael. This is Steve from staff. This is actually sort of a general comment, but also directly in reference to this one. If you look on the right-hand column, what staff has tried to do when there's sort of ambiguity in the response or the comment fitting into the agreement and new idea-concern structure neatly; what we try to do is add a little bit of context.

So if you scroll to the right, what you'll see if that it says, new idea, in this case an additional consideration/suggestion. So to the extent that's helpful, I just wanted to point that out that that's there. Again, you know staff is going through a number of comments, and we very likely we'll probably miss some nuance here and there. But we're trying to put some of that nuance into that sidebar, so that it helps facilitate this process. Thanks.

Michael Flemming: Thanks, Steve. Not a problem at all. Michael you have your hand up as well. Please go ahead.

Michael: I would just add the tag concern to this, because it talks a lot about how this should be implemented. So it's agreement, concern, and new idea; if that's the way-- or agreement and concern. Because it's talking about how it can be implemented, even though it gave suggestion. So just two cents.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, Michael. We can take that into consideration. Let's look at a few of the other comments as well before we fully take on the aspect of the earmarking that as concerns as well. I think one of the aspect of the -- just before we jump in -- I just think one of the aspects of our earmarking it as a concern as well as is to call itself whether or not it clearly states that it does not agree or disagree. But this in and of itself does say it supports. That's why we have marked agreement at this point. But let's-- as we go further, let's just continue and we can keep that in consideration.

So INTA also supports for this recommendation and provides a suggestion to provide case studies or specific examples for each of the criteria to assist panelists. The Registry Stakeholder Group also supports this. And they also support with adjustment to text, stating that ICANN must publish as part of contemporaneously with a -- I just cannot read very well this morning. Excuse me. ICANN must publish as part of or contemporaneously with applicant guidebook for each type of objection. Sorry, it needs to be published in order -- it needs to be published with or contemporaneously with the applicant guidebook.

Good. And then ICANN Org -- (inaudible) to be bold and italic. Ah, okay. So we just have added this -- sorry. First of all, thank you for your comment. I just want to ask for clarity purposes that text in blue here probably should be the one that should be bold and italic. Could you offer a little bit more details with regards to what you mean by that? We'll wait. He needs to type out his answer.

Ah, oh I see, right after that proposed change in bold and italics. I see. I see. Okay. Thank you for that. We'll just make sure to mark that and -- thank you. Thank you. We'll make sure to take note of that. Okay.

With that, I'll go ahead and go over to the ICANN Org comment. This one is concerns or more accurately clarification provided and requires additional detail in the recommendation. So this note said ICANN Org already publishes all supplemental rules and procedures, requests clarification on what guidance for decision making is referencing.

They go on to state there's a bit of text here, saying that it isn't clear to ICANN Org what guidance for decision making is referencing in this preliminary recommendation. It also states it would be helpful if the PDP working group could clarify what additional information is meant by guidance for decision making.

I am unable to respond to this specifically, not being able to have a clear mind in the morning, but also not having full background information on this. Is anyone that maybe has been very active on this in the past, on the objections itself, able to perhaps add any response to what ICANN Org is requesting more clarity on?

Cheryl and Jeff, not to put you on the spot, oh Jamie, thank you very much.

Jamie Baxter: Yeah, Jamie Baxter for the record. I'm not sure if this is going to be helpful. But maybe this is one way of looking at it. Because what seemed to be quite prevalent in the 2012 round were situations where vagueness of the guidance language or even the direction of the AGB, the application guidebook, led to varied interpretations on behalf of the applicants. And then applications were built around those interpretations and submitted. What didn't happen, however, was a reconciliation of that vagueness as it was expressed within the application. And I think this led to a great deal of frustration that never really got acknowledged or adjusted when it came to the evaluations or possibly even the objection process.

So maybe this is something that's trying to be drawn out here. It's certainly a sentiment that I think is important to acknowledge.

Michael Flemming: Thanks, Jamie. That is important to know. So I mean what we originally had was very vague, I believe, in the past as you've stated. So if we can take this -- I think it would help if we try to work, maybe put a little penmanship to this, maybe, or just some more ideas in the mailing list, to see where we might be able to -- see if there is additional un-clarity with what it is exactly we're proposing. And also (inaudible) if we go back to the initial report itself and just look at exactly what the language is stating in order to see if it really is unclear. But I can say that this is a suggestion that's been brought up by ICANN Org at this point for implementation purposes as well. We will need to have more clarity there to give -- offer instruction moving forward. So let's take that as a to-do off of here. And we can work on that a little bit offline, or at least outside of this call, so that we can move forward. Thank you very much, Jamie. That was very helpful.

All right, then. I am going to move to 2.8.1.c.4, unless there is anyone else that would like to add to 2.8.1.c.3. Hearing none, let's move on. So this next one is the extension of the Quick Look mechanism, which currently applies to only the limited public interest objections to all objection types. So it would be extending this from one objection from going to a public interest objection type, to all the rest as well.

The Quick Look is designed to identify and eliminate frivolous and/or abusive objections. So I will go through the agreements then. So we have the Council of Europe that agree with this, and I think that this is -- a highlighted portion of their text is the one that is in agreement with this, saying it appears useful to enlarge the scope of use of the Quick Look initial as an evaluation mechanism. And we have the brand registry group supporting this. Neustar supports this. The Registry Stakeholder Group supports this recommendation. The IPC supports this. MarkMonitor offers support on this in the green portion of their text, which is also used for other answers.

And then we have agreement with new idea from INTA, stating that it is however clear that it's easier to objectively assess when its interest public objection, based on generally accepted legal norms of normality, of morality, and principles of international law, than it is to assess the other grounds of objection-- string confusion, legal rights objections, and community objections; all of which involve third-party rights. In the event a Quick Look mechanism is to -- I'm really having hard issues with reading this morning. My sincere apologies. I'm a horrible narrator.

In the event a Quick Look mechanism is to be applied to these other grounds of objection, ICANN should provide clear guidance on what constitutes a frivolous or abusive claim in the context of third-party rights and a review or approval or appeal process made available to challenge dismissal of this ground.

Yeah, I mean Jeff has just stated it seems like almost full agreement. Jeff, you're offering -- more typing, okay. Feel free to jump on the mic, on the phone, everyone. This is an opportunity to hear the voices of everyone. I know that my voice is like chirping birds in the morning. But I'd love to hear from you as well.

Jeff, go on ahead. Perfect. Happy to have it.

Jeff Neuman	Sure, I'll help you maybe take a glass of water or something. This is Jeff Neuman. Yeah, I mean I was just saying for this entire section, it seems like there is pretty much straight agreement across the line on the concept of Quick Look. I think the concern expressed by the ALAC is more of they're not so sure that the same criteria that was applied for the Quick Look in the limited public interest objection necessarily would apply across the board. So they're just basically saying, hey, keep in mind that the same standards may not be-- or you may not be able to use the same standards in every type of objection. But it still seems like they do support the Quick Look. And the INTA one, kind of saying the same thing, but just looking at -- it's kind of saying the same thing in the fact that the string confusion objection is one where it might need a little bit different grounds for Quick Look. But I still think that does support the notion if I'm reading that correctly. So I think that's good.
Michael Flemming:	Thank you, Jeff. That's thorous. Okay, Jeff, I think you're still on the mic. Or I can -- thank you. All right then, let's take that. And I do agree with Jeff on that point. So then we also have an ALAC that is offering agreement with concern. They state that on a practical level, can and should all the same criteria used in the Quick Look mechanism be applied to all types of objections? So I think this is kind of one of the areas that INTA has just raised whether or not all the criteria can be used in the aspect of Quick Look. So that is definitely something to look at there.

And MARQUES has an umbrella, it's an umbrella comment, and stating that they support the transparent process for absolving conflict, but it doesn't really get into the meat of this aspect. So I'm going to leave it outside of this. And in response to your question, your comment, Justine; so yes, it is -- ALAC doesn't really necessarily offer specific advice in that aspect. So that's why I don't think we offer or mark as new idea, but rather raises it as a question. So that's why I think we kind of put it as an aspect of concern in regards to the marking of this. But we can group those -- we can kind of keep these ideas the same.

There is a little -- it is an Excel document -- sorry. It's workbook document there. So there's a sheet as well. And we can always mark that together on the right-hand side. So let's go ahead and move on to 2.8.1.c.5, if there is no other more feedback on this. Oh, Jamie, you have your hand raised. Please go ahead. |
| Jamie Baxter: | Yeah, thanks. Jamie Baxter for the record. I think maybe in kind of response to or at least what they're getting in the ALAC question there is, for example, as far as the same criteria for each objection; if an objector does not have standing, I don't think they're going to succeed in any type of objection. So that may be one way of answering that question is that if you can't establish standing in a Quick Look, then it's not even worth proceeding with the objection, because it doesn't really have any chance of passing. So maybe that's sort of the question they're asking there. |
| Michael Flemming: | Thanks, Jamie. I'm just going to read that question. Yeah. I think that's a good interpretation of the question. And then Jeff offers more input, stating that so in summary to full working group, we would say that there is full support from the comments for expanding the Quick Look, expressing that there is concerns that are expressed to whether or not the same criteria -- and that it may not |

be applicable to all types of objections. And as Jamie has stated, that would it even be worth doing the Quick Look, I mean if the same criteria could not be established? I think that would be very helpful, so that summary as well.

So then, let's go ahead and move on to 2.8.1.c.5. All righty then, this next one states, provide applicants with the opportunity to amend an application or add public interest comments in response to concerns raised in an objection. And I think at this point we'll be able to analyze the comment that was raised by MARQUES. I really don't think I'm pronouncing that correctly. But you can read it the same nonetheless.

MARQUES, thanks Jeff. Thank you. I appreciate the assistance. So MARQUES stated this in a previous comment. It's the same public comment, but we'll address it here. So they're in agreement, stating that PICs should be allowed to be amended in responds to objection. Neustar supports this comment. The Council of Europe, the green portion -- sorry, my screen is alive again.

Just going to scroll back up. It keeps going down. All right. So the green portion of the Council of Europe's comment says that providing applicants with the opportunity to amend an application, to add public comment, public interest, the commitment in response to a concern raised in objections; so literally any response. BRG, the Brand Registry Group, also supports this. MarkMonitor raised a comment supporting this. But they also state that not limited it to the use of PICs, but also the RSAP comments as applicable -- sorry, the RSAP commitment as applicable.

So RSAP as well, yes. And concerns were raised by INTA with agreement, provided that -- they're in agreement, provided that there is not a mandatory requirement that circumvents other options to overcome the objection. The Registry Stakeholder Group was also in agreement with concerns, saying that so long as the dispute resolution provider panel or arbitrator must determine if the proposed PIC or application amendment resolves their objection. IPC is also in support, with concern; supporting, provided the PICs are published for comment.

And then we have merely concerns that are raised. So ALAC's concern is that the applicant be given the choice of withdrawing its application in the event the objector prevails. The working group is urged to also give considerations to the matter of refunds for withdrawals, as well as the appeals mechanism for the community objection dispute resolution process. I'm just making sure that's the correct text highlighted here.

Okay. Yeah, so there are -- I think that this comment is worth noting that it's basically offering the option to withdraw as well, and also other mechanisms. So merely PICs is not the only fish in the bucket. And then ICANN Org also provides concerns here, stating that it would be helpful if the PDP working group could clarify what the expectations are on the applicant objector and ICANN Org to satisfy there is the response to concerns raised in the objection part of the preliminary recommendation.

Additionally, in the case of community applications that might elect community priority evaluations in a later phase of the program, the PDP working group might want to consider the potential impact to other applicants in the contingence that if the community applicant is providing the opportunity to change its application or add public interest commitments.

So clarity on the aspect in response -- I'm starting to hear myself again. Okay. In response to concerns raised in the objection as well as considering what the effect of some of these changes allowing applicants to add PICs might be to other applicants in the aspect of community priority evaluation.

So Jeff has stated that in text that there's general support with some concerns about the details. I completely agree with that. And I think we'll flesh out the majority of those details. But I do feel that the ALAC's comment and the ICANN Org one is worth picking at a little bit here.

So Steve Chan, thank you. Staff comment, as clarification might be needed for the ALAC comment, since as far as recollection goes, withdrawals, refunds were available after losing an objection. I too am of the same opinion, having participated in a few myself. But I think that -- is anyone from ALAC here? Cheryl, I know you're on another call. I'm not going to pick on you.

Seeing none, then we might want to consider reaching out (inaudible) this aspect. But the ICANN Org comment, I think, is worth picking at as well. Does anyone have anything they'd like to jump in on this one to add? Justine is typing. All right.

Justine asks, what about appeals and probably in regards to the ALAC comment. So that is an aspect that we might want to look at as well. But seeing as we don't have much discussion on this point right now, I think we'll just move on to the next question and make sure that we need to come back. So the action item here is to come back to the ICANN Org concerns and see if we cannot address these better.

All righty then. 2.8.1.d.1, so GAC advice must clearly articulate -- sorry. GAC advice must include clearly articulated rationale, including the national or international law upon which it is based. So MARQUES supports this. ALAC supports this. Council of Europe supports this. INTA support this. Neustar supports this. IPC supports this. The NCSGG (ph) supports this. Yes, their comment pretty much says that. The CCTRT report also is supporting this. MarkMonitor supports, Brand Registry Group supports, RySG supports, and then we-- oops. There goes my screen again.

And then the last comment is divergent and agreement. So this response is from the GAC. And so it's kind of two-pronged question, two-pronged response. I think it's overall support to discuss options to increase transparency and I think this is applied to multiple aspects of the multiple responses in regards to some of the questions. But they really state that however the GAC does not consider that the PDP should make recommendations on GAC activities, which are carried out in accordance with the bylaws in GAC's internal procedures. So divergence, I think, is the portion we should be highlighting on here. Any takers that would like jump in and perhaps give their two cents or maybe three cents?

Hearing none, we shall proceed forward. Okay. So divergent on that last comment from the GAC. 2.8.1.d.2, future GAC advice and board action thereupon for categories of gTLDs should be issued prior to the finalization of the next applicant guidebook. Any GAC advice issued after the application has begun, must apply to individual strings only, based on the merits and details of the application, not on groups or classes of your application.

So the ALAC supports this. Brand Registry Group supports this. Neustar supports this. IPC supports this. The CCTRT report is supporting this. Yeah, okay. Just making sure it's not offering anything new. NCSG supports this. MarkMonitor supports this. And then we get to the Registry Stakeholder Group comment that's supporting with concerns. And their concerns are they believe that GAC advice should be issued against specifically identified applications. And the GAC advice was provided against strings, encompassing all (inaudible) of contention that were recommended in the individual applications. This also contradicts procedures defined the applicant guidebook. The applicants for a single string may propose vastly different business models.

I'm not sure how this is giving concerns rather than just stating what has already been said. But I'll just take it as a (inaudible). Because I don't see a specific concern that we have not necessarily addressed here. But it does highlight the aspect that applicants have different business models, and that's why they may. So let's take that as that.

And then INTA is agreeing with this, and they also provide a new idea, stating that INTA also suggests requires that the GAC advice nominate and provide contact details for an authorized GAC, contact who is knowledgeable about this, probably to give better -- to be able to act as kind of liaison, not using those words specifically. So we'll use that as a new idea there. And then the

GAC is diverging from this, stated the same exact thing. They're happy to talk about it, but we shouldn't be talking about it.

So that's too much of a summary. They're happy to talk about it, but they do not feel the PDP should be making recommendations on GAC activities, which are governed by the bylaws in GAC's internal procedures. Sorry, Anne, you have your hand up. I'll let you take on the INTA comments and it will give me a chance to break.

Anne: Thanks, Michael. Yeah, I just put my hand up so that you could get a drink of water. No. Really I appreciate all that you're doing with summarizing (inaudible). I think it's notable though that--

Michael Flemming: Anne, your volume is really low. Can you speak up just a little bit more, please? Thank you.

Anne: Oh, sorry. I had my mic out of place. I apologize. This is Anne for the transcript. And thanks, Michael, for all that you're doing in summarizing these comments. I just wanted to point out that in the INTA comment, they also stated that they have no objection to general categories of concerns being expressed by the GAC. And I think I can't speak for INTA, obviously. But I think that one of the areas of concern, especially for trademark holders, has been the area of regulated industries and eligibility. And so I don't think we can let that comment drop. Now it's listed as a new idea, I think, as well. Probably because it wasn't really expected in the 2012 round, the whole issue of safeguards for highly regulated industries. But I think it's something, the way I interpret this comment that INTA is saying that they believe it's legitimate in terms of consumer protection.

And I don't know if that's something that we want to raise in the full working group. But I think it's significant enough to raise here, at least. Thank you.

Michael Flemming: Thanks, Anne. And I do feel that that is something we should raise. The aspect of liaison addresses multiple areas that it could be applied to. And at this point, I think what we'll do is we will merely raise this as it is, to the full working group, saying that this needs to be considered as well. And yes, so thank you for bringing that out. Gigi, in response to your question -- oh, go ahead, Anne, if you have something more to add.

Anne: No, I just said thank you, Michael. It's Anne. Thanks.

Michael Flemming: Oh, no. Okay. Thank you. Appreciate that, okay. And then Gigi, in response to your question how do we handle the contrary position, again, this exercise is merely just going through and looking at specific -- I think rather than saying just someone disagrees and looking at their reasoning -- sorry, let me restate that. So the exercise, as I've stated, is we're just going through and kind of summarizing these. We're just trying to -- doing the first pass, if you will. And then basically the ones that need to be highlighted out of this, so obviously the majority of agreement comments that are in agreement will probably be the ones that we say that all these people, all these wonderful contributors agree. But obviously the ones with the divergence will be highlighted and given to the full working group to -- I think what we're doing here is probably giving attention to the validity of the -- or the value of the comment itself, and seeing if it really contributes to the question in response to if it's divergent and concerns. But we don't make any final call on these, obviously. So we're giving this to the full working group.

And the final report itself, how that will be written by the full working group, I will turn that over to Jeff, since he's the overall Chair here, about contrary positions. Jeff, could you answer, Gigi's question in better detail than I?

Jeff Neuman: So, yeah. Sorry. This is Jeff. I was talking on mute. So with contrary positions, so our role is to try to summarize for the full working group what patterns are. So for the other two, it's basically to say things like there were-- so the other items before this, there was full support for the general concept of this, but there was some concerns around some implementation, including these things.

For things where there's actual divergence, it's going to be important for the group to state to the full working group -- so sorry the sub group to state to the full working group that there were x number of comments that were in support from these groups on this notion. But there were expressions of divergence from these groups. If the full group can then think of a way -- make an assessment as to whether it's divergence on all the parts or whether there is some agreement but some divergence; that's all going to go to the full working group, and it's still up to the full working group then to discuss that issue and see where it lands on that topic.

So if it's from the GAC, it's going to be the full working group really to weigh the comments. And I think we had a discussion in a separate working group just earlier today actually, where I'm not going to come out and say that some groups deserve more weight than others. Because that's not true. But I'm sure the full working group will be not only looking at the substance of the comments themselves, but when they're evaluating the comments, they'll likely also look at who's making those comments and what level of support there are for those comments.

So I know that doesn't fully answer the question. But at the end of the day, it's really for the full working group to -- we have to make the full working group aware of the divergence, and then it's for the full working group to debate. Thanks.

Michael Flemming: Thanks, Jeff. And Steve, would you like to add to that since you're still up (ph)?

Steve Chan: Sure. Thanks, Michael. This is Steve Chan from staff. And the way that the question is worded from Gigi, it's sort of a complicated nuanced way that it's written. So as Jeff and Michael had mentioned, the goal at this point is to assess how the comment relates to the preliminary recommendation and can someone mute their line, please? It's causing an echo. Thanks.

And so at this point, the divergence or concerns are in respect to the preliminary recommendation or options, or whatever the case may be. And so at the end of the day, once it's referred to the full working group, that quote-unquote, "divergence" could in fact turn out to be the actual preliminary recommendation. So I don't know. That's kind of nuanced complicated response to your question. And I might be just confusing you. But I just thought that might be worth bringing up. Thanks.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, Steve. And thank you to Jeff, again. I think at this point we can probably say that it's going to be up the full working group to discuss the divergence aspects, and we really don't know the full result, what the final report will say in regards to that until we do weigh those there.

Seeing as though we are close to the hour, I'm going to leave us off here. One thing I do want to note lastly is the fact of our progress for this call. I think was a good example of how well we're able to move forward when we do not have a lot of heated discussions, specifically in regards to a comment. But we went through about 12 pages, give or take. And we have, I think, as I can see, as I feel, we may have two or three more calls on the objections alone in this regard. So just keeping that in mind, we also have about six or seven other topics that we need to get through. Some of those we'll be able to do two topics in one call, because we have very few comments for some of those. But others we might have to stretch two calls as well. So we are in a very, very tight schedule, and I think we need to consider some aspects for how to move forward. But we'll take this back to the leadership and discuss to see how we can move forward a little bit as well.

In the meantime, I hope you have a wonderful weekend, and get a good bit of rest, and we'll come back next week for another episode of Sub Group C. The next call is -- that's a good question. I don't have my calendar in front of me. But I do believe it's next week on the 5th -- 6th, at 15:00 UTC. So for those of us in Asia, that will be a good late night call.

But all right then. I look forward to seeing you then. In the meantime, have a wonderful weekend. Bye-bye.

Unidentified Participant: Thanks, Michael. Thanks, everyone for joining. Today's meeting is adjourned. You can disconnect your lines and Ashley, can you stop the recording?