ICANN
Transcription ICANN Barcelona
GNSO – New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Session 1 of 3
Monday 20 October 2018 at 1330 CEST
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 recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:
https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It looks to me like the meeting is being recorded. But Steve, if you want to do your check to begin with?

Man 1: Tech team in the back, can you confirm when we have the recording started? Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks very much ladies and gentlemen. And for those of you who snuck in late, please assume the forward part of the seating. If you see any seats available in the first four rows, please take those up. We have only one row being mic'd and we don't particularly want to have to be walking our staff to the back of it. So, come forward, come one and all. Come towards the front. I'm just going to stand up with my cane and start doing come one, come all. Do come forward in the room if you possibly can. I know you're all used to having seats with marked signs in front of it. But that's not the case in today's set-up.

Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen on behalf of co-chair Jeff. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. And Jeff Neuman and I are the co-chairs of the subsequent stages pay on new GTODs. We have today a number of our

subgroup leaders at the front table. And a little later in this afternoon's proceedings, we'll be breaking up into our new groups.

Note we're not using work track nomenclature one to four anymore. The only nomenclature numeral one that belongs to use is work track five. And so I want to welcome Art and Mark and Robin. And to that end, you will see we've shared ourselves fairly equitable across the various topics. What I'm going to do now - just take you briefly through the agenda.

Perhaps to begin with, first of all - a little bit of housekeeping. When you do get the microphone and I suggest the best way of getting the microphone is just, you know, raise your hand and just - some abled bodied individual IE not me will be bringing a microphone to you. Or we could also have - Emily, we could also have someone take a queue there in front. But rather than get up and down if you don't want to, raise your hand and Emily or someone similar to Emily will come to you.

When you get your microphone and we do want this to be an interactive session, at least when we get into the next part of our session, we want to be fairly interactive. We would very much appreciate it if you stated your name for the record and any affiliation if at all possible. If you're speaking on behalf of an entity you represent, obviously it is useful for you to mention it.

Under normal circumstances, we expect people to keep it straight (unintelligible) interest up to date. But in this public meeting forum, we've found it over many many years easier if people say who you are and if you are speaking on your own behalf or on behalf of either a community or an entity or organization. I think that's about it for housekeeping.

You'll see in front of you our agenda for today. It's broken into three sessions. The first one hopefully not running too late as yet - we'll be running through til the afternoon tea break. The midafternoon break. Which will be at 3PM local time, we'll be breaking. And here we're going to take a reasonably hefty lump

of time. And a lot more of Jeff's voice and brisk. And a lot less of mine. Probably because I won't make it through many more words. Is a review of the supplementals initial report.

Where session two after the 15-minute break - midafternoon break which will run until local time 4:45 will be looking at some matters which were termed ICANN community readiness subsequent procedures. And then as a thrill exciting roundoff to your afternoon, with us all here just to keep you all excited and thrilled, we're going to break up into our three subgroups.

And we're going to start to have our subgroups one to three kick off. And we'll get to what we mean in gory detail - what we're going to do with that kickoff. Suffice it to say, there's been a pile of public comments seen and you're about to dip your toe into the water of working through them. Next slide, thanks Steve.

With that, I think I've pretty much covered welcome introductions and background. But I will just run through again. You have Jeff and myself as overall co-chairs. Subgroup A, we have Jeff working with Robin. And particularly want to thank the returning staff of Robin and Ruben and (Michael) through to running these extra groups that have already done. Dare I say, the hard yards. On the rather work track. So they run in this process.

Subgroup B, we have Rueben there on the end working with Krista who I think is next to him, yes? Yes, that's right. And subgroup C, Michael Flemings drew the short straw and tries to work with me. How that works out, we'll - be kind to him. He has a lot to put up with, what else can I say?

Next slide, thanks very much. How much further do you want me to get? Through background then Jeff and then you dive in? Okay. Let's take you through a little bit of history, the high days and holidays of where we call came from. Going back to 2007, resulting in the efficient guidebook in the

(unintelligible) brand is where we are all from. Well, not personally obviously. The material we're working from is all from.

We were tasked to look at any subsequent procedures that based on the experience of the 2012 round, anything that we learned in that. Are there any changes that meet or may need to be made to the regional GNS recommendations from 2007? And Jeff, we know the (unintelligible) guidebook and the 2006 - 7 GNS recommendations were not the same thing. But this also - this experience gives us an opportunity to normalize or not those aspects as well.

Our work was chartered and began in 2016. And it seems like such a short time ago. However, it is in fact two years. And there is a link to the charter for those of you who do not know it all by heart. There will be a pop quiz later just in case. The PDP has done a huge amount of work with more than 40 separate topics identified in its charter.

And we started with our four-work track which some of you will be painfully familiar with. To tackle its work and then added the work track five to deal with the specifics of the geographic names at the top level.

Next slide, thank you Steve. The current status is what could be described as a behemoth of a initial report. Some people are using it to hold the corners of their dining tables up. Some have leveled out, you know, building construction work being done. However, some people also read it and we were delighted to coming up to 26th of September after our extended public comment period to have received quite a number of very well thought out and indeed quite detailed - some of the responses exceeded 100 pages. Which I think they thought was only fair the 300 we gave them in the first place. But, you know, the public comments that we got in, more than 70 I believe if memory serves and some of them quite extensive of what we now need to deal with.

And it's along those lines of those public comments and the topics that we've broken up the subgroups into A, B, and C. We've also in the interim between publishing the initial report and the ICANN 63 meeting have come out with a draft of a supplemental initial report which was work we're planning on publishing for our comment shortly after ICANN 63. This - these topics were matters which were not covered in the initial report but were discussed substantially during ICANN 62. And in our subsequent full PDP meetings.

Next slide, please. And you will note I am not reading it all adlib. I am just picking out a few highlights here. So you will have the slide deck and you can look at it in greater detail yourself. Jeff, are you ready to launch into the thrill and exciting world of timelines? Good luck. I am ready for a drink of water, thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. Welcome everyone. Thanks Cheryl for taking over the beginning while I just ate some food real quick. So sorry about eating in front of everyone. So times - the timeline you have up front is one that is fairly consistent or has been consistent pretty much for about the past year or so. So we're happy to say that we're still on schedule for what we said we would do.

Take note of the part that - so Cheryl said we're going to release a supplemental initial report, we'll be discussing in just a couple minutes. Hope is to release that say next week, but I guess it would be more a week from Monday or Tuesday. And so we'll start a comment shortly after. We'll start a public comment period on that and then the goal ultimately is to get a final report to the council to the GNSO council along with work track five materials somewhere around the end of Q2 2019, early Q3.

So that's a lot of work in a fairly short amount of time. Although it may sound to some of you that that's a long amount of time. But as we go through this, you will see why there is still a lot to do. But certainly this is achievable. You want to go to the next slide? Okay, is there any questions initially on just

some of the preamble stuff until we get to the meat of the supplemental repeats? I see Jim up there.

Jim Prendergast: Yes, thanks Jeff. Jim Prendergast. I put it in the chat so. How are folks who have, you know, oversubscribed to participating in more than one subgroup supposed to participate in more than one breakout session this afternoon? And are there plans for remote participation in them as well? Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes so this is Jeff. Jeff Neuman. So there are plans for remote participation so yes. But unfortunately because this is probably a more talk more about logistics of how the groups are going to work when we get down to that third session, this is probably hopefully the only time where the three groups will meet at the same time and have a little bit of conflict.

But this session today here is just one to more of kind of a get to know you kind of you or get to know the rest of the members and just talk a little bit more about the - how each of the groups are going to work. As opposed to diving real deep into any of the substance. So hopefully this is the only time where people that are participating in multiple groups will be sort of conflicted and will have to choose one.

Jim Prendergast: Thanks, Jim.

Jeff Neuman: Anyone else? Okay. So let's get on to some of the meat of the conversation of this first session which is on this supplemental report. So again, these - there are five basic issues that are covered in this supplemental report. These are issues that as you go onto the next slide - these are issues that were either not mentioned at all in the initial report or just touched on and we knew after or towards the end of drafting the initial report that we would need to spend some additional time.

So the first of these issues deals with mechanisms of last resort. Which in the 2012 guidebook was an auction conducted by ICANN. So the first - this is the

first of the five issues. And so the group that's been meeting over the last several months have been talking about whether the string contention ultimately the mechanism to resolve that string contention would be or still should be an ICANN auction.

And if so, we also discussed potential alternatives. So there are many options or there are several options that the group has been discussing. One is just do it, same exact way that it was done in the 2012 guidebook. Namely that at the very end, after evaluations, objections, disputes, all that stuff. And then after a period of offered for private resolution, you go into an ICANN auction. That's always one option that we certainly discussed. And we'll talk a little bit towards the end of this part how what some of the working group thinking was or is currently.

Second option that came out through these discussions we had is the concept of a sealed bid auction also called a victory auction, I think is the official term. That's essentially and there is two types of those - but essentially it amounts to submitting a sealed bid for the string.

And then ultimately at the end, you would take the bid - the highest bid, so it wouldn't be a full auction process, but it would be if you - basically each applicant would put in an envelope or submit along with their application an amount that they thought that they would be willing to pay for those strings.

And there are two types of those. Type one would be that you - as soon as you know that there is contention. So you have gotten all the applications, the applications have been revealed. The type one would be the evaluators would look to see who put in these highest sealed bid and then would evaluate that first. And then if it passed all the evaluations and everything else, then that would be the one that you would proceed on.

Second type would be for you to evaluate all of the applications for a given string. And at the very end if all of them did survive and made it through this

and all that stuff, you at that point would then open up the part of the application that had the bid in there. Then you would see which one would get it. There's obviously again - there were lots of pros and cons that have already been discussed between the groups as far as, you know, one of the pros of this type of auction or this type of resolution is that you, you know - applicants would indicate the precise value of what they thought a string would be.

It could in theory eliminate the contention sets from the very beginning. Especially if you did like a type - the type one where immediately you would only evaluate the one with the highest amount bid. The - but of course, in terms of solving some of the issues with auctions that have been brought up in general, it still would reward the party - either type, type one or two, would reward the party with the deepest pockets. And not necessarily one that was community based.

And I'll come to questions just let me finish this slide real quick. Then I'll come to (Michael). So, you know, so either forms of these types of auctions if we still wanted to go with an auction mechanism would still have the same issue of, you know, rewarding the one with the deepest pockets. And one of the concerns that was discussed for type one in particular is that they - that people were - or two concerns.

One is that they were afraid that evaluators would by seeing an amount that was bid, immediately they would attach some sort of significance to that amount. Either in a positive or negative way. And the second concern that was expressed was that if - and this was brought up by someone who applied for multiple strings. That it could show the evaluators or ICANN some sort of confidential proprietary strategy of how they intended to bid certain strings.

And so these kind of concerns were brought up. So now let me just open this up. These were the alternatives of auctions discussed. The next slide we'll talk about other options other than auctions that were discussed. So I can

either go onto the next slide or take a question. Or comments, sorry - either way?

Michael Casadevall: This is (Michael), ICANN fellow. So, this came up in previous meetings but the message of last resort - I don't remember the exact number but I believe it was in the high 70's that this procedure was used. So this is - I won't say relatively common. It is a valid concern. And I want to make sure that we are keeping this in mind. That this is something that will be used and probably will be used a lot more when we go for the next round of GTDLs. Especially with the other rule revisions in place.

Jeff Neuman: Yes (Michael), thanks. I don't have the exact number. I don't think there were that many auctions of last resort but someone probably has the numbers specifically. But I think you are right. That we certainly may see some additional mechanisms of last resorts of auctions or whatever we end up going with.

And the next round and the other important thing is especially - this especially may be the case if as we talk about another subject a little bit later on about private resolution. Whether to allow that or not. That could make mechanism of last resort either more to the last comment. So I think it's definitely certainly an important before.

Okay before - Sarah just please keep in mind we have other slides of other options. Do you want me to go through those first Sarah? Let me go through those. I have a feeling those will answer some other questions. So let me just go to the next slide. Yes, on different mechanisms.

In addition to auctions, we talked about other possibilities so there could be what we're calling a request for proposals. Or some others called it beauty contest. Or however you want to call it, it's basically establishing with third party evaluators some set of criteria that would be applied by the decision-makers on choosing one of the applications from a contention set.

And so, there could be a whole number of different types of criteria. And one of those could be that was discussed - again this is not a valued judgement of the working group just a kind of reflection of some of the discussions. One of them was, you know, we could establish - or could we establish diversity as a factor?

So priority could be given to applicants applying for their first domain. Or maybe more of an emphasis on community focused domains. Rather than commercially focused. Or there could be something, you know, a preference towards the global south.

There is a whole bunch of other types of preferences and things that could be put into a request for proposal process. So that was discussed by the group. Lots of pros and cons around that as well. You know, obviously the advantages are it doesn't necessarily favor the party with the deepest pockets. It certainly would have some sort of criteria's associated with the selection.

Drawbacks of course are the fact that you now put evaluators or ICANN or whoever in a position of choosing a winner. And that makes a lot of - or that could make a lot of people nervous or uneasy about that. Another option that was discussed which was the concept of a random draw.

So, you know, if everyone passes through all of the evaluations and objections and disputes and at the end, you have two or three applications or more, you throw them into a random draw and just pick one out and that's the one that goes forward. You know, aside from the potential risk of holding a drawing or a lottery and you know, you may have to get licensed to do that. Depending on where you do.

But putting that aside, some members of the working group pointed out that would avoid lots of the difficulties with, you know, auctions and private auctions and private negotiations and all sorts of issues that you currently

have with an auction as a last resort. There's also no danger in there of doing a comparative evaluation of the beauty contest that some people called the 2000 round that happened. And of course, it doesn't favor the ones with the most money.

And there is also kind of a less incentive for parties to resolve these types of - if a draw was used, it would provide less of an incentive to try to resolve this privately through some sort of negotiation or private auction.

And finally, a - well maybe not finally because there might be another option on the next slide. But one of the options also that was discussed was a system of graduated fees. This was a proposal that one person had made which, you know, based on the number of applications you submitted, it would increase the value of each application to sort of provide a disincentive to apply for multiple top-level domains.

There's much more detail of - or certainly, maybe not much more but there is more detail about a lot of these options in the draft supplemental report that working groups members have worked on. Try to provide a concise overview of some of those just to let you know what the working group has been discussing. If you could just go to the next slide because I just want to double check to see if there are any other mechanisms on that next - okay before we get to this one, let me take some comments.

So I know that Sarah had a question or a comment. And anyone else, I'll look in the chat too. I have Sarah, then (Michael). And I'll look at the chat while Sarah please.

Sarah Langstone: Hi Sarah Langstone from Verisign. So I'm just going to talk about the second price field bid option. Also known as the victory auction model. Folks have been asking why is it that - the one that bids the highest only actually pays the value of the second highest bid? And I just wanted to explain that.

Because the sealed bid, when it's sealed, you don't get a chance to see what the other TLD applicants are prepared to pay. Which you do in the normal auction situation. So you don't get a chance to really understand what it's worth to the second bidders. So if you pay the second highest amount, then it helps to kind of mitigate that, make sure that you don't pay substantially over for the TLD. So that was just a little bit more information about that.

And I guess I would instead of calling it the ICANN auction of last resort, I would call it the ICANN auction of first resort. Because then it deals with all of the contention sets in advance. And then, you know, only one TLD gets evaluated, for example.

I think that there's an assumption that evaluators would have to see the value of that sealed bid and I don't think they necessarily would have to. I think that could be kept in some kind of, you know, confidential locker. And, you know, there were some comments around - some folks having issues about participating in the draw. And I know that some publicly traded company did have issues with that. But we did all overcome them. Because, you know, we all participated in the prioritization draw. So that was my fore sense.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Sarah. (Michael)?

Michael Casadevall: So two comments. First I'm going to directly respond to Sarah. My biggest concern with the victory auction is it doesn't stop people from bidding an absurd amount of money. And then paying what the previous person bid. I mean, what's stopping someone from realistically putting a million-dollar downs for each one? And if you are a very large size company that could realistically afford to pay that, you are going to pay a lot less and still going to be able to drive everyone out of the competition. So I don't think it solves the problem, I think it makes it worse.

The second part is - and this is more of a comment - is with escalating fees, while it does help reduce the number of people coming into the GTDL, I don't

know if that's a good thing for one. And two, it still doesn't solve the problem mechanism of last resort unless you want to give it to whoever's applied for the least number of strings. Which again still doesn't completely solve the problem. So that's my two cents.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks (Michael). I'm looking through the chats. I see Jamie which - I'm sorry Jamie Baxter. There are a couple of comments. I may not go back far enough. Hold on let me make sure there are no ones that I missed.

Okay so first comment I see from Jamie and I'll ask if people can keep me honest to make sure I covered all of them. First one is I do encourage the inclusion of how community applications are handled. We discuss simultaneously one and two for auctions of last resort. And not as an afterthought the way community applications have been handled in the past.

Second comment is it will also be important to understand how the objection process is integrated into both of the field bid - the victory auction types. And let me see if there is a - okay. I think those are the two comments. I think I've captured them both. On the first one, just for this - there is some discussion in the supplemental report on the interaction between community applications and these other options. Just for the purpose of trying to be a little bit more brief in this session, I didn't go over all the text that's written there.

So Jamie, we'll go back and look at the actual text to make sure that you're okay with the treatment it's given in the text. And - but I do understand that I did not give it as much attention in the presentation I just did as it was given in the working group. And how the objection process is integrated into the two options, that's - it's a great question.

Especially if you did - so if you did - well I guess objections can be filed after the reveal. But if it's only the first one, let's say if you did type one and it' sonly one of the applications that's evaluated, perhaps you would only need to hear those objections to that first application. As opposed to all of them.

So, that's a detail I think Jamie, we would certainly need to look at if in fact when we do put this out for public comment, that seems to be the option that most people seem to favor. I just want to go to the third slide or fourth slide, sorry. The one where we start talking about - so third slide.

So ultimately where the group, you know, even though we discussed all of these options and we're putting them all out for public comment, when we initially took the temperature of the working group. Most seemed, because of the, you know, positives and negatives that (Michael) just brought up a few and others did as well. You know, unbalanced the working group thought that the mechanism of last resort, the auctions would remain in place. That was kind of the way most of the group was leaning.

But we didn't want to - and the reason I put this as kind of the third slide is because I do think the working group is sincerely interested in the views of the community on these other options that have been presented. So we don't want to create the perception that we're not - certainly not open to these other options. And then this topic - well both this topic and the next one on private resolution of contention sets do also interact with the concept of one of the other topics in this paper which deals with change request. So changes that applicants want to make to their applications for a variety of reasons and one of them could be to deal with contention sets. If we go onto the next slide. I'm sorry Jim - so as we go onto the next slide, Jim please.

Jim Prendergast: Yes, thanks. Jim Prendergast. (unintelligible) we're getting good questions about the sealed bid auction. So can we just make sure that all of those questions that are coming up asking about how you integrate objections into this process, can we turn those out into the community as part of the questions we're asking in the initial repeat? Try and get some ideas?

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Jim. Just - do you want us to pose them as questions? Or do you want like - so (Michael) asked questions, Sarah answered them. Do you want

us to put - Sarah's the one that presented the auction. Do you mean as questions or just the feedback we're getting now to put in there?

Jim Prendergast: I think generally speaking we're getting good feedback on what are relatively new sixes on how to deal with these topics. Before we start shooting holes in the thing, if people have, you know, ideas on how - people have questions about how it could operate, then let's put those out to the community as well and how do you solve for this? You know, one of the things that I'm still trying to figure out is how do you solve for in a sealed bid auction applicant support applicants? Ones that need money to apply, how do you - do put a multiplier on whatever they agreed to put up and that's matched by - I don't know the answer right now. But there's a lot of other people out there who are probably smarter than I am who probably could come up with a smarter answer.

So, turning some of these concerns out to the community to try to get some ideas coming in. So that within three months, or you know - in a couple weeks when we're talking about this again, we're feeding off the collective instead of just the active people in this group.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Jim. I see (Michael) and this is really a good segue into the next - I'm sorry Edmon has been in the queue for a while. I just saw that in Adobe. So let me go to (Michael), then just to go to Edmon.

Michael Casadevall: So the one thing we should definitely need to do before we hand it out to community, we need to whittle down this list. Right now the list is growing of ways of last resort -I want to say an exponential way. Every time we have a subpro meeting, we add something new. If we do that, we're going to end up with public comments that will crush a small cat. So let's try and figure out the simplest way we can word these questions and present as few options as viable before we kick it over to the public. If we as a working group think that it's unlikely we'll ever go with option X, that's something that the sub working groups need to figure out when we get to that.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks (Michael). This is our last meeting on this subject so I think the options that are in there now, I really only heard clarifications to the options and no additional ones. The hard part for us is that because we haven't spent months or taken straw polls or anything like that to judge kind of the feedback on these proposals and whether there's lots of support or not, I'd rather err on the side of putting it out for comment, even though I understand your concern wholeheartedly that, you know, we're now just dropping a lot more stuff on the public. But I think if you kind of weigh the pros and cons, I would rather err on the side of being more open and letting people comment on more things than trying to take things out based on a pretty small sample size of people in this room or people that participate on the discussion. But I completely sympathize with your concerns. And certainly a lot of people on the initial report were not very happy that we dropped a lot onto them. Edmon, please.

Edmon Chung: Emond Chung here. Not sure if I'm adding options but I wonder if anyone had thought about combining them? And what I mean by that is it seems to me that it might solve some of the problems we just talked about, like community or applicant supports. Imagine a situation where all the applicants put in their application and they check I want to do lucky draw, I want to do type one, I want to do type two. And if there is at least one applicant that picked lucky draw, it goes to lucky draw.

                 Basically what happens is an applicant support guide would probably check that. And you know, that group would go to lucky draw. If everyone picks - if one person - if nobody picks lucky draw, one of them picks type one, then it goes to type one. If everyone selects to go type two, it becomes type two. That might be a way to actually address many of the things that was said. Just an idea.

Jeff Neuman: thanks Edmon. I think that would be great to submit and comment back to these questions. We'll go over what the questions are. Rather than submit that as a wholly separate option at this point because we're kind of in our final

stages. But certainly, the questions - one of them does ask for the views on these different options and how they could interoperate and whether they need to be exclusive or not. So that's kind of where we're getting to now which is the questions that we have.

First one is - I am' not going to read this out in detail. But the first one is essentially about the notion of auctions providing an incentive for those with the deepest pockets. And so, just a kind of question on whether people agree with that notion and whether that's a problem or not. The second question is about fairness and about how we deal with - as Jim kind of mentioned a little bit - how you deal with the notion of applicant support and the global south?

You add kind of a multiplier and if you did that in auctions, how that would result as Jim said, the sealed bid or the draw or I guess for the draw it wouldn't matter because they would just be one of the many.

So there's a question on that. There's other questions on just the concept of fairness. And then this question on the next page. Or sorry, the last two questions. Which is really on the comparative evaluation, the draw, and then finally about potential of restricting the number of applications. And as (Michael) talked a little bit about the graduated fees solution. (Michael) please?

Michael Casadevall: I think there was a wording change that didn't make it into the slides. Can you go back one? I believe we had discussed in the working group that some of participants of the working group - auctions of last resort inherently unfair. Didn't' we have an entire email discussion of this wording and agreed to change it? There was a lot of dispute in what the method of last resort was in general? I just feel this looks out of date to me. Does anyone else remember this conversation or am I imagining things?

Jeff Neuman: We'll take a look at it. Because the slides and questions are really long, it may be my fault in trying to condense it down just for this presentation here.

So if you could take a look at the actual supplemental report, the wording might be right there. And it could have just been my fault in trying to get everything to fit on one slide.

Michael Casadevall: Okay sorry it's also sleep deprivation.

Jeff Neuman: I totally understand. and some others warned me about changing some of the wording. But I did because I just wanted it to fit on a slide and not be too obnoxious. So I'll take that as my own problem. But thanks. So check that language and make sure that the language is actually in there and reflects what we want it to. Okay, any other questions on this section?

We have four other sections of supplemental report. So everyone is wide awake? Come on. Coffee. Coffee, what time do we break for coffee? We have plenty of time. Great, come on. That's right. Okay, so let's go onto into the second topic which is related.

Which we changed the name of. It used to just be private auctions, but now we're calling it private resolution of contention sets including private auctions. And so this is just in general for those new to the conversation, the guidebook how to provision that. Basically said before we get to a mechanism of last resort, also known as the ICANN auction, there would a period of time offered to all of the applicants to see if they could resolve the contention set amongst themselves.

And so, a number of different parties were - or a number of different contention sets were resolved through some sort of private mechanism. Whether it was an auction, whether it was a private negotiation, or something in between. Which because those were resolved privately, we don't have all of the data we'd love to have as to exactly how they resolved those. And for those that were resolved in private auction, we may know it was resolved in private auction but we don't know for how much or anything like that.

So the amount of data is fairly limited because these were private but we do have at least one private auction provider that is willing to talk to us about alternatives or ways to improve the process not necessarily to give us any data because of the confidential nature of what happened in 2012.

So we're still trying to put that together for the group. And we'll hopefully have that as feedback when we're evaluating the comments. So there has been concerns expressed within the community including if you look at the ICANN board's letter in response to the initial report, expressing some concerns on the notion of private auctions and specifically they were concerned that applicants would apply for strings in the next round for the sole purpose of being paid to withdraw their applications in the contention set. The applicant would receive compensation greater than the application fee. That's the wording the board used.

So the question then becomes should the applicant guidebook and the terms and conditions - should it be amended to state that the resolution of string contention via private resolution be disallowed? So that's a significant question which we need comment on. And if the answer is yes, we think as a community that this type of private resolution should not be allowed, then how do we enforce that?

And you know, is it something of just taking away - if the string hasn't been granted yet, is it just withdrawing or removing their application? Or if it has been granted or delegated, is it a termination of the registry agreement? So there is obviously some logistics depending on when this activity is discovered or if this activity is discovered.

So but there were others in the group certainly in the working group, there are several members that do favor private resolution of contention sets in whatever manner that they choose because these are private parties working things out themselves within ICANN regulating how private parties resolve these disputes. So we'll go to number three, I'm sorry the next slide has

number three on it. Some believe that simply saying a, you know, you are not allowed to do a private auction would or could be easily circumvented with other types of private resolution mechanisms that although they don't say auction or look like an auction, they have the same practical effect of compensating the losers of the contention set for withdrawing their application.

And so there were certainly feedback within the working group that, you know - how do you - where do you draw the line as to where an auction versus any other mechanism of giving compensation to those that withdraw their applications? So that's certainly something that we're going to see feedback on.

And then another solution that was presented by one member was to create a hybrid of those roles. So while you don't allow things like private auctions, is there a way that you can allow certain types of private resolution? So, for example, something we'll discuss when we talk about change - or changes of applications.

You could see a scenario where let's say two brands apply for the same top-level domain because they both use those in the real world for different goods and services. And maybe after they get together and talk about this amongst themselves, they agree that - you know what? We both applied for - and I can mention it because Karen has talked about SAS. There are two applicants for SAS. Both brand applicants. One was the airline and one was an analytics software company.

At the end of the day, the analytics software company is the registry operator but they did enter into some sort of arrangement, it's private whatever that arrangement was. So other than the fact that there was an arrangement, we don't have any other details. But there was an arrangement made by the two companies.

The comment that we go back was - it would have been probably better if you could have done a change in the application to have one of the companies, let's say the airlines, to SAS air or .sasair. And the other company, the analytics company keeping .sas or going with SAS analytics or something like that. So, you know, a private resolution where the impact could be allowing the delegation of both strings or multiply strings maybe much more in a public interest than doing some sort of auction of last resort.

So, that is discussed as a potential kind of hybrid option of between saying yes, we allow private auctions and no, we don't allow any kind of private resolution of contention sets. Just to note, there were some that had issues with essentially putting ICANN in the position then of judging which forms of private resolution would be okay. And which ones wouldn't. And having IANN regulate that made some members of the working group a little bit nervous. So those - that's some of the feedback we got on those options. Go to the next slide.

Okay, so before we get into questions. Any comments or questions on the private - the discussions on private resolution of contention sets? Sarah? And (Michael).

Sarah Langstone: Thank you. Sarah Langstone from Verisign for the transcript. During the last planner, we agreed to work in the comments on the initial report that stakeholders had given on private auctions or private resolution. Because I guess there is some kind of procedural issue of soliciting feedback on private auctions at the end of September not responding to it, and then sending out another report that just asks for more questions.

Because if you look at the problematic comments, a number of stakeholder groups and constituencies, they took the time to give feedback and they asked for more information to help inform their opinion. The registry stakeholder group said it wanted to know if abuse had been occurred or if it had been reported. I know we started that but we haven't seen it yet.

They also said an assessment should be made around the legality of private auctions under US or other competition laws because collusive private auctions could violate civil and criminal laws. The IPC said that it should have a study of abusive behavior. The ALAX said that the legality of private auctions is in question. And an analysis of this should be completed to inform their position. And yes also the ICANN board said that they were a particular area of concern for them.

So I guess first of all I am concerned that the current draft of the report really doesn't do all of this feedback justice. It's just a sentence. And it really only refers to the feedback from the ICANN board. But most importantly and a bit more fundamentally, why ask for all of this feedback last month be given the feedback, people say I need more information to provide you with an informed opinion.

And then why not respond to that and give them the data instead of just, you know, issuing another report asking more questions? I'm wondering if it might be worth removing private auctions from the supplemental report so as we don't derail the timeline of it. And then have a supplemental report too when we've actually had time to do the analysis and give them the data that they're looking for. Because we want quality, you know, data and comments back from folks. And if they're asking us the things, I feel like as a working group, we should be giving it to them.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Sarah. I actually was prepared for that question so thank you for asking it. So the answer to that question is that not - we didn't ask questions about private auctions in the initial report. So there's some groups that voluntarily provided information because they knew that we were discussing that issue as part of a supplemental report.

And so what we wanted to is to make sure that every group could respond on the notion of private auctions rather than just evaluating the comments that

came in from I'll call it, insiders that knew we were discussing that issue. So I think it's a great comment but I think on the balance and looking at it, we'd like to provide the opportunity for everyone to provide comments on it before discussing it further as a working group.

Even though you are right, the IPC, the registry's, ALAC, there may be one or two others that have been discussing it did provide some comments. So the other part of that is that in the preamble to this supplemental report, we do clearly acknowledge that we may have received comments on some of these subjects and that the comments we've received will absolutely be included in the discussions on the subjects and that they don't need to restate the exact same things in the comments back here.

But maybe as kind of a helpful aid if they can just reference as Cheryl said some of the comments back were 100 pages long. So if they could reference, you know, in section four point whatever, the IPC addressed this issue. And then we could then have a good kind of reference point to look at those comments. We probably drawn them out already but just in case we haven't. It's kind of a double check back on us. So that's the reason why Sarah.

If we had asked the questions on private auctions in that first initial report, and everyone was given kind of the same opportunity to respond, you are absolutely right. It doesn't - it wouldn't make sense to just issue these questions out again. But because they didn't go out to everybody and because only those insiders that knew that we were discussing this issue responded to those, we felt like we had to go out to everybody and ask them the same questions.

I hope that helps. I don't know, were there any other comments anyone else? Cheryl? Or Steve? Anyone?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Let's go to the new space of focus and then come back to your article.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thank you.

Woman 1:   (unintelligible) of Europe. We are of the opinion that (unintelligible) America
                  should be considered more in-depth. Notably with regards to community
                  applicants and (unintelligible) for profit applicants. So there's a lot of benefit to
                  give most space to public interest goals, considerations, and provide
                  additional support to introduce this other method mechanism as the last
                  resort. We provided some ideas how this would be achieved in response to
                  the initial report public comments. And we'll be happy to provide additional
                  explanations in this second works.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks. We got the volume turned up a little bit towards the end of it.
                  Certainly what that, we have not yet gone through all the comments that we
                  received. But certainly, we're flagging all of those to make sure that we
                  consider them in these discussions.

                  So it sounds like to me, the option of a - where we talk about a comparative
                  evaluation where you're looking at factors like public interest and granting a
                  top-level domain. That sounds to me, what we discussed in this report and
                  would be good to - when you respond to the supplemental report is to just -
                  you don't have to restate everything again.

                  But say in our last comment, we, you know, look here and talked about this.
                  But yes, absolutely in a comparative evaluation that's one of the things that
                  was certainly discussed in terms of trying to - instead of reward the deepest
                  pockets, it's to provide incentives for the global south or to also provide some
                  sort of I guess advantage for public interest applications.

Michael Casadevall: So one thing I want to bring up is that with other changes we're making
                  with the report, the last resort mechanism may become a lot more used. The
                  thing is that with private resolution, it can be a situation, you know - if we
                  allow it at all, it can be situational from one to the other to other to the other.

And I worry there's an entire step where the public is basically locked out of the loop. I feel like any private resolution then needs to go to public comment possibly with a little bit of redaction like if money is changing hands, and then reopen for comment and evaluation.

The main reason I can think of this is I can think of the cases where, you know, all these contention sets manage to come to a resolution that would not be in the public interest. And that this is obviously something we want to be able to handle because sometimes we can get a good solution from it. But basically we want to avoid these private resolutions to prevent overloading the board on one hand. But have a mechanism for solving these special cases when it comes along.

So I'm not sure there was an inherent question there. But I think as a comment it works.

Jeff Neuman: So I think in the case of a private resolution, where there would be a need for a comment period, it seems to me that that's addressed in a couple different areas because I think the way that would come about would be essentially - there would have to be a change request, right? If everyone just withdraws and you are left with one application, I'm not sure that a need for a public comment period on how they decided on one application surviving if there is no changes, right? Because there is - right now, there is a requirement in the guidebook that says if there's any change to the application, any material changes that that needs to be filed as a change request.

And that there may be a public comment period associated with that change depending on how material. We'll talk about that in the change section. Just trying to visualize how a private resolution of a contention set that did not result in a change would need - where you have a need for a public comment period. So, (Michael) just questions?

Michael Casadevall: (Michael Casavale). ICANN. Let me put this more specifically. If one per group can force other people out, you know, in general then whatever resolution we make with private - if basically if one private organization can go to others and get them to withdraw, then whatever we say is moot. Because you can basically force everyone else out if you can get them to agree.

I think at some point, they need to be committed and locked in and cannot withdraw without permission from the board. You know, because at that point then, you know, otherwise you allow all private resolution or you allow then. Because otherwise, backroom deals can get companies to withdraw from it. And bypass any public comment period. I mean, that's ultimately what it boils down to. That was the point of wording that was escaping me, I'm sorry for the first one.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks for that clarification. I think - let's see how we - I think that's just in general the private, whether you have - if you have private resolution of contention sets, I think your concern is probably a comment back to all of that in general. Yes? Sorry. Katrin, please.

Katrin Ohlmer: Hi this is Katrin Ohlmer from DOTZON also representing GOTD group. One question I ask myself is whether we want to ask the upcoming, if we want to differentiate between different applicant groups e.g. if there is private contention resolution between a city and private entity. Would we want to have different categories or do we want to have that considered in the contention resolution?

Jeff Neuman: I'm just trying to think of whether we - whether that would be subsumed in another question. So we ask about private resolution, and I guess your point is that may perhaps for different types of applications, you may allow it. But for others, you don't. That's kind of a hybrid solution.

Katrin Ohlmer: I mean, we would maybe like to add that as a question. And if there would be (discontention) resolution between a city and let's say generic or brand, would a city be allowed to participate in any kind of contention resolution at all?

Jeff Neuman: So, okay. Let's perhaps rather than just look at it from a city perspective, I'm trying to push it up a little bit and just ask the question. When we ask questions on private resolution of contention sets, maybe asking a question of whether the same rules would apply regardless of - or ask it a more positive way.

Should there be different rules for different types of top-level domain? We'll try to figure out a more generic way to state that. On the - with the cities can participate in private resolution, I don't know. I mean, I don't know how we - that didn't really come up as a concern to 2012 guidebook. I'm not sure how many applications that we had between a city and a private company.

So I'm not sure I know the answer to that. Whether it presents any issues. But there is a question on legality. I mean Sarah just brought up the notion a little bit ago about the legalities of private auctions or frankly any kind of private resolution of contention I would think. We'll make sure that concept gets in there without asking specifically about a city, but just put in the notion of the legalities of that. Okay?

Some of the other questions that we do have already on here are, you know, basic questions. Do you think that private resolution of contention sets should still be allowed? It's in the guidebook, it's in the policy. I take that back. It's in the guidebook. I don't think it was ever part of the policy. I don't think that notion was ever really discussed as part of the 2007-2008 policy but it's in the guidebook.

And then, talking about enforceability of prevention of certain types of private resolution. Then there's asking for is there any kind of practical way of looking

at the financial benefit that losing applicant derives from withdrawing their application. Or whether that is even something that ICANN should be looking at. To some heads that they're not comfortable with ICANN doing that.

Can we go to the next page? More questions include - so with the hybrid proposal of allowing some forms of private resolution, you know, what does the community think about that? And what are some ways that that can be implemented? And finally, a question that members of the working group on different occasions have said things like, you know, if the fees were high enough for an application, you would basically deter anyone from applying that as a (intentive) profiting off of withdrawing applications. That may or may not be true. We haven't really - no way to really test that theory without actually implementing this.

So this is kind of a philosophical question of the community seeing whether they agree with this assumption or assertion. And if so, to try to help us figure out whether that is a viable potential alternative. Okay, and then to the next slide. Or next topic. So okay. So now we're on the next topic of rolled application comments. Any other comments before I leave the private resolution of contention sets? Christopher, please. A mike's coming around.

Christopher Wilkinson: Thank you Jeff. Christopher Wilkinson for the record. You will be very pleased I have very little to say about auctions. Two points however regarding cities. The model I have in mind is the city itself will call for proposals and decide which applicant was going to be put forward to the ICANN procedure. I don't see how you can have contention sets over a city's name. With the city itself, sitting on a town, watching the process. Regarding private auctions, I think - I have to think about it. But I think you are steering very close to the risks of what in other sectors and other activities would be regarded as potential anticompetitive collusion.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Got some comments over here. I know (Michael) and anyone else?

Michael Casadevall: So going with city names and sort of recapping Chad here is - I actually take issues with the concept of the city name being generic. Now I know dot NYC exists but this is pretty much what CCTDLs were created for, for regional localization of names and such. So I'm not sure I would consider a city name as a generic string. You know, it may be not how we define generic right now. But given that - let's look at the case of Springfield in the United States. There's 15 of them I think.

You know, I'm not sure you can realistically say that that type of string is generic. I mean there are certainly names that are used all over the place. Is that generic string? Or is this something that if something is a place, do they have a place as a top-level domain or should they be under their country code? I mean is that a question that should be asked? You know, maybe it's off topic but this is kind of where I'm seeing this going.

Jeff Neuman: So we have a separate work track that deals with geographic names. It's called work track five. They met actually this morning - all morning. So the whole notion of city names, protections, all of that is - you might want to join that group. That discussion is taking place there. So I'll confer on that question for now since we spent a lot of the morning talking about that but that is going on in work track five - that discussion.

Okay anyone else? Before we get to the role of application comment? Okay so the next topic of is the role of application comment in the -- I guess this is redundant -- in the application process.

So some just background - when an application was filed or should say when reveal came in 2012, there was a period of time in which comments were accepted in each of the applications. And this was a subject again - we didn't really talk initial report area. But realized that the - there was very little guidance provided on how evaluators and others would treat comments that came in during this comment period. And there were a lot of comments that were filed on a lot of different applications.

And at the end of the time, ICANN had to with the evaluators create some sort of process to deal with the application comments. But they were not guided by the policy that we - that the GNSO gave them 10 years ago or so. So what I think the group - the working group pretty much agreed that it is a no - an obvious point or what we call a no brainer. That yes the application comments, applications should still be accepted. And should still be looked at.

The questions came up as to, you know, there were a lot of anonymous comments that were submitted. There was a hope that - or some guidance that the working group wanted to make sure that the email and name used for filing comments were actually verified so that they didn't come from robots or other sources.

The second recommendation is that there should be some way of filtering comments out so that people could - the system that was in place basically just posted every comment that was submitted. There was no way to search them. There was no way to do anything with those comments that were submitted. Made it difficult not only for ICANN and the evaluators to make sure that they got each of the comments, but difficult for the community to review which comments were received.

And then a general unhappiness I guess or - yes, unhappiness with the way that the applicant guidebook wasn't very explicit on how comments would be treated. And in fact, there's - so the working group is basically saying that as part of ICANN - should be much more upfront on what it's going to do with these comments. Who's going to consider those comments? And what kind of impact it would have? So are certain types of comments going to go to evaluators? If so, what are those evaluators going to do with those comments?

Hopefully there is an opportunity to respond to those comments if they impact scoring, let's say, of your application. So that's what this third point deals with. And we go onto the next slide. There was also some discussion and Jamie Factor who's on the chat I think is still on - certainly wanted to make the point that comment periods were supposed to close at some period of time. Either 30 days and it was extended to 45.

But the reality was that the comment board or the portal was actually open for a lot longer than that. And so, there were a number of comments that were filed years after the applications were submitted. And so - by the time that community party evaluation panels got the application to look at whether this application was for a community, they not only looking at comments that were submitted during the proper application comment period but had been looking at comments that were received up until pretty much that part - that point in time.

And so there was a comment that we just - it wasn't necessarily saying you shouldn't have the comment period open for longer or you couldn't have it indefinitely open but ICANN should be much more upfront in the guidebook stating how long these public comment periods were going to remain open.

And then finally, there was the notion that - and ICANN pretty much did this so it's pretty much clarifying what ICANN did, but if there was any comments that would result in a lower score to that evaluation, that there was an opportunity - ample opportunity for the applicant to respond to those comments. It wasn't seen as fair to the applicants that there's a comment received but yet the applicant wasn't able to respond to those comments.

And next page, the last one on application comment. So, again so do you basically then after comments come in - do you rather than just dealing with it through clarifying questions the way it was dealt with in this last round. So you say we're going to close the comment period 60 days after the applications are revealed, let's just say. And then we'll allow an additional 20

or 30 days for the applicant to respond to those comments. Do you just give the applicant affirmatively a right to comment on those? As opposed to just commenting on those applications when a negative - when negative comments are posted and they may affect the score.

So, go back a step. ICANN only allowed applicants to respond to comments if those comments would have impacted the scoring. But didn't allow applicants to respond to any comments if they weren't likely to impact the scoring. And you may say that's obvious, why would you care if it's not going to impact the scoring?

But there were a number of public companies and others that didn't enjoy having comments out there very negatively portraying them even if at the end of the day that comment wasn't going to be used against in them in some sort of scoring for the evaluation. They still did not want that information out there without their rebuttal.

Okay, any questions on this? That one is pretty self-explanatory - that topic. It tells you about your style, there weren't many comments that were received when we were discussing that. Either you are all tired out or we got this section right. I prefer to think of the latter. Yes.

Okay, so the next one. This is change request. We spent some time already talking about this, but this was important enough to have as its own topic. There were no real guidelines from the policy process or in the applicant guidebook on how ICANN can handle change request. But when it became clear that applications were going to sit in a queue for potentially years at a time, that there needed to be a process to deal with simple things like change of address or change of your directors or you know, lots of changes happen within companies fairly rapidly so there should be a way to make those changes in an application.

But then the more difficult types of change requests are like what we talked about, do you allow changes of strings. And if so, when you do allow them? Is it only under the circumstance that I mentioned before? Is it only under the circumstance where you have two companies applying for the same string and both have rights to it? And at the end of the day they can agree to some kind of resolution that results in a change to their application? Should those be allowed? If so, what is the standard to improve those? And also if you go to some sort of - if you are going to go to a first come, first serve or some sort of ongoing process, you may need the ability to change a number of aspects of your application depending on how long it takes you to get in the queue.

So there is lots of different kind of dependencies and in fact in 2012, very few changes were actually allowed to applications. And that resulted in a whole bunch of outdated material in their portal because you may not allow something in the rules for applying for a top-level domain, but if a company wants to change out its senior executive team and it's a large multinational public company, they're not going to care what ICANN says. They're going to make those changes. And they need a way to adapt those changes into their current contracts. So that's going to happen regardless of what ICANN wants to do necessarily.

So the real recommendations here are just spelled out in the guidebook. Make sure the guidebook is fairly clear on how to file change requests. Excuse me, I'm boring myself here. Come on guys, speak up.

Okay, so filing change requests to, you know, what changes would need public comment? Which changes wouldn't need comment? And making sure that we don't put everything out for public comment even if, you know, it's just a change of a director. Does that really need to go out for public comment? So those are the types of questions we ask.

Let's move on. Because I will put myself to sleep. Come on guys, let's go. It's Saturday, it's the first day. It's the afternoon. (unintelligible) lunch. I should

have everyone stand up. Almost. Okay. So almost break time. We have one more - a couple more slides here. So, yes right.

So, this is actually fairly - I think this is an interesting topic. But you might not. So, we talked a little bit about this, right? There were some members of the group that, you know, were okay with the basic general rule of not allowing material changes in most cases. But then they also viewed that some types of changes could be deemed beneficial or in the public interest.

Because at the end of the day, that's what we're here for. We're not here to just have rules for the sake of having rules. We're not here to, you know, just prop up commercial amenities we're actually here to look out for the public interest. So in some cases, allowing joint ventures or the merging of applications or changes of strings. In some situations that may be something that's much more in the public interest than not allowing these things.

So if we can find applicants that agree in some sort of way to merge their applications, maybe one of them is a public interest application. And maybe they're going against a commercial entity. Maybe the two of them come up with some sort of merged venture that, you know, is both commercial but also in the public interest which can exist. Maybe that is a beneficial thing. And why should we just ban them all outright from the very beginning?

And then we did talk about the potential for changes of strings. Which are also talked about in the initial report. In the initial report, we talked about the notion of changing strings to deal with objection.

So let's say, the government objects to - what was your example? It's good to come up with examples. But, let's say the government objects to a certain string because it happens to be the name of - also shares the name with a company. And the company says then you know what I'll agree to drop that. But if I can change the string to company name Inc. Or company name something else.

Then maybe that is a much more beneficial solution for everyone then not allowing any kinds of changes of strings but of course, when you start allowing changes of strings, you then need to - you might need to set some limitations. Because some are worried about the gaming of those. You know, do you allow people to change strings just because they don't want to be in a contention with say, Google. Right?

You might lose that if it's going to go to a public auction. Those are, you know, there is a line somewhere potentially. Or maybe we do allow it. Maybe we don't care. Maybe we say fine, we allow anyone to change strings for any reason. But there may be a line. And so this set of change requests - there might - you know, we asked questions about this. Are there certain types of - certain situations where we allow changes of strings? And certain situations where we don't. Are there certain situations where we allow the merger or joint venture of certain bids and other case where we don't?

It's not an easy question. Certainly not easy criteria to - if we say yes to those questions. But if that's what the community wants and finds that to be beneficial, then we'll find some answers. Michael, please.

Michael Casadevall: (Michael Casavale), ICANN fellow. So I think it is in our benefit that we meet - basically these changes can happen and as long as there is no contest from the community, it basically goes through as it was always there. I think the exact wording needs to be locked down. Because sometimes what would seem like an innocent change may be, you know, community uproar. As we've seen in the past.

I mean, Apple removing the headphone jack comes to mind just as an example. So I think the process that needs to be coherent. I don't have a solid example. Is basically a company announces that's going to happen and if it fails under a approved category, the community can then object and then it'll go through the full change process, otherwise it gets streamlined and

history retroactively rewrites stuff I guess is the word I'm looking for. I don't know if that's the best way to put it. But we were - you wanted comments.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks (Michael). And other people did - I know Ann raised this comment too. About if there is a change of strings or there is some sort of change that you do allow for a period of time for comments and potential objections and also to make sure that whatever string they change it to, you're not just moving them into another contention set. You know, that was a concern.

And then a final concern was if you change the string and that presents maybe a name collision risk or some other kind of risk that wasn't necessarily inherent in the initial application. That needs to be looked at as well. So I think those are good comments. And those are, I think, reflected in the current draft. And I am looking for a head nod from Ann . So I think that's definitely in there to provide those opportunities.

Okay, let's go to three of three of change requests. If there is one more subject, I did lie. Sorry, there is one more subject after this. So here's some questions. I think we covered all of these. I think we can just go onto the last - this last one. Which we can probably spend an entire day or more talking about, which we're not going to.

But essentially, the good news bad news of this section is, this is a topic where the - it's definitely very important to a number of registries that launched - that found themselves in a position where they could not attract registrars to sell or distribute their top-level domains for a whole bunch of reasons which we won't judge whether right or wrong.

For whatever reason, they didn't have the distribution that they had wanted or thought they were going to get. So this whole section deals with a number of different potential alternatives or options. None of which were the consensus of the working group or even close to that agreed upon or thought necessarily

was a good or bad idea. But ones we all thought should go out to the public for their comments.

So when you go through the section, in the supplemental initial report, you will see some, you know, kind of really somewhat that will make sense right away. Others that you might need to be sort of an insider to understand including the difference between prepay and post pay of - from registrars to registries to registration. That's very esoteric but very important to registrars and a reason why some registrars were or may not have been able to distribute certain top-level domains.

So I would just encourage you as we get up to our breaktime to read that. Let us know if you have any additional comments. Of course, we've had a lot of comments to date. I believe we've incorporated that.

And we will set a deadline of comments to the supplemental initial report by the end of this meeting. I'll say the end of the day of the end of this meeting. So 2359 central or what do we call? CST , is that what we're called? CEST? So whatever time zone we're in, 11:59 PM on this coming Thursday is the deadline for comments - last comments to this report. We don't envision getting too many comments that would change the substance of the report. Other than reflecting what was discussed today.

So assuming that's the case, then the goal is to release this supplemental initial report by I keep saying Monday or Tuesday. Cheryl keeps correcting me as soon as after this meeting as ICANN staff can get it out. It will go out for a comment period that we estimated would end somewhere around mid-December. December 10th area. Or 17th. Somewhere around there.

So it is not as much to comment on as the initial report but certainly areas of importance to a lot of different groups. So with that, we will take a small break til 3:15. Otherwise, we'll get in trouble for not breaking. And then we'll talk

about less policy, more on some pragmatic questions on how we can proceed this program forward. So see you in 15 minutes.

END