

**ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group
Monday, 25 March 2019 at 15:00 UTC for 90 minutes**

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/gns0/gns0-new-gtld-subsequent-25mar19-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p26oytwziub/>

Attendance is on wiki agenda page: <https://community.icann.org/x/VIs2Bg>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Operator: The recording has started.

Michelle: Great. Thanks so much, Peggy. Well, welcome, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to all. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on the 25th of March, 2019. It's 15:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. So if you happen to be only on the audio bridge today, would you please let yourself be known now?

All right, thank you. Hearing no names, I would like to remind all participants, if you would please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I will hand the meeting back over to Jeff Neuman. Please begin.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Michelle. This is Jeff Neuman. Welcome to our first call back from ICANN64. We are now hopefully nearing the home stretch. And if you've looked at the work plan document, which should -- if I'll get a link put, if ICANN staff could put a link. We're now starting weekly calls so that we can get moving on the recommendations, well, first finalizing the review of the comments from the supplemental initial report, but then getting on to final recommendations.

So the agenda is on the top right-hand side. I'm actually going to make one change, and that's to switch number 3 and 2 around, which is to do the brief review of ICANN64 activity and then we'll get into the next steps for Sub Group comment analysis. Then after that, we'll go through a review of or the substance

of the call, which is to review the comments -- or continue to review the comments from the supplemental initial report, specifically the role of public comments, and then hopefully change requests, and then any other business.

So let me see if there is anyone for any other business. Yes, Anne, please?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Hi, Jeff. It's Anne, and for the transcript, Anne Aikman-Scalese. In terms of any other business, I was hoping that some of the discussion that we had on the list regarding methods of proceeding would be added to the agenda.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, Anne. Actually I should have said --

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I don't see it here anywhere.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks, Anne. I probably should have said -- sorry, this is Jeff. I'm going to try to include that in with the review of ICANN64, since the questions--

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh, okay.

Jeff Neuman: --I think came out of there. So yeah, thanks, Anne for raising Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay, thanks. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Sure. Okay. So we will then go to the first item, which is anyone have any update to their statement of interest?

Okay, I'm not seeing anyone raise their hand and not hearing anyone, I will assume that's a no. So let's go on to a brief review of ICANN64.

So I'm going to review -- well, we're going to review on this call the sessions that were not Work Track 5. I know that there was a couple meetings of Work Track 5, and they were important. But just for the purpose of this call, we'll just stick to the Non-Work Track 5 items, meaning all the items other than geographic names at the top level.

So there were three sessions held on two days of Sub Group PDP activity. One of those sessions was spent talking about -- actually, two of the sessions were spent talking about getting some more detail on some items that it seemed from the public comments from the initial report there was some agreement on including the notion of having at least in some form, substantive appeals that were separate and apart from the bylaws accountability mechanisms. And then there was some time spent on talking about the-- and again, I think we need to come up with a better title for this. But for now, we'll call it closure of a round. But that really dealt with certain milestones. When certain milestones are hit, what other activities would that trigger?

So when would it be acceptable to start a new round? Or what's the milestone we need to hit in order to get to a place that we're going to issue refunds if there are

refunds to be issued? So that's where we spent some time on the first couple sessions. But then we got into a discussion of a synthesis of the public comment period, which also relates to the next item on the agenda, so it's kind of good that we'll almost tackle together. But it's, how do we take the comments that we've gotten, also synthesize that with the recommendations or the material, the concept that was in the initial report? And then how do we work towards getting to final recommendations? And of course, then will be the question that we'll address at a later point is should some of this go out for public comments, and if so, which parts should go out for public comment? So we're not going to talk about that particular issue today. But that will be on a subsequent meeting agenda. And if you look at the work plan that is on there already for I think in May or June timeframe.

So going back to actual, some of the substance and then to also address some of the comments that were raised on the list, the discussion around the synthesis of the public comment analysis and how we move forward; what we did at the meeting was prepared slides to go over a couple of the topics where we thought there was broad agreement, both from the initial work track discussions that were had on the subject, the material that was in the initial report, and the comments that came back. So what we did is we created a PowerPoint presentation, which we're not going to put on the screen at this point. But we learned a couple things from that.

Number one is that the use of PowerPoint slides, while can be an effective tool, I think also became a distraction in that there were a number of people that were wordsmithing or debating over certain words that were used on the slides, when they weren't necessarily intended to convey that kind of meaning, but were rather used as a short form. So I'm going ask that the -- we'll decide as a leadership team whether we want to use slides in the future. Because we don't want it to detract from the conversation, even though it is a useful tool. But we also want to reiterate that for those that saw the slides and of course they're up on the ICANN meeting, the schedule, the meeting schedule which has all the documents from that meeting. So you can go view it, but we ask that you not dwell on the exact wording of what's in the slides. Because again, there was no, especially with a lot of it, there was no intent to have different meaning than what's already been discussed or commented on. So I hope that makes sense, and I'm trying to get away from using certain labels.

So we'll have to figure out how in the future to focus on concepts, as opposed to the exact wording. Obviously wording will matter. But what we want to spend time on is making sure that we're agreed on the concepts and then we can do the drafting exercise and the wordsmithing. I hope that makes some sense. And that's part of what was in the email discussion after or last week.

I see a few people typing and I'm giving a minute for people to digest. Okay, so in addition to not focusing on labels, it also became apparent, more so during the meeting that there may be additional meaning in the words "new idea" than what was intended when we went through the analysis. So when we go through this

and even in the supplemental report or comment period, and we'll go through some of those comments. I'm going to ask that the meaning that's ascribed to the, quote, "new idea" is not that this is a new idea in the sense that nobody's ever thought of it before or it hasn't been explored before, but rather that it is new in the sense of it was not mentioned in the supplemental initial report in this case. So again, it doesn't mean that it's new that nobody's ever thought of it or nobody's ever consider it. But it was something that was not necessarily expressed in the initial or in this case supplemental initial report.

And I do not think the labels should be used for anything else. So there were a number of questions on the email list that said, well, how are you going to consider, quote, "new ideas" in the concept of measuring consensus? And we don't understand what the label means when you have to determine consensus. But the point is that the measurements of consensus is going to depend on ideas themselves or concept themselves or words themselves, but not on whether in a public comment tool we label it as a new idea.

If the idea, whether new, old, indifferent; gets accepted from the group and seems to be supported by the group, that's what's going to be key and ultimately that will shape the recommendations and then ultimately those will be used to measure consensus. So Anne, you have your hand up. So please?

Anne Aikman Scalese: Yeah. Thanks, Jeff. I appreciate you clarifying that. Sorry. It's Anne Aikman Scalese for the transcript. Interestingly, the way that the question arose for me was not in terms, I guess, of a public comment that was made and now previously characterized as a new idea, but rather that the lively discussion that was had regarding autofill and application, somebody suggested -- I don't know whether it was you -- that those comments might be listed as a new idea. And the point that I was trying to make, which I think is still valid, is that sometimes something that can be characterized as a new idea is actually dissent from the recommendation, which is what was really going on in that discussion. And so what it indicated was a lack of consensus on the recommendation.

So in those cases where something is actually a reflection and the lack of consent, I don't think it's accurate to list it as a new idea. And there may be other examples of that, even in terms of public comment. So I think as a working group, we need to be very careful that we haven't just characterized something as a new idea, when in fact it's a dissent from the recommendation. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. Thanks, Anne. I understand and appreciate that. And I'll go back and make sure that it certainly wasn't the intent to kind of dismiss that. But it was more in the sense of I'm going to try to remember the specific (inaudible). But I think it was new to me in the sense of that was not what necessarily the recommendation was saying. But yes, obviously when we do -- later on, when we do take consensus, something that we'll be very careful to make sure that if something is a dissent to the recommendation or lack of agreement with the recommendation that it's classified that way, as opposed to just being a new idea. But also things that come up as new ideas may not necessarily mean that it

is a different way than the consensus can go. In fact, if it's a new idea and the group likes it, then that could become the new consensus, right? So certainly when there are things that are being discussed, the group should weigh in on those as well.

So I see Kathy has got her hand up. So Kathy, please?

Kathy Kleiman: Yeah. Can you hear me, Jeff? This is Kathy, Kathy Kleiman.

Jeff Neuman: Yep, I can hear you.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay, terrific. Okay, so following up on what Anne said, two things that I just wanted to confirm. One is that a new idea, I think Anne mentioned it, but I was dialing in. One is that a new idea, even if it hasn't been raised in the comments, a new idea can't be the way we did it originally, because that's always our default, right, is the way it was in the 2012 applicant guidebook? So that's one thing I wanted to check. And the other thing I wanted to check is something that we heard many, many times in the sub groups when we were reviewing the comments and kind of doing the categorization and double-checking. It was a very good process to look at how we use these 75-77 comments and put them in all the right places.

But every time a new idea came up, at least when I was on the call, the question was raised, will we be adopting this without going back to public comment? And the response from you and Cheryl was no that a new idea, if adopted by the working group, would go out to public comment. And so I just wanted to confirm that. Because we are dealing with an array of new ideas. So again, that's something in the 2012 applicant guidebook can't be a new idea by definition; and two, that new ideas, if adopted by the working group, will go out to public comment so we can hear from the broader community. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. Thanks, Kathy. So a couple things on that one, so technically the term "new idea" in the public comment period was for anything that was not a recommendation by the work track and then subsequently put into the initial or subsequent initial report. So I don't believe there are instances where something was labeled a new idea where it was the way it was done in 2012. But it is theoretically possible that that could have been labeled as a new idea, if it was not addressed or -- I'm trying to think of a way to put this. So I'm not aware of an incident where something that was in 2012 was a new idea. But in theory it could be possible. I guess it's something we'll have to just as we go along. But either way, anything that was -- let me stop using the term "new idea."

Anything that was not out for public comment nor could have been out for public comment during these initial and supplemental initial reports, if adopted by the working group, are exactly the type of things that should go out for a public comment. So hopefully that makes sense. And I'm not aware of any items where a new idea would be something the way it was, as the guidebook. But I just

wanted to just kind of draw that it is possible, but I think for the most part, you're right.

So Donna, please?

Donna Austin:

Thanks, Jeff. Donna Austin from Neustar. I guess this is something that I raised during one of the sessions in Kobe. But I'm concerned that Anne is saying that something like the Neustar proposal where windows would also go out for public comment. But I think the important point here is what you just said, Jeff, is that it's up to this working group to decide what the recommendations will be moving forward. And I guess if the recommendation is something that hasn't been proposed by this group before, then that would be something that would go for public comment. But I just want to be sure that we're clear on that in that it is the role of this working group to go through all the comments that have been received to date, and debate those and decide what the recommendations are moving forward. And if there's anything new or different in that, then that's a process we have to go through to identify and then that would go to public comment. Is that -- I just want to be sure on the same page here. Because where I'm getting confused is the role of this working group and the role of public comment.

So I see we have 39 people on this call. And that's 39 people that generally turn up to these calls. So I see our role as going through and identifying what we can live with and potentially what we can't. And where we come up with a recommendation that is different from what's been proposed previously, that goes out for public comment. But we don't simply put a new idea out for public comment, because it came up in another public comment round. This working group will go through and review all the public comments and decide -- and make recommendations moving forward. So I just want to be sure that we're on the same page in that regard. Thanks, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman:

Yeah. Thanks, Donna. And so I agree with everything you said. And so I believe that the way you put it, probably was more clear than the way that I put it. So I appreciate that and I'm hoping that everyone else is in line with that as well. I see a comment from Anne on the June 17th date. And I think that's -- we're not giving (ph) any substance on that -- or sorry, on the substance of what's in there, including the Neustar proposal or when a round closes. But yes, in that timeframe, we're going to be talking about what should go out for public comment. And presumably by then we'll know where the working group stands on all the types of ideas that we think are likely to go out for public comment. So I don't really have anything to add, other than that. Anybody else with any questions?

Okay, the last thing I want to say before we get into the -- well two things before we get into the review of the comments from the supplemental initial report and continuing that. The first is that I want to draw everyone's attention to one of the board resolutions, which I'm not going to read or do (inaudible). But essentially it approved the latest plan for NCAP the name collision analysis project. I think

that's the right acronym, study 1. And so that study 1 will then be used to determine, I guess, if there's a study 2 or 3 that is a version of what was initially proposed by the SSAC or the admin committee of the NCAP study, which is comprised of SSAC members.

The reason I'm mentioning it is because number one, we actually got a comment from the At Large on it, and thank you, Justine, for getting that. But there's also some other comments on that particular topic that it relates to. So I want to draw everyone's attention to that. Hopefully that study will be done in a timely basis. Most likely I would think that that study is going to go on past the time period of this working group. And so one of the things we will need to address is what does this working group do in its final report to address that that study or studies are going on? And if you look at the email I just sent back to Justine on the ALAC comment, there are a number of different scenarios that could take place or we could recommend regarding that NCAP study.

And I don't want to go into the substance of that now. We will certainly hit the substance of that in a subsequent call. But I want to point that out for two reasons. One is the study is going on. And number two is from here on out, I'm going to be pressing and Cheryl will as well, for comments to be as specific as possible. And if there are multiple interpretations of comments, do not be surprised if you get some clarification questions from either other members of the group or from the leadership. Because we want to make sure that we understand the exact meaning of the comment. And if you look at the email from Justine and the ALAC, you'll see that I've potentially interpreted that comment -- well not interpreted -- but there could be five different scenarios that all comply with that comment or all could be within the meaning of that comment. And we need to determine as a group the specific path forward. Again, not to focus on that particular comment at all, but just to say that we're going to try to get everyone to be as exact as possible.

And then finally, I'm going to ask that as we have discussions going forward, if we can make these constructive conversations, not just in pointing out what issues are, but putting in a proposal to resolve those issues. We've certainly spent a number of years talking about potential issues and the pros and cons of those issues. What we need to do now is to come up with solutions where possible and try to work towards consensus.

And that is not always the most comfortable thing for everyone. Because it may take you a little bit out of your comfort zone in terms of the position maybe you have been lobbying or trying to get. But I think Donna said it sort of in the right way, which is look, now we know where everyone stands or should know where everyone stands. The question is, what can we all live with as opposed to what is our ideal preferred solution. With that, I'll take one last comment from Anne, and then go on to review the supplemental comments. Anne, please?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks, Jeff. It's Anne Aikman-Scalese for the transcript. The question about one thing that came up in ICANN64 was the board referral I guess, via

resolution of several issues or recommendations coming out of CCTRT, the consumer confidence and trust review team. And some recommendations being adopted and other recommendations stating specifically I think we refer these to subsequent procedures. How are we going to be treating that? Are we going to assume that we've already considered CCTRT or are we going to be looking at it anew, based on the board resolutions? It's sort of the interaction between the board and us. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman:

So thanks, Anne. That's a good question. And the way I look at it and of course this is just my view, and so feel free to disagree. But in this group we took the initial report and the items that the-- sorry the CCT review team, quote, "referred to us" was proposed to refer to us. And we've been working those into our discussions and in a lot of cases they were either in the initial report or the supplemental initial report. We took comments on it.

So I don't think what's going on currently in the discussions between the CCT review team and the board are really going to have any bearing on our activities, because I think we've been incorporating those anyway, regardless of whether the board said, yes, we adopt this one, we adopt that one. So I haven't yet done the huge deep dive to see if there's any exceptions to that. But I believe we've already been incorporating everything that they had asked us to incorporate from the initial report, not even necessarily the final report. Or sorry -- from the final report, but not from the board's interpretation of the final report or the board's analysis of the final report.

So some of those items that the board comment on were never really intended for us anyway. But the ones that were intended for us and maybe Steve or Julie will disagree if there is any disagreement; but I believe we've been talking about those. So Anne's saying, at this point, CCT review team is not (ph) a discussion. They're actual resolutions by the board. We should take a look at the references to sub pro.

Yes, Anne. We'll certainly do a deep dive on that. But again, I think all of the items that are in the resolution, which the board tells us to review or sorry where the board references sub pro, are items that we're looking at anyway. And there may even be additional items that we're looking at that the board did not necessarily adopt or refer to us. So we'll try to see if we can have some answers for you on that for the next call.

Okay. So let's now get into the supplemental initial report public comments. We are in tab 2.3, the role of application comments. And we are starting off on line 37, taking Gigi's comments before of it's hard to read the light green. It's not the easiest on the eyes. Maybe we'll look at changing that to a different darker shade of green. But for now, the link Steve just posted to the Google doc, which is a little bit easier to read than the Adobe Connect.

So starting on line 37, 2.3.e.2; so this talks about the clarifying questions and basically -- well, I'll just read it. So in the 2012 round, the applicants are given the

opportunity to through clarifying questions to respond to comments. This is comments during the public comment period that might impact scoring. From one perspective this may have reduced the incentive for applicants to respond to all input through the public forum, including comments that may be perceived as negative. So is this an issue that needs to be addressed, and if so, what measures do you propose in response to the problem?

So you'll see broad agreement on the notion of applicants being given an opportunity to respond to comments from the public comment period that could negatively impact scoring and also in a -- I think, I'm trying to remember. I think before, so on our last call talking about this, we did talk about providing a short period of time for applicants to respond to all public comments if they wanted to. But this is specifically talking about comments that an evaluator may find or may believe impacts the scoring. So you'll see the BRG, the IPC, the registrars, the registries, and Non-commercial Stakeholder group all agree that yes, this is appropriate to continue. The comment from Jamie and dotgay, and Jamie's on the call. So I hope I interpret this right, Jamie. So if not, please let me know.

So I think what dotgay is saying is that we started with the premise of the fact that applicants were given an opportunity to respond where there were comments that could negatively impact scoring. And then based on that, we made a recommendation to continue to allow applicants to respond to that. What dotgay is saying is that not all applicants were given the opportunity to respond to comments that could negatively impact their scoring. I don't think they're disagreeing with the notion that if there are comments that could impact scoring, there should be an opportunity to respond. I think they're just disagreeing with the notion that everyone was afforded that opportunity. And in this example of the community priority evaluations and letters of opposition, that's one of those areas where they believe that there was not necessarily the opportunity to respond.

Jamie, did I get that right? And you've got your hand raised, so please? Thanks.

Jamie Baxter:

Thanks, Jeff. Jamie Baxter, for the transcript. I think what's unfortunate about this is question is that it appears that nobody included community priority evaluation in the category of evaluations. And that is where this particular notion that's made that everybody had a chance to respond to comments is in fact incorrect and not true. Because community priority evaluations, from our two experiences of going through community priority evaluation, never did we receive a clarifying question addressing a public comment which was in opposition of the applicant, which in fact took away a point. So the assumption is incorrect. And I think the interpretation for most in response here isn't including community priority evaluation as part of evaluations overall. So I just wanted to make that point clear, because it's unfortunate when community priority evaluation gets dropped from the discussion part of what we're talking about here. So I'm trying to make the point that it needs to be part of this discussion. And if in fact all evaluations are supposed to or everybody is suggesting that evaluations should give an opportunity for response when points are in jeopardy; then I'm suggesting

community priority evaluation needs to be part of that consideration as well.
Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. Thanks, Jamie. So I'll take that as two different items. Number one is the group needs to consider when we're talking about public comment period, whether all of these recommendations apply both to the regular public comment period as well as the community priority evaluation public comment period, or for that matter any other area that may in the future have a public comment period. If we do, then Jamie, I think what you're saying is you agree with the notion that applicants should have an opportunity to respond to comments that could negatively impact your application, both in the regular comment period as well as in the community priority evaluation period as well. Is that fair to say?

Jamie Baxter: Yeah, Jeff. Jamie once again for the record. I do agree with that at assumption. But the assumption has to be tagged with the fact that community priority evaluation needs to be added to that. And then on top of that, any letter of opposition which is a new title that was created during the process, needs to be considered a public comment. And that is a very important thing that needs to be addressed. Because if ICANN is not going to consider a letter of opposition as a public comment, then sadly it doesn't even fall into this category that we're talking about. So those are the important distinctions that I'm trying to bring forward, so that everybody understands it, especially those who were not part of community priority evaluation in the last round.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so Jamie that does make sense. So what I would say then is it stays as divergent from the notion that letters of opposition were given an opportunity for public comment. As a blue kind of new -- again, I'm just using this new idea notion, because that's we do in this matrix; blue is a new idea to make sure that all public comment periods adopt this type of proposal, including community priority evaluation and/or any other areas that might have sent for a public comment period. But then green on the notion that applicants should have a chance to respond to things that negatively impact their application; that's kind of all the different ones: red, blue and green.

Okay. Cool. And so Jamie just confirmed that. And then the ALAC has a comment at the end, which is not colored, or actually sorry, it is as divergent in the sense that the ALAC did not consider that this issue needs to be addressed. Because they understand all applicants are free to determine for themselves whether they'll respond to any comment and judge the consequences. So I'm a little bit -- and Justine, I know you're on the call. I'm a little bit confused on this comment.

I think what you're saying is that applicants should have an opportunity to-- no, I'm not sure. Maybe Justine, if there's a way that you can explain it. Because I'm not sure it disagrees with the notion that applicants should be able to respond if they want to. But Jamie, are you in a position to add anything?

Justine: Hi, this is Justine. To respond to Jeff, yes, we don't -- the ALAC doesn't oppose the use of the opportunity for responding to public comment. We are just answering the question that was posed, which is do you consider this an issue that needs to be addressed. So as far as we're concerned, it's not an issue, so long as the opportunity is available to respond to public comment, then whether any party chooses to respond to it or not is up to them. That's all we're saying. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. Thanks, Justine. Okay, so I think I understand. Because this question specifically is through responses to a clarifying question, as opposed to responses in general; because before in the comments of above -- and I know this is a month ago, or about it. But in the comments above, it does say that applicants should have a chance to respond to any public comment, whether that's a 7-day period or 10-day period, after all the other public comments are in. I think what you're saying is that because they have that time period, then they shouldn't need another time period when clarifying questions or if an evaluator were to send out clarifying questions. I think I understand the distinction now, unless I'm wrong. Please jump in, but Anne and Jamie?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yeah. Thanks, Jeff. It's Anne Aikman-Scalese for the transcript. I think the question there that would spring naturally would be -- and it's a good idea to permit that sort of response -- but let's say in the case of community priority evaluation, the question then it's going to be how the evaluators are required or not required to take that response into account. So it creates a little bit of a procedural issue. It seems to be a good idea. But when you look at whether this CTE is accurate or not accurate or whatever, I would just have to know how they're expected to treat that public comment or response from the applicant at that point. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. Thanks, Anne. So absolutely. If we do allow responses by the applicant after the public comment period, whether it's as an official part of the public comment period or whether it's only to clarifying questions or both; there should be guidance issued as to how evaluators consider those responses, like there should be guidance on how -- we said before, on how evaluators treat public comments to begin with.

Jamie, please?

Jamie Baxter: Yeah. Jamie Baxter for the transcript. I'd also like to add our additional experience in this, so the people really understand the full scope of what could possibly happen, especially as it relates to community priority evaluation. Because it's one thing to say that if somebody puts out a public comment that actually you have the ability to respond to that comment prior to entering evaluation. But when that public comment in the form of a letter of opposition arrives days before you start your community priority evaluation and you don't have the time to immediately respond to it or even become aware of it until it's too late or you've already entered CTE, there needs to be that built-in mechanism for you to be able to respond to it. Otherwise this just becomes an incredibly

opportunistic gaming situation, where people will submit their letters of opposition at the last moment, giving the applicant no time to respond, which is exactly what happened to us.

And so I think it's important that people understand that it is understood you should respond to public comments that may be perceived as negative. But when they don't happen until or you become aware of them until it's too late, there needs to be a built-in system for you to be able to actually respond, especially if it's going to affect your score. So I wanted to highlight that to everybody. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. Thanks, Jamie. So this is Jeff again. So I'm going to go out on a limb and say that all of the comments and the discussion so far generally support the notion of giving applicants a built-in opportunity to public comments that are filed and including in that certainly any public comments that could impact scoring. Like we'll need to -- or maybe even an implementation team, we'll need to look into the exact timing of what that occurs and whether that differs in cases of community priority evaluation or whether it's twice in community (ph) priority evaluation, whatever it is; I think we're all generally in agreement with the notion that applicants should have an opportunity to respond.

Anyone disagree with that? Okay. Moving on to the last area on public comments, which we have universal green, which is great, and this is on the 7 to 10 day public comment, well we're adding 7 to 10 days onto the public comment period just to allow applicants to respond. And I don't think this needs much discussion, because we've already kind of gone through a lot of this. But that's supported by ALAC, the BRG, IPC, registries, non-commercial and registrars.

Kathy, please? Kathy, are you -- I can't hear you. You might be on mute.

Kathy Kleiman: Can you hear me now?

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. Sorry about that, I guess I was on mute. Okay, Jeff, in NCSD's comments, and I know there will be a collective groan on this. But there's a recommendation and it may be a new idea that not only should the applicants be allowed to respond, but the commenter who made the comment should have a time to respond as well, so there's a comment. There's a concern that's expressed by the community. The applicant has a short window to respond. And we are suggesting that the community member also that made the initial comment, also had the opportunity to respond, critique and comment on the applicant's response. And that way everything has a full circle of commenting on a short period of time. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks Kathy. So let's put that part in blue. Because that is something we're going to have to discuss that I'm not sure again has been discussed by others. But that's kind of like a reply period, I guess, for the -- well here it says the

community as well as the commenter. So that would be -- so if we could put that in blue to make sure that we address that.

And Donna is saying that we need to put a clock on the complete comment process. Yes, and then Susan of course brings up the next natural question is, then you'll have to go back to the applicant -- do you have to go back to the applicant again and where does it end? So I think that is going to, when we get down to the substance of the conversation, that's certainly going to play a role in that discussion.

Okay, so why don't we -- we do have enough time to start the change request, which is a long item. I don't want to miss up the additional 10 minutes that we have. So if you go onto section 2.4 or tab 2.4, which hopefully will get brought up on Adobe. This deals with the issue of change requests, which can come in many forms. And we've talked about some of these in a number of different areas. This could be anything from being able to change the string, as something as major as that, to just changing routine information in the application, as we know that the application period took a very long time -- sorry, not the application -- the evaluation period. And so naturally organizations, businesses, entities all go through natural attribution and other things during a long evaluation process. And so this is for applicants being able to change their application for a whole host of reasons.

So the first one is just in general, and we'll go over those comments for now. So the ALAC believes that the high level criteria that were used by ICANN Org that they published are generally the right criteria that should be used, and also that the criteria can be used to leverage for a string change request as well. And so just to read their comment, it says that ICANN Org must determine if a reevaluation is needed with that change request, to ensure that if a new entity is created as a part of this change request that it still meets the program requirements. ICANN must also if the string is changed, do all the string-related evaluations: like string or similarity, stability, et cetera; potentially a name collision risk, depending on if that's part of the process. And then it goes on to talk a little bit more about name collision risk and IDN variance. So that's important.

Then the second comment from the BC agrees that changes should be allowed within the application. But the type of changes allowed should be spelled out definitively in the guidebook. And the impact of the change should be categorized and appropriate actions should be triggered. So they're agreeing with the notion that if you allow a string change, for example, you're going to have to do the associated evaluation or reevaluation. And BC agrees that the 2012 guidebook criteria should be reviewed and amended if necessary. And the new idea essentially is that a change to the string should only be allowed if the same string has not yet been applied for and the application should be considered as a new application to be evaluated from the beginning, with the appropriate cost being charged to the applicant.

So this seems to be broader than just looking at string similarity DNS stability name collision type things. This also seems to imply a re-looking at the technical business and financial. But I'd love to get clarification from the BC if that was what was intended, whether it's the whole application, even the technical business and financial, and like cybersquatting check on the directors, whether it truly means everything or whether it just means some parts of it. So we'll put that as an action item.

And then next comment from the registrars, thinks that yes, the change request should be more flexible, so that if there is a joint venture that comes into play because of a contention set or a negotiation from a contention set. But optionally here's what they say. An applicant could be able to specify alternative TLDs in the application process that could be used in place of the primary choice to encourage a reasonable resolution of string contention. Alternatives would need to be private. So it's not published with the application. The predefined alternatives would be submitted at the time of the application, alternatives provided and arranged in order of ranking.

While the registrars understand that community would ultimately need to create rules regarding when to use and how to use, such an option could potentially reduce the number of auctions and of course the ability to change the applied-for string should be limited to -- or of course -- sorry. What they say is the ability to change the applied-for string should be limited to correction of typos or resolution of contention sets. So that's a pretty specific proposal there labeled as a new idea. It supports the notion of having the ability to change, but only under this criteria. So that's something we'll have to discuss with the group, that proposal.

So Kathy, you have your hand up. I'm not sure if that's an old hand or a new one.

Kathy Kleiman: It is a new hand, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Ah, okay. Good. Kathy, then Anne.

Kathy Kleiman: Great. Kathy Kleiman: So NCSG's comments were not reflected in this section and it may be because they weren't properly labeled. But I just want to read them to you. And I apologize. It's a long paragraph. But it directly relates and I would say it echoes the concerns of the BC and goes farther.

So, quote, and this is coming from our supplemental comments. "On the subject of changes to application, the NCSG believes it should not include changes to the gTLD string itself. On the hypothesis of a string contention, in which those responsible for the string contention objection wins, we support the withdrawal of the other applicant as a fair and reasonable method of handling the conflict." This was what was in 2012. What the question is suggesting here, if we read it correctly, is going to create a very difficult situation for applicants and an almost impossible one for the public and the ICANN community to monitor. We note and have included below a long list of concerns raised by sub pro members to the SPIRS (ph). At the outset, the changing of strings midway in the evaluation will

cause confusion and delay. For example, if there are 11 applicants for .cloud, of course we're referring in the past. And the applicants all agree that one can be .cloudy, one can be .cloud1, one can be icloud and the other can be clouds, et cetera. Such an outcome is not fair, not reasonable, and not envisioned by the rules and not a valid way to proceed. It will require reevaluation, re-commenting, another round of objections and a thoroughly difficult situation for applicants to handle as well the public and community. And when a gTLD string variation is rejected, the entire process will start again. We think this type of contention should just go to open auction, and to do otherwise is kind of to skirt the rules we've created, and create a lot of turbulence, and also to create a lot of confusion in the DNS.

So I think this paragraph 19 of our supplemental comments, and I'd like to ask that it all be included here and classified as a disagreement. Thank you. Thanks, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. Thanks, Kathy. And it is lower, as Martin points out. It's in row 38. So it's in there and perhaps can be moved up as a general one as well. But let me ask a question of the NCSG or could be brought back. Because it does say in the NCSG comment that there is a -- it implies that -- or I shouldn't say implies. Let me think. There is a mention in there. It says to change a string would -- let's see, sorry. I'm trying to find the exact word that you said, but basically that it would require a reevaluation. But that's what others are talking about. If the string is changed and it did allow another period for comments, objections; would the NCSG still have that same view? Because here the assumption is that there wouldn't be those types of reevaluations. But if there are those other types, is it still something that NCSG would oppose? Please, Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: Yes, yes. Let me make sure I'm on unmute. Yeah. Again, it's just drawing one small line in the sand that lots and lots of changes to the application that weren't acceptable in the first round are now being considered and supported broadly, but not this one, not changes to the string itself. You're just asking too much of the community. Remember my posit that they'll be 20,000 applications. Now if you've got everyone going through a round of variation, you're just asking a lot from the community. In fact, you're asking too much, so kind of a line; just not the string itself. That way everybody knows what's being evaluated and it's very clear. Thanks, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Kathy. And again, we're just, if we can think about -- I understand you said it's a line. But there was definitely positive support from a lot of the different groups that, for example, if there were let's say two brand applications, and I think when Karen Gray was participating in this -- sorry Karen Day. I know a Karen Gray as well. But Karen Day was participating. She was from SAS. And SAS had the Swiss Airlines and the software company both used SAS. But they were saying if one of the options was that one of them could use sasair, and the other could use sassoftware, then both would be satisfied in getting TLDs, rather than having one party back out. So that was something that was certainly in

previous discussions with this working group. And what you'll see later on down in the comments, a lot of groups support.

Kathy Kleiman: But Jeff, if I might respond, that's one thing with say brand names. But when you're talking about generics, it's -- we created an auction process for a reason. We created a way of handling contention sets. So I can see that that would be more an exception than the rule. But let me pass it back to you. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. And fine. Exceptions to the rule, I mean those are all things that we can and should talk about. But again, what I'm trying to do is get people to -- in all groups and it's not just you, it's all when going forward, let's not draw lines in the sand. Let's figure out ways to accommodate situations and if we can get consensus. And if it's an exception rather than a general rule, again, I don't know how the rest of the group feels about that. But obviously if we can make proposals in an effort to move forward, I think that that will be very helpful.

Anne, please?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks, Jeff. It's Anne Aikman-Scalese. I noticed that one comment that was made in chat, Martin said, could we please point out which comments you're referring to when you make summaries. I have one question and one comment in that regard. I heard you reel off a list of things from -- that would be able to be subject to change. And I don't know where your list came from. Where were you - - you had a list of items that you said, for example, X, Y, and Z. And I couldn't identify in the comments where those examples that you gave were.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. Sure, Anne. Thanks. This is Jeff. So the examples were from the report, initial report, not from the comments. And I was just trying to give some context for the discussion of what we were talking about when we're talking about change requests. So those examples were all in the initial -- or sorry, in this case the supplemental initial report.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: But not in the question specifically -- we didn't pose-- in other words, we didn't list those examples in our question?

Jeff Neuman: I have to go back to the actual questions. We certainly talked about them in leading up to the question. But whether they're in the question itself, they may not have been. And at this point, I'm just trying to cover the concept. Some of them were in the question, like changes of strings. That's in the question.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: So on sort of a higher level, the comment that I actually have is on this where it says, ICANN Org should set forth in the applicant guidebook the types of changes that would require reevaluation and those which would not. What I'm looking for here is the role of implementation review team. Because the language we used in the question was ICANN Org. And we have agreement, a lot of agreement on this. But it would seem that in terms of types of changes that would require further public comment that it only makes sense it would be really

important for IRT to weigh in on that, when the guidebook is being drafted, rather than just pushing it all onto ICANN Org.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Anne. So I think -- so in the supplemental initial report, I believe we either cited the criteria or sorry copied it in there, or at least cited the link to where that criteria is. And I think that's what we were referring to. Your question is also about who is the evaluator of that criteria or whether that criteria is met; is it broader than that? Or am I misinterpreting, Anne?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: No. I just meant in terms of types of changes that would appear in the applicant guidebook that I guess I have an assumption that IRT has input into the text of the applicant guidebook and IRT has input into what those changes would be that would require public comment and that would require reevaluation. Is that right or wrong from your standpoint?

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Anne. That's a complicated question. It's not an easy-- there's no easy answer. Because it's ultimately the -- from what I understand, the staff gets the policy document from the board, assuming it's approved. The staff then leads an IRT through which is the GNSO helps to populate. And there are some rules obviously in the GNSO procedures, operating guidelines on IRTs. But I don't think anyone's gotten or thought about specifically whether that means the exact wording of the guidebook or what that means. And I'm not sure that's certainly within our jurisdiction to say what an IRT can or can't do. It's really for the GNSO and ICANN or council and ICANN staff. So I don't really have a view, if that makes sense. I mean I have a view, but not as chair. I don't have a view.

And I see some comments. There are types of changes are at the beginning of question 2.4.d.1. One of the types is resolving string contention. Anyway, sorry Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Do we have view or a practice on whether or not IRT weighs in on the final applicant guidebook before it goes out for public comment? Do we have a practice or a view on that?

Jeff Neuman: Well, I'm going to see if anyone from the council is on that I know Flip and Elsa are our liaisons and I don't want to put them on the spot. But at this point, there's no practice. Because IRT were not created, or the concept of IRT weren't created until after the final book (ph) the last time. So I think whatever we do here is going to be new, one way or the other. But we can put that on the list for Flip and Elsa to see if there's guidance that the council wants to give on this. And Steve, please?

Steve Chan: Thanks, Jeff. This is Steve Chan from staff. And just to try to speak to that issue, so for recent implementations of policy recommendations for say, thick WHOIS and IGO/INGO protections; all those things in the case where the policy language is drafted in consultation with the IRT, the policy language is published for public comment. So without predicting exactly how that would go for the new gTLD Sup Pro Group, you could potentially assume that the AGB constitutes the

policy implementation, and therefore would go out for public comment. So hopefully that helps. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Steve. And so yeah, I guess there's sort of a distinction I hear in Anne's question, which is the implementation might go out for public comment, but would the exact wording go out for public comment. So I'll guess we'll see if there's any clarification on that. But you know, as Donna notes, that the guidebook last time was many reiterations developed by staff with many iterations for public comment. So Donna, please?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Jeff. Donna Austin from Neustar. So maybe to Anne's point, but some of what we would develop here will be policy recommendations and some of it will be implementation guidance. So I think there's another difference here as to how things happened last time. So I don't know at what point we will or if we intend to kind of separate the two into policy recommendations versus implementation guidance. But I think, depending on which one of these, there's a difference in how it would be dealt with moving forward.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. Thanks, Donna. And not to use the exact wording of what we did at ICANN64 from those slides, but the slides do have a separation of policy recommendations versus implementation guidance. So if you want to look back at those slides, we are going to, as we develop final recommendations, attempt to divide those up like we tried to do for those slides. Again, don't look at the exact wording of the slides. But that's what we tried to do.

Kathy, please?

Kathy Kleiman: Yeah. Kathy Kleiman. So just a warning about implementation review teams, we're seeing them being actively lobbied to change policy. And in some cases, they are. Now I know the IRT didn't exist for the applicant guidebook. But whoever edited that and I don't want to blame ICANN staff, but where those edits came in, they were significant and they went to policy and they changed policy, sometimes 180 degrees. And then they put the applicant guidebook out. But by then, it's a short time frame. It's a really fast turnaround. It's a lot of pages. People are doing a lot of other things. So the implementation review team turnaround time comments is fairly fast and again, in the middle of a whole bunch of other things going on, generally.

So we should be very clear and we should be clear with implementation review teams. Don't change the policy. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, everyone. We'll take those comments. Obviously what an IRT does or doesn't do is not really the jurisdiction of our group. But to the extent that we want to be specific on certain items as to how they're implemented and we want to do implementation, we certainly can include that in our report and in some cases we already have. So let's move on to the line 7 of the change request. And this one actually does try to divide certain things into -- or actually says that these things are guidance as opposed to policy recommendation. And

just to go back, the distinction we make in this is that for policy recommendations, these are things that the group says must happen. This must be the case.

For implementation guidance, we are saying that these should happen or should be the case. But of course if there's good reason not to, then ICANN staff could -- or then other alternatives could be suggested or could be the way that they're going to go. The reason this is important is we're not getting into a distinction of what's policy and what's implementation, because there is no concrete objective definition of what's policy and implementation. So the distinction we're really making is AI can, if we're only doing it as a recommendation, you have to do it. If we're labeling it as an implementation guideline, we really want you to do it and you should do it. But obviously it's not a must. So Anne, please?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yeah, Jeff. It's Anne for the transcript. I totally agree with you, of course, that it's not always the line between policy and implementation. And I don't read it as something where when we give implementation guidance, we're saying hey, ICANN Org, try to do this, but maybe not. Again, I have to go back to the role of IRT and the fact that -- so I think the working group put out a recommendation for standing IRT precisely because we know that during that implementation process there are issues that arise that some people view as policy and others view as implementation. And that's why there has to be checks and balances. That's why the policy and implementation working group did what it did. That's why you have EPDPs, the GNSO guidance, GNSO input. So I don't agree with your characterization that if it's implementation guidance, it's just up to ICANN Org to decide it. I don't think that's accurate. I think it depends in the implementation process what issues arise and whether any issue that may be viewed by somebody as implementation, a councilor has the right to bring that issue to the full council if a councilor feels that that's a policy issue. So it's a false distinction at times between policy and implementation, depending upon which side of an issue you're on. So it's not really just about ICANN Org deciding it. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Yeah. Thanks, Anne. This is definitely a much bigger discussion. I think for our purposes, let's just think of this as the recommendations are you must do this and the implementation guidance is you should do this. We can leave what the IRT does or doesn't do to the council and to the subsequent IRT. I think in some circumstances we all need to recognize that these are, especially with implementation guidance, these are areas we'd like to see or really want to see. But again, we're not necessarily in the best position. And maybe an IRT is in a much better position. But we, this group here, is not in the best position to assess the feasibility of all of the things that we are recommending, including the cost-benefit analysis of would it take 20 years to implement this if you implement our guidance? Or will it cost like \$10 million to implement this? Whatever it is, I think what we need to do as a group is recognize that look, there's recommendations that we have to have, we have to do. But implementation guidance is we really want you to do it, but we're not necessarily in the best position vis-à-vis ICANN staff and/or the implementation team to make it a must. So I think that's the distinction which we're trying to make.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yeah, Jeff. The distinction is not-- I'm sorry, but the distinction is you say that when that's the case it's ICANN Org, the staff that decides the issue. What I say is that the IRT is involved in that. That's the difference between what you're saying and what I'm saying. That's all.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Anne. And I'm not saying you're wrong or I'm right or I'm wrong and you're right. I'm saying that's an issue for beyond this group, okay? So let's just say that we have the things that we must have and then we have the things that we should have as implementation guidance. And it's for (inaudible) to make that decision at this point. But that's not within our purview as to dictate who that is that makes that ultimate decision, whether it's ICANN staff alone or ICANN staff with the IRT, the IRT alone; that's beyond this group. Does that make sense? I hope.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Sorry, Jeff. No, it doesn't. It's very much within our purview to comment on the role of IRT. We're making a lot of recommendations in relation to IRT and predictability, and we're also very aware of the policy and implementation and working group work. So it's very much within our jurisdiction to talk about how implementation happens. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Anne. Let me save that then and see how we can -- I'll talk with the council liaisons and we'll add this kind of as an action item to make sure we get clarity going forward, not in the immediate future. I'm not saying Elsa and Flip, you need an answer immediately. But let's make sure we get some guidance. I just want to move on, if we can.

Anne, your hand is up. I don't know if that's an old hand or if it's new. Okay, I'll assume that it's an old hand. Okay. So the first implementation guidance, other consideration that we have in here is that ICANN should seek to provide guidance on changes that will likely be approved and changes that will not likely be approved. ICANN Org should also set forth the types of changes which will be required to be posted for public comment. ICANN Org should set forth in the applicant guidebook the types of changes that will require reevaluation of some or all of the application, and which ones would not. And the last one is the working group believes that several types of change requests that were disallowed in 2012 should be allowed going forward. So that's just a general summary of what we said in the initial report.

Support for that for those concepts came pretty much down the line, subject to of course to the non-commercial group comment on the string itself. But from the BRG, the ALAC, the IPC, Registry Stakeholder Group, and the ALAC and even the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, there is wide support for those implementation guidance, but divergence on the notion of the string changes, as we discussed before.

Does anybody have any questions on those comments? Okay, line 16, 2.4.d.1; this is specifically on two notions. One is creation of joint ventures. Two is string

changes. And then we do say or we did say in the initial report, supplemental initial report that ICANN Org may determine that in the event of a joint venture, reevaluation is needed. Implementation guidance, some examples to consider in allowing for a new string include pending, pending a new element of this original string or selecting a string that's closely related to the clause sector of the original string. So for example, the sas to sasair was a good example of something like that. We're saying we did say that ICANN should perform a reevaluation of at least the string, related evaluation, stability, string contention, et cetera. That objection should be able to be filed on those changes. One working group member noted that in allowing for a string change, the new string would need to be subject also to name collision risk assessment and put out for public comment, and open for objection.

So that's what was in the supplemental initial report. The BRG supports the guidance that was in the initial report and does support the notion of allowing a string change in limited circumstances. And let's see. So then we have the -- whoops. I did not mean to skip the ALAC. The ALAC opines that ICANN Org must determine if reevaluation is needed on the joint venture. The ALAC agrees that ICANN must perform reevaluation of the string, if it's a new string. And they also agree that in allowing for string change, it would need to be A, subject to name collision risk, put out for public comment, and open to objections.

The registrars, this reiterates what we talked about in the general comments, the new idea of requiring alternates to be listed in the application, if we consider string changes. And the registries, they are not in favor of allowing an applicant to change in string. So it's only divergence in the instance of allowing a string to change if it places the string into a contention set.

Kathy's asking if I mentioned the GAC. Did I skip a comment? If I did, it was unintentional. I don't see a GAC comment. Is there a GAC comment on this thing? Ah, ALAC, yes I may have accidentally said GAC, but I mean ALAC. Sorry about that. I misspoke.

Okay, next question only one comment, let's see. Section d above outlines possible application changes that could be allowed and corresponding implementation guidance. So registries had a general comment, which is that some members do not support the suggestion that applicants can change their string, post application. All right. Probably should have been in the question above, but okay, Kathy, please?

Kathy Kleiman: Yeah. Jeff, I think the GAC comment has to be classified both as with some divergence because of the red, but not the string changes to the gTLD. Once the gTLD string is chosen, it is fixed. So there is a chorus of comments on that. So there's an agreement. There's new idea, and there should be some divergence. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Kathy.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm not-- sorry. Cheryl here. Maybe I'm confused and at this hour that's not unlikely. I'm not seeing a GAC comment.

Jeff Neuman: It is a little bit -- it's lower. We haven't gotten there yet. It is in line, sorry, line 14. We haven't gotten there yet. So there is a GAC comment.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, we haven't -- right. Thank you. I did think I was teething up (ph), but then again, I also could be in a (inaudible) state.

Jeff Neuman: No, no. No, we're getting there. So the GAC did comment that they agree on the guidance, but had a what we labeled as a new idea, where the GAC believes that a change to the likely operator of the new gTLD would constitute a material change that invokes the notification requirement of 1.2.7 and that ICANN may require reevaluation of the application. So this is if there's a change in the operator. I'm assuming they mean the registry operator that's the contract entity, as opposed to the back-end operator. But maybe I shouldn't assume. So let's make sure we get clarification on that. It seems from the context, this really means the registry operator, not the back-end operator. But I could be wrong. But I don't see anything in the GAC comment that says it opposes change of string. But let me -- uh. Kathy, can you just in the GAC comment where it says that. And I don't know if it's --

Kathy Kleiman: Line 13 in red, if you're looking at the spreadsheet, if you're looking directly at the spreadsheet. I don't know about what's going on in the room. But it's definitely highlighted in red.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, yeah, yeah. So that the NCSG. That's not the GAC. The GAC is the comment below it, line 14.

Kathy Kleiman: Then I apologize. These things are not flipping properly. Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. That's okay. It happens to me too. So okay, the Business Constituency then states that they agree with changes. They should be spelled out clearly in the guidebook. They do say that a change to the applied for string should only be allowed if it's not yet been applied for. So it agrees with the notion that the registries said that it shouldn't be put it into another contention set. And it should be considered a new application to be evaluated from the beginning. This again, I think we have the clarification question of whether they mean the beginning in terms of everything needs to be done, including like a technical evaluation of the back-end operator and the financial or the background checks, if it's the same directors. So I want to make sure we're precise with the BC and make sure we get that.

So we're going to stop here for now, because we're getting towards the end of the call. I think we made good progress. We'll continue on line 16 moving forward. I think a lot of these comments going forward are repeats. So I think we'll be able to get through this and through the next item, which is the registrar support for new gTLDs, all in the next call and finish it up. So just a reminder that

we are now on a weekly schedule, as we are getting towards these recommendations. And again, I'll try to do some more conversation, add some more conversation on the list. And I really want to stress that from now on, it's okay to think of new issues and new comments of things. But I want everyone to try to see -- to just not only point out new issues or problems, but to try to propose a solution that they think might have a chance of gaining consensus, if possible.

So thank you, everyone. It is now 90 minutes in, and welcome back, and talk to everyone next week. Thanks, everyone.

Michelle: Meeting has been adjourned.