ICANN Transcription

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group

Monday, 06 May 2019 at 1500 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-06may19-en.mp3

Zoom Recording:
https://icann.zoom.us/recording/play/06oRAARWj45aG0T3emcMe6yGJQ1roKZQPsYntNfYWN3gu0AaP0C89vYleRVswRxA?continueMode=true

Attendance is on the wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/_RVIBg

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

MICHELLE DESMYTER: I'd like to welcome everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on the 6th of May, 2019. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the Zoom room. So if you're only on the phone bridge today, would you please let yourself be known now?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Excuse me. I am on the phone bridge. Kavouss Arasteh.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Thank you so much, Kavouss. We have noted that. As a reminder to 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. Also, as a friendly reminder, to view the documents being shared during today's meeting, if you would direct yourself to the top of the shared screen, you will see an option that says View Options. Please click on the drop down area and then you will direct yourself between Julie Hedlund and Steve Chan's documents today.

With this, I'll hand the meeting back over to Jeff Neuman. Please begin.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thank you, Michelle. Sorry, it took me a second there to get off of mute. Welcome, everyone. Today's agenda is up on the Zoom room right now. If you are looking, I think there might be two … yeah, it's on Julie Hedlund's screen. So if you're on Steve Chan's one, change over and you'll see Julie's. So we're going to spend the bulk of the time going back over the predictability model and then doing the clarity of the application process and, if there's time, starting the conversation on application assessed in rounds.

But first let me ask if there are any updates to any statements of interest.

Okay. Not seeing any. Are there any questions about the agenda before we get started or anything to add under Any Other Business?

Okay. Not seeing any. I will note that we probably have a smaller turnout than usual at this time, simply because the GDD Summit is going on at the moment. It is currently 10:00 P.M. here in Bangkok, and I'm sure there are some people that are still out to dinner or just otherwise unavailable, but we are still moving ahead.

On that note, before we turn to the actual documents, I want to just again go over the goal of this call and the future calls: to see if we can come up with draft final recommendations on the material that was in the initial report or maybe material derived from the initial report as well as the comments and the review of those comments from the last several months. I would request that, if you have an opinion, please do feel free to express them but also try to do so in a constructive manner. So, if you, let's say, are not in favor of something, if you could explain if there is anything that could change your view either by adding something or taking away something. The goal here is to really try to come to get concrete recommendations if possible, remembering that, if we cannot come to a consensus on a particular topic, and that topic involves potential changes to the guidebook or the program, then the status quo will be as it was in 2012 as it was implemented. I know, and it's noted for the record, that some people do not support that, but that is our mandate that's in our charter. That's how the GNSO expects us to operate this group. So I hope that

we all just go along with that for now in order to make some progress.

With that said, we're going to continue our discussion on 2.2.2: Predictability. For that, there is a link that was sent [inaudible] in the agenda. But the last couple days of the end of the week I started to try get a more focused, narrowed-down document of what I thought the issues were that we still need to solve and come with some very specific questions. So I'm going to ask that – Steve, is this the link to the newer document that I would like walk through? It's just a tool for this call and certainly will be available or is available. It will be sent by e-mail to everyone, and then everyone can comment on it after the call.

Let me just clarify. Steve, is that the – yeah, okay. So this is a new document. It contains all the stuff that was in the older document. It's not any new information but it just tries to put in a different format that will hopefully focus us more on the stuff that we can agree upon and the specific questions we need to answer and then comments that may have been related to those specific questions.

I see that Kathy's got her hand up, so, Kathy, please go ahead.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Can you hear me, Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Great. And thanks for coming on so late, Bangkok time. So you said something that I just wanted to point out that I'm not sure is exactly right, that, if we don't adopt anything, we go back to the way it was. I just wanted to clarify. In light of what Anne's been posted, that doesn't appear to be completely true because the Council has taken some serious steps since we wrote everything in 2009/2010.. The Council has taken – I'm going to move this computer and read off another computer. So she's pointing to the GNSO policy and IRT principles and guidelines that have been adopted since last round in the GNSO input process manual.

So I think it would be fair to say that revert back to the way it was plus these new procedures that the GSNO Council has put in place that appear to address some of the very issues that we're talking about here. So I think we've got some new tools in our toolkit on that one. Just wanted to share. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Kathy. That is true. So, of course, any new bylaws that have been put into effect by ICANN as well would apply. So there's a different IRP. There's some different things in terms of that external to the New gTLD Program that obviously would be new. But everything else, in terms of the guidebook and the default with the as-it-was in 2012 … But let's talk a little bit about or get more specifics with the predictability model itself and the policies behind it. We could actually go into what it means to have the status quo because I do think that that's very relevant for our conversation.

So, if we could switch to, I would think, Steve Chan. Steve, your view is that document that we were just talking about? Can you confirm? It looks like it, so I'll take it – yes. Okay, great. So, if you look at this, again, I want to go over the policy goals. These are the same ones that were in the last document that we looked at last week. Everybody seemed to nod their head at that. I added a fourth one, and I want to see if this is a principle that we could agree with as a group.

The last bullet, which is the added one, states that the predictability model complements – I underlined it – the existing GNSO processes and procedures and shall not in any way operate to be a substitute or replacement for those. In fact, they are incorporated into the predictability framework explicitly.

Maybe we should say the "they" (pronoun) relates to the existing GNSO processes and procedures. Is there any comment or question on that? Does everybody agree with that?

Any disagreement?

KATHY KLEIMAN: I disagree, Jeff. It's Kathy.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay, Kathy. If you disagree, that's fine. You could—

KATHY KLEIMAN: Can I just offer some slight rephrasing? "The predictability model strives to complement …" I'm not sure we're there yet.

JEFF NEUMAN:	Sure. Okay. That's fine. Hopefully we will be there. But I think that's fine. Any other comments?
	Okay.
MAARTEN SIMON:	Sorry, Jeff, it's Maarten.
JEFF NEUMAN:	Yes, Martin? Please.
MAARTEN SIMON:	Sorry. I haven't worked out how to raise my hand. Kind of. Perhaps we just change that to, "intends to" rather than "strives." It's a play on words, but I'd be more content with "intends to completement the existing …"
JEFF NEUMAN:	Cool. I think – okay. Kathy has put in the chat that she's fine with that. Cool. All right. So, on those, let's now—
KRISTINA ROSETTE:	Hey, Jeff? It's Kristina. I'm sorry. I did raise my hand, which you may or may not be able to see. Or maybe no one can see it?
JEFF NEUMAN:	No, I can see it. Great. Go ahead. Sorry about that.

KRISTINA ROSETTE: Okay. Just picking up on the points that Kathy and Maarten made, I do think that, to avoid any doubt in the future when somebody is looking back at this, we may want to add just a clarifying sentence in that bullet that basically says that, in the event of a conflict, existing GNSO processes and procedures take priority. Or something to that effect to make that clear that, in the event that there is a conflict as opposed to a complement, which takes precedent.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Kristina. I think that makes a lot of sense. Anybody opposed to having that in there? I know, Christopher, you have your hand raised, but I think that's for a separate point. Right?

Okay. I don't see anyone disagreeing, so I think that makes a lot of sense. Thanks, Maarten. Maarten is weighing in, saying he's happy with that. So let's then move on. Christopher, please.

Do we have Christopher's mic working?

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Christopher is unmuted.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Christopher, we'll give you another shot. If not, if you could just chat with Michelle and see what the issue is.

Okay. I'm going to move on. Once we can get Christopher in, we'll try to address his question. Let's go to the next paragraph. So what are we proposing here? I tried to add this paragraph in here just to give, again, some background. This all was taken from the initial report itself, so I did not draft any new language here. Everything is from the initial report in this section. I just wanted to make that clear again as we go through it.

If someone could jump in, like Steve or someone else, because I'm actually looking at my Google Doc version as opposed to the one that's on the Zoom. So I may miss people's hands that might be up.

Okay. So what are we proposing? Part A says the type/scope of the change to the program dictates the process that must be followed when a change/modification to the program is necessary or requested. So this just to help with some pronouns here. "The type/scope of a change to the New gTLD Program dictates the process that must be followed when a change/modification to the gTLD program is necessary or requested." Just to make that just a little bit more clear. And Steve is trying to edit in real time.

Any question on that as we go forward?

Kathy, please?

KATHY KLEIMAN: I'm sorry, everybody. Still trying to find the unmute button. Okay. I propose in the e-mails that we set up a gateway to decide what is a minor change and what is a major change. So, when we start with "All minor changes may be implemented by ICANN org

without a need for consultation," I think first we have to established that gateway. We can decide later who will be part of that gateway. But I don't think we know what a minor change is yet and we've discussed at length that what one person's implementation issue is another person's policy issue.

So I think, first, we're going to have to create a little structure for handling that flow through. Just wanted to share that. Thanks. And if we could a placeholder – if anybody disagrees that's one thing, but if they don't let's put a placeholder so that we start that so we know that nobody labels anything quite yet, that there has to be an initial process of which way a requested change is going to go.

JEFF NEUMAN: Right. That is addressed in Part B. That's where we're getting to. We're only on A at this point. These under B involve changes to ICANN org's internal processes. The first sub-bullet of B states, "All minor changes may be implemented by ICANN org without a need for consultation." A "minor change" is defined as – and this comes from the initial report – "a change to ICANN's internal processes that does not have a material impact on applicants or other community members. This involves no changes to the Applicant Guidebook but involve the way in which the ICANN organization or its third-party contractors meet their obligations under the Applicant Guidebook. Examples include" – there's three examples. One is a change in the internal process workflow for contracting or pre-delegation testing. Two is changing backend accounting systems. Three is the ICANN or selecting or changing subcontractors to perform assigned tasks under the Applicant Guidebook. So these changes under that definition would be

deemed minor, and therefore ICANN would not have to go through any kind of consultation, whether that's an existing GNSO process or the standing IRT as it's now called in the draft. We'll talk about the name later on.

So, Kathy, I think that gets at what you were just talking about. Let me go back – sorry. I'm switching between documents here. And I don't know why I lost my Zoom. Hopefully everyone is still there … ah, there we go. I got back. Sorry.

Kathy's got her hand up and Maarten as well. Kathy, please, and then Maarten.

Oh, okay. Kathy does not have – so Maarten, please.

MAARTEN SIMON: Thanks, Jeff. Just working through Kathy's comments there, I think that the next bit in Section B is comfortable for me in terms of distinguishing what would be minor and therefore routed through this process. So, in terms of going back and trying to replay some of the activities in the last round, I would be comfortable if that gives an added predictability and course of action for necessary changes that don't seem major and don't need to waste their time amongst the community that very specifically would be policy-oriented. So those should go through the major changes, but it's nice here that we got a distinction for minor changes. So I'm comfortable with that. I'm to hear if anybody has got views.

JEFF NEUMAN:	Thanks, Maarten. Good. Kathy has asked if she's been muted. I don't think so – okay. Kathy, your hand is up. Great. Please.
KATHY KLEIMAN:	Okay. Let me try it. Just some weird instructions popped up for a second. Jeff, let me just double-check that a change in the internal process workflow for contracting does not include anything involving the application itself or changes to the application – anything the public might see.
JEFF NEUMAN:	Yeah. The way that I interpreted it and the way that it was put into the initial report – that's correct. It's the backend internal org process or workflow but does not involve any changes to the Applicant Guidebook, which also means any changes to the legal agreements or anything that's incorporated in there, which would not have any kind of impact on the applicants.
KATHY KLEIMAN:	Is there any way we could add that clarification for future people who are trying to read and understand this? A shorter version is fine.
JEFF NEUMAN:	It does say that it wouldn't have a – what is the wording here now? Let's see. It says, "does not have a material impact." You're proposing that wouldn't involve changes to the application or …

sorry. Is that what you're – that don't involve changes to the application?

KATHY KLEIMAN: Exactly. Changes to the application or anything visible by the public or the community.

JEFF NEUMAN: Certainly, changes to the application. The second part of that seems a little bit difficult in the sense that, if it's a, let's say, different vendor – I don't know – there may be technically something that's seen by the outside community or visible in the sense … Is there – right. So Kristina asked the question, I think, better than I just put it: "What does "anything visible" encompass?" Is there way we can capture that as more of a concept as opposed to something so broad, like "anything visible"?

KATHY KLEIMAN: This is Kathy.

JEFF NEUMAN: Maybe changes – yeah, go ahead, Kathy.

KATHY KLEIMAN: No, you go ahead.

EN

JEFF NEUMAN: I was just thinking maybe it's – because what we're worried is not just changes to the application but changes to the way that someone would respond, like in a public comment, or the way an evaluator do its activities. So I'm just thinking there'd be "does not have a material impact on applicants, change the applications, or any other processes set forth in the Applicant Guidebook." Something like that.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Something like that. Maybe let's put that in a placeholder and see what other people think. But thank you. That captures it.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Steve is trying to type in real time, and that's actually showing up through Zoom. So that's pretty cool. That's awesome. That is an advantage of Zoom over Adobe Connect, I guess.

The next paragraph is a little bit of tougher case. This is all non-minor changes that involve … I don't think I worded this right. "All non-minor changes must be communicated to all affected parties or reasonably foreseeable affected parties prior to deployment." Remember, we're still dealing with ICANN org's internal processes. It's all under that same original Section [V]. So these are changes to ICANN's internal processes that have a material effect on applicants or other community members. Examples include a change in the internal service levels related to contracting or pre-delegation testing that adjusts the overall timeline. The second example is changes made to the workflow

for handling change requests. For example, a procedural change rather than a change in the scope of allowable change requests.

So, in this one, again, it's "Changes to ICANN's internal processes essentially must be communicated to all the affected parties or reasonably foreseeable affected parties prior to deployment of the change." So this would not go through any additional processes, other than a communication from ICANN to whoever is affected or who could be reasonably foreseeably affected.

Let's get some comments on that. I have Christopher and then Maarten. Christopher?

Okay. Have we fixed, Michelle, Christopher's problem?

JULIE HEDLUND: Hi, Jeff. It's Julie. I'll take a look and see what … I'll work on Christopher. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Then let's go to Maarten now and then we'll come back.

MAARTEN SIMON: Hi, Jeff. It's Maarten. I'm just wondering whether we can capture the early comment, where there's been an amendment here: "Applications are only processed [when] procedures in the Applicant Guidebook …" Can we capture that at all by those parts of the application that are scored? Does that work? I'm just trying to, again, simplify and focus in on areas that are important. So, as long as it doesn't affect these particular areas, and, in particular,

EN

the scored part of the application, then these are treated as minor and this is the process. Again, that's a very straightforward capture of anything that might suddenly come out as an exceptional item that needs to deviate to a different process. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks, Maarten. I'm trying to think if this … even though it's non-minor, I'm not sure it does impact the scoring. I'm just trying to remember. Steve may also remember this because this is way back now when we initially drafted the initial report. Kathy has asked for some additional examples, and it's really hard to come up with them in this category. It's easier to come up with the comes in the first bullet and the third bullet, but it's harder to come up with these middle-bullet examples.

So perhaps going through the next bullet will help us focus what this second one is. The next one is, "If the proposed change is not a change to an internal process but rather" – so this doesn't involve a change but it's something new that's added. So it's a new ICANN org internal process that's likely to have a material impact on applicants or community members. Then we would employ the use of a new standing IRT. There's a footnote there that talks about that we'll have a discussion the terminology we use – whether we want to use standing IRT or what. But let's just use the same terminology that was in the initial report.

So examples of this type of change include: let's say ICANN develops a new public comment platform, or ICANN develops a new process to submit objections, or ICANN develops a new

procedural mechanism to determine the order in which applications are evaluated. So this is where the changing from digital archery to randomization would fit in.

So these are, again, internal ICANN org changes. They wouldn't fall within the remit of a GNSO implementation review team or anything like that that's existing in the GNSO processes. But they are something that could have an effect on applicants. So this was one of the recommendations for the standing IRT, which says, again, below those three bullets – and then we'll take comments here – "Because the process is new, collaboration with the standing IRT is likely needed. Staff will work with the community to develop the solution. Once changes are agreed to, the changes would be communicated to all the affected parties before they are deployed."

First question, from Jamie, is, "Would a non-minor change involve the cost or length of an evaluation?"

Jamie, if you're referring of the cost to ICANN itself, I think that would be an ICANN internal because it's not like they would be able to pass the cost on to the applicant. So it's their own internal cost. So that might be major to them, but it shouldn't impact the applicants.

Kathy's got a comment. "They could" – I'm assuming this is to the third bullet point – "have an effect on the community, too."

Right. So what this says is, again, the standing IRT is supposed to be comprised of – I will talk about that later – community members

to help evaluate and help ICANN evaluate these and how to come up with a solution to those.

Bunch of hands. I'm going to try to go to Christopher again to see if it's working. If not, then we'll go to Kathy. Christopher, please?

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Sorry, Jeff. We're still chatting about it.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. So let me go to Kathy and then, Kristine, we'll come back. Kathy?

KATHY KLEIMAN: Great. Thanks, Jeff. It's interesting what the writing says and then the way you described it. So [inaudible] – can you hear me?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes, I can hear you.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Great. Sorry. There was some crosstalk there. Some of these examples – I'm glad we have examples here – have direct relevance to the larger community, so the affected parties are really the entire world, especially if we're changing a public comment platform for a process for submitting objections. I think we have to be really careful on that. A new process to submit

objections might actually be a policy change, by the way. In fact, I think it would be, given the complexity and cost of objections.

So I don't know. I think we need to take a little more time to think about whether this IRT or policy. This may be one of those areas where we're beginning to go on the borderline, especially, again, a public comment platform that could severely impact and affect in real time the way public comments are being submitted and, without intention, reduce access of the community.

So I'm getting concerned about this third bullet point. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Sure. When we get into – thanks, Kathy – the role of the standing IRT, they're supposed to evaluate the change. One of the potential outcomes of the standing IRT is to say, "You know what? This is policy, and it should go through a GNSO process," whether that's the input process, the guidance. That would need to be decided by the GNSO. But that's one of the gateway function of the standing IRT.

KATHY KLEIMAN: I don't think so, though. That's one of the things we've been debating on the list: who gets that gateway function? I'd like to submit that it's out there that it not be the standing IRT that decides what is within its own scope. That's probably too much authority for one group. And there seems to be agreement on that in the world [and] on our list. So how would we handle that particular ambiguity right now? Thanks.

EN

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Let's park that question for the moment because that comes into when we talk about the role of the standing IRT. Let me go to Kristina and then Jamie.

KRISTINA ROSETTE: Hi. Two clarifying questions about this third bullet. First, are we concerned about any material impact or only a material adverse impact? That's question #1.

Question #2 – this is the thing I'm really struggling with – is the reference to "staff will work with the community to develop the solution. It's not clear to me. The solution to what? The solution that will mitigate that material impact? What is it we're solving?

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Thanks, Kristina. Let me turn it around a little bit to you. Do you think it should be, for the first part, "material adverse," or do you think … I'm assuming, by asking the question, that, but I don't want to assume. So do you think it's any material or do you think it should be something that adversely affects?

KRISTINA ROSETTE: I'm still running through the scenarios in my head. I want to tentatively say a material adverse impact. But I want to think about if there any scenarios where the impact would actual be positive but we still want this check-in. So "adverse" for now, with a pin in it.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Thanks, Kristina. That makes a lot of sense, so we'll do that. Then anyone else that's got a comment, obviously, let's hear from that. So I got Jamie, then Maarten, and then I'll check back in with Christopher.

JAMIE BAXTER: Thanks, Jeff. I have a question on the second point. When it says "all non-minor changes," are we exclusively talking about changes in the written policy, or changes in the implementation of the written policy? The example I gave earlier was about the changes to the cost and the length of an evaluation. Despite what was offered, that isn't what happened. Even though the policy wasn't rewritten, that was the way it was implemented.

So maybe I'm lost in the weeds here, but could I get some clarity on that?

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. The way I think it is intended is to be either or, I should say, both because presumably the output of this whole thing will eventually be the Applicant Guidebook. If there are changes to the Applicant Guidebook, obviously those would be written. In theory, the implementation of the guidebook should also involve these types. So just off the cuff, I would say it's probably intended to imply to both.

JAMIE BAXTER:	Okay. So to answer that, then, I don't feel that it's acceptable enough just to communicate that an evaluation is going to go from two months to, in our case, eight months. That doesn't seem like a reasonable response, to just say, "Hey, it's going to take longer," especially since that doesn't really feed into the level of predictability that was originally presented.
	So I'm not really comfortable with it just being a communication. It feels like there needs to be more accountability there somehow.
JEFF NEUMAN:	Thanks. Let's put – because that's a really good example – a comment and a note in there to just see if that falls under a different category or whether there's some parameters to that. But I definitely hear what you're saying, and I do think that that's something we need to come back to after we finish this section and figure out how to deal with something or set some parameters on something like that.
	I know Steve and Julie are taking notes. Let me go back – sorry. There's a bunch of comments on the chat in the last couple minutes. Let's see. Okay. Kathy is asking about how "adverse" works. "What's adverse to one part may be a benefit to another." Kristina then replies, "True, but "adverse to any" would be sufficient. My initial thought was to avoid triggering some further action when there was agreement that a material impact existed but it was a positive one." Cheryl then says, "The flow that we imagined for when a loop back to the wider community discussion over implantation review team … just [managing] it was for

material effects, not just adverse but [inaudible] to get to that later." Okay. I think that's right.

Okay. Going back the queue, I'm going to go to Maarten. I think, Kristina, your hand is left up. But let me go to Maarten and then to Kathy.

MAARTEN SIMON: Thanks. Jeff. I'm thinking the process through here. We've gone through a couple bullet points that try to ease of those items that do not need full, in-depth assessment and process applied to them. So that starts to become an exception process for the third bullet. So we [eke] out everything else in a practical manner, in a predictable manner, and then we come to this third bullet that we probably need to work on a little bit more but focuses on things that need some decisions. And whether that IRT, if it's the right route, is the one that deals with? I would imagine that they would be putting recommendations to the GNSO rather than the GNSO having to work this through themselves. They've got plenty of other work to do.

So the [IRT] in this example, as I'm reading it through, would flow through to very exceptional items that need special attention, though, and process with recommendations that are pushed through to the GNSO because these are more likely to have an impact particularly on policy elements.

So, to me, this is a good flow. I think we're working through filtering out stuff that can be dealt with in a reasonable and practical manner and leaving those exceptional items that need far

deeper thought and attention to a group that can be assigned to assess and make recommendations through to the GNSO.

So that's my practical view of this as I read through it, which seems to make sense. But I'm happy for any other thoughts and concerns that people may have to make us aware of those or if people are particularly keen on that. Does it work for them? Might be [interesting]. Thanks, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Maarten. Also remember, just before I give it to Kathy, that the GNSO can override any of this in the sense of, if the GNSO really thinks it's an issue, the GNSO could say, "You know what? No. We're going to do an input process here," or, "We think we need to do a guidance process," or whatever it's processes are. So this is, like you said, really an effort to help out with all those kinds of things.

Let me go to Kathy and then I'll do another check-in with Christopher to see if we have things fixed.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Great. Thanks, Jeff. Let me reflect my concerns again that we need a gateway process. And if this could be noted specifically in comment here, that would be very useful: that we need a gateway process before we get to this because a public comment platform is one [that] impacts the community. We're talking about a change while the applications are being evaluated. That could be huge.

A new process is created to submit objections. I assume here we're talking about the objections that go to third parties. These are like legal filings. This is major arbitration. These are extensive. That's also huge.

This is not mere process. I mean, process can have serious policy implications. So this is not what would normally go into implementation, and I don't think it's fair to say the GSNO Council can stop it. By the time the GNSO Council finds out what's going on, recommendations are in play, and all sorts of things … It would be very disruptive and it would also be late in the game.

So wherever anything affects the world the way the first two bullet points are here, I think it has to go through a gateway, asking is it really just a procedural change or is it something much bigger like a process that could be changing the underlying rules, steps, and actions? That has huge implications.

So I don't think we can move on from this bullet point. I think here we're getting into things that border on policy and implications for policy. Sorry about that, Jeff, but I don't think this is business as usual. This is big stuff. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Thanks, Kathy. Let me try to make it a little bit better because I think, in hearing your interpretation of the sub-bullets, I don't think they mean what you may be interpreting, which means we need to fix the wording.

So, in here, a new public comment platform was really intended to involve the tools to submit. Let's say they were using a custom-

built solution and then they find out their Salesforce platform could do this in a better way and they're going to change that. So the public still comments the same. It's the same process. They submit a comment. They have whatever number of days to do it. It's still the same. It's just that the internal platform used for the submission – the submit button – is different. So it's meant to be more – and, again, I think that's a problem with the way the sub-bullet was worded.

Then the second bullet, which I see Steve typing in there, is not meant to be a new process like changing of the timeframes or changing of what needs to be in an objection or changing how you respond to an objection. Again, let's say that you were initially submitting an objection through one portal or you're supposed to and then ICANN says, "You know what? This portal is just not doing what it's supposed to do. We're going to change from X portal to Y portal." So it's not meant to cover process like we're thinking or … sorry. I'm trying to explain this in a better way, and maybe it's just a way of putting better words around it. But it's not meant to have that huge impact that you were talking about.

Kristina does put in, "It's mechanisms with non-substantive impact." Yeah, that is the intention. And Kathy says … sorry, I probably should go back because some of those comments are really good. So let's see. Kathy starts out with saying, "Objections go through third parties." Yeah. Then Kristina says, "Seems to me we're having a definitional issue with respect to procedure and process. If that's the case, perhaps a quick footnote example would be helpful." Yeah, that's the way I do want to go.

Kathy, it seems like, with that narrowing, if we could find the right words to capture that, is that better for you? Because I think the changes to an actual process of filing objections, meaning timeframes or what needs to be in it or things like that I view under Section C as bigger changes. But let me go to you, Kathy, and then I'll circle back with Christopher.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Sorry. That was an old hand, but, yeah, if we can include Kristina's line as a clarifying line, capturing an additional explanation. I'd recommending doing it at the bottom, by the way, not in the top paragraph, after the final paragraph, because it's where people will look to see what this doesn't capture. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Great. Okay, yeah. I think we should do that upfront, too. So we'll put that in there. Let me try to circle back with Christopher.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi.

JEFF NEUMAN: Is this working – yes, I can hear you. Go ahead.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I'm on a dial-out now because somehow the other the computer mic is not always being listened to. Thank you, Jeff. It's been a very rewarding conversation to

date and I've accumulated a few comments which I'll try and offer you as succinctly as possible.

First of all, I've a certain skepticism about this process at this stage because, at least as far as I'm concerned, I think we're quite far away from having a viable predictability framework for the future rounds. So I would really ask the PDP to focus on improving the predictability of the process.

Secondly, I can see that you've made a great effort to produce a balanced text, but we have to recognize that was in a minor change for some could turn out to be a major change for others. The staff or even GNSO would have difficulty in certain circumstances reaching an understanding to what is or is not a major or a minor change. That probably needs some additional work.

Then there's the question of adverse and positive outcomes. Adverse and positive to who? We have a situation in the PDP where the non-applicant third parties are not fully participating in the negotiations for the future rules. So I think you will find that what is an advantage for some may appear to be a disadvantage to others. This leads me to a general concern on this subject, that the – I'll use the expression but I'm quite sure we're going to change it; I like "the SNAG" – the SNAG will find it has third-party participants who do not agree with what may or may not be a positive outcome for certain applicants.

Then there's the question, which I think has already been mentioned, that the SNAG, since you proposed it, will have to be transparent, accountable, and independent, and certainly

independent of the vested interests of the applicants and their representatives. Otherwise, this looks like – yeah, I'm afraid to say – [a stitch up].

Particularly, as I've already suggested, many implementation decisions may become policy, and it's not at all clear whether the implementation decisions will be case by case or of general applicability, and especially whether or not the implementation decisions are recognized as precedents for future policy. As you can imagine from my experience with WT5, that is an extremely issue which you would have to address further down the line.

So I come back to my first point of that this is all very well and it's interesting and I admire the efforts that have been put into it, but we don't yet a framework of policies which could be regarded as predictable, neither from the applicants' point of view but especially from the third-party interests concerned. I think the PDP needs to address that in greater depth as soon as possible. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Christopher. In all the work we're doing on every single subject, our goal or one of our overriding principles is to improve the predictability. So, hopefully, we won't have to use this process as much as we would have to use something like this in the last round. I encourage everyone to just really, as you go through this, think about what happened the last time, which was that, any time ICANN wanted to make any change, they pretty much just could. And they were making it up as they went along – what was the process was to follow. Sometimes they'd have a public comment.

Sometimes they wouldn't. Sometimes they would give notice. Sometimes they didn't.

So, really, we're trying to improve that, and I really see that this is putting mechanisms to improve that for areas which are unforeseen. But, yes, the goal for this whole PDP is to make the other aspects more predictable.

Let me go back to … okay. Let me read Kathy's suggestion and then I'll go to Steve. Kathy says, "These proposed changes" – or wants to add an additional line: "These proposed changes are intended to be only those that involve mechanisms with no substantive impact," and then asks some questions on the materiality and adverse to who. And should this path through gateway?

Let me go to Steve first and then I'll jump in. Steve, please?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Jeff. This is Steve Chan from staff. My comment, or I guess question, was really about the text you just read because, in looking at the text – I'll just highlight it now – if you look at how it's worded now, it talks about material impact on applicants or community members, and I'm wondering how that's consistent with the additional language that's being suggested to be added. So this says material and then the suggested edit talks about it being non-substantive. So I guess I see material and substantive effect being very similar concepts, so I'm wondering if they are consistent to be added together in that way. So that's my

EN

question, I guess, to both you Jeff and then also Kristina and Kathy.

I guess one other, while I have the mic – I just wanted to add that I think part of the background and genesis for the … or I guess one of the things that was intended that we tried to take into account for this predictability framework is to try to balance the ability of ICANN org to be able to reasonably make change and not be paralyzed in their ability to improve the program but also to ensure that the community is involved where necessary, informed where necessary, and not taken by surprise by things. As we're seeing here, it's not always an easy distinction to make. But I was just hoping that maybe that background context might be helpful as you're looking through this, that, if everything goes through a gateway or a triage group, it could paralyze the program. So hopefully that's helpful context. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks, Steve. I do think that's really helpful. I probably am remiss for not saying that earlier. So that is very helpful. I do think one of the goals here is to not hamstring ICANN staff and just have everything come to a screeching halt any time there is any sort of change that wants to be proposed.

Let me go to Kathy and Jamie. If you guys could just – yeah, please. Go ahead, Kathy.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Thanks. Given the discussion over the last 10 or 15 minutes, I do think an additional line is needed because it wasn't clear. We

weren't clear on it. So, Steve, I don't see any downside in adding a line. I was just giving a variation of the line Kristina had already given us. And I would, again, not put it there. I would put it all the way at the bottom, right after "are deployed" so that there's this clarification of the scope.

But whenever you're dealing with the public and platforms involving the public – public comment platforms, objection platforms – you've got a problem because you've gone through at least one educational pass, if not multiple ones if we're many rounds in. There's nothing simple or easy about this, Steve, because – and you want to know. You want to know from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. You want to know from the Commercial Stakeholder Group. You want to know from anyone else who's involved in the community what things you can do to communicate so that people know where to put the comments and how to get that educational word out. Otherwise, you may wind up short-circuiting very important input inadvertently.

So I do think we need the clarifying line and maybe more, but I know what you're trying to do. But we're trying to separate things that really impact the community. And the three bullet points we've got here really do. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Kathy. Again, we're trying to past processes, which ICANN didn't have a mechanism to solicit that feedback for. If we can come up with a standing representative panel, hopefully they're in a position to point those out to staff and know when to get the broader community involved. That's the check on the

ICANN staff. But also, on the same token, we don't want to make every single change have to go through some arduous, bureaucratic, year-long process to make. So that's the delicate balance we're trying to figure out and at least improve on from the last round. And I know you know that, Kathy.

So, after this call, one of the homework assignments is to get a small group of people interested to help revise these documents and to really come up with something that we can live with. But I'm just giving you a foreshadowing of what we're going to talk about at the end.

Let me go to Jamie and then we'll go on.

JAMIE BAXTER: Great. Thanks, Jeff. I think something [that is pertinent] to this discussion is that, in the work environment, when you have an employee that makes a mistake, you don't generally send them back into the boardroom to figure out their own mistake. You offer them help. So I'm looking at this process as an opportunity for the IRT or whoever it is to actually come in and help assist in making better decisions because the decision wasn't done correctly the first time.

So I don't actually think it's a bad thing to have additional input as to how to get to a better solution instead of having the person or the group who made the decision poorly the first time make it poorly again the second time. So just my perspective on this. I really don't see this as a negative thing, as it seems to be portrayed. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Jamie. That's good. [Kristina] – sorry. Going back to chat to make sure I've covered everything. Kristina says, "In my opinion, an example of a change that wouldn't be substantive but could have a material adverse impact would be requiring that legal rights objections be filed through a proprietary platform instead of e-mail. It wouldn't affect the substantive legal rights objection, like standing or any of the other elements, but there may be some potential objectives that, for one reason or another, can't use that type of platform." I think that is a helpful example. Kristina is saying that she just wants to make sure that proposed text is as unambiguous and clear as possible, capable of only one interpretation.

So there we go. And we're going to capture Kristina's idea as well. So we're trying to capture all of these. Some of them are being done on the fly, but others will be certainly done after this call. I have to commend Steve, Julie, and Emily. They do go back and listen to the calls again and they do take great notes and capture everything. So even if they can't do it on the fly, they do a fantastic job afterwards.

Okay. Let's go on to the next page, if you could … there we go. Okay. So now we get into changes that have possible policy impacts or fundamental possible policy-level changes. This is what it was called in the initial report. So these are potential changes to implementation that may materially different from the original intent of the policy and could be considered the creation of new policy. An example is the development of an application ordering system.

EN

So this is like now you're creating something new from scratch, like digital archery was initially created. In the previous example, we talked about changing from a digital archery to a new system. Here we're talking about just creating a new process where one was not ever contemplated. In this case, collaboration with the community is essential. The concept is staff will collaborate with the community, consider the issue, and agree upon the mechanism by which the solution will be developed. This is through the standing IRT or SNAG or whatever we end up calling it. The SNAG was, what? Standing New gTLD Advisory Group. That was what it was. So these are potential options of the standing IRT. It could recommend that the change is not really significant and therefore it's consistent with the existing policy and therefore would go forward. It could recommend that additional consideration be needed. So it could send that to the GNSO Council to consider doing one of its own processes. Under extraordinary circumstances, the standing IRT could recommend that the New gTLD Program could be halted for some amount of time.

Paul McGrady, you don't like SNAG? Oh, come on. Anyway, let's go back to some of the comments and anyone that's got questions. Let me see. Okay. So these are just questions about the name. Obviously we're not there yet: the name. We can come up with whatever. And there's still an issue to deal with a little bit later on as to whether we need or could use a different name. That's where we'll go through some of Anne's point.

Let me go to Kathy.

EN

KATHY KLEIMAN: Here we're really getting into something that appears out of scope for an IRT. There are potential changes to implementation that may materially differ from the original intent of the policy and could be considered the creation of new policy. I think, based on what Anne has taught us about the new rules of the GNSO, this now pops out, right here, right now, of any IRT and goes back to Council.

So how do we address that? We're now in the possible creation of new policy. So way outside of implementation. Thanks for the clarity of whoever drafted this, if that was you Jeff or … But let's just stick with the first line for a while if we could and see how that is supposed to proceed under the new rules. I'm hoping Anne's got her microphone back, but I'm not sure she does. Thanks. Back to you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Kathy. Let me check. I don't see Anne on -- oh, there she… So I don't see Anne on the—

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Jeff, can you hear me?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes. There we go.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Sorry. I'm on the phone only and it's going to be very short because I'm on a plane. Basically, yeah, I think that, as far as

deciding something that is policy, the way it works is an IRT or a SNAG or a standing IRT can raise that issue, and the GNSO liaison is supposed to take that and carry that back to GNSO Council and say, "Hey, what do you guys think? Policy or non-policy?"

But it's also true, as Paul and others will tell you, that any GNSO Council member can raise something and having it considered at the Council level. So, in a way, it's as if we're talking about now having two different gateways because an IRT – or in this case, this new post-launch IRT we're creating – is supposed to have the ability to raise that issue. But the decider is the GNSO Council. No one other than GNSO Council decides whether something is policy or implementation. If we're setting up a second gateway, we're probably setting up two different processes. But it has always been intended that that IRT – or in this case, the post-launch IRT – can raise that issue. But they're not the final arbiter of it, and it's also possible for the GNSO Council to raise it directly. Thanks. I'm going to have to mute myself.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Anne. I think you're right on all accounts. I'm not sure if you were with us at the beginning, but we did add a point in there to say that these are only intended to complement the GNSO processes. Then we added a further additional concept, which is, in the case of any conflict, the existing GNSO procedures would take precedence.

So, yes to Anne on all accounts. Any Councilor could always raise it. The Council could always do it on its own, but this standing

EN

panel is really there for staff to go to as it's contemplating this new change or this new thing. And the standing IRT is there to say, "Hey, wait a minute. Look, we see that this may involve a policy issue, so we're going to go and bring it to Council quickly (or we're going to bring it to them now) and make a recommendation." As Anne said, it's only a recommendation. It can't override that the Council wants to or does not want to do. But it is there to provide a predictable process so that ICANN staff knows who it has to go first or has that sounding board or gateway that it knows it has to go to first. If we do this standing IRT thing right, then the standing IRT is going to make the recommendation to the Council as to what to do. But it is not a binding recommendation. It doesn't override any existing process that's in place. But it's there to help move it along.

Kathy is saying, "How do we build all that into this point?" I think we just do, so we will. We will put it into this paragraph, that these are option, and then we would need to put in a third sub-bullet point there to say what we just talked about, that the GNSO is free to accept or not accept the recommendation that's not a binding recommendation. So we'll put those concepts in there.

As Cheryl says, we should do some cross-referencing to the current process flows [in] what we've worked on. So I think we can do that.

Let's move onto the next one – oh, sorry. There is a hand up. I'm sorry. I scrolled down to look at Anne's status and forgot to scroll back up. Kathy, please.

EN

KATHY KLEIMAN: Great. Thanks, Jeff. And thanks to Anne and her flight for the discussion. Walk me through this one, Jeff: closed generics on the bullet point we're on, C. So closed generics was a huge issue in the first round. A number of parties, particularly applicants, thought it was in the rulebook. A number of parties, particularly community, though it wasn't.

So here, if we have closed generics come again, I don't understand, as we look at this bullet point, what collaboration with the community means. "Staff will collaborate with the community to consider the issue and agree upon the mechanism by which the solution will be developed." Staff has no business collaborating with the community. The GNSO Council should be figuring out the mechanism for collaborating with the community.

It just seems like some … Could you walk me through? I don't think we should leave this point yet because I think we're potentially dealing with some really big, really explosive, issues. And I think we should acknowledge that a standing IRT is likely to be registries and registrars. That's traditionally it because A) the length and B) registries and registrars are paid for this type of participation, and C) it's normally very technical. So it's a kind of thing you want the technical people on. But the community sets the policy. We're involved here. We're not going to be involved in the standing IRT.

So this real question of parsing what's a policy issue and what's not? Again, we're talking about right here, and this is enormous. Thanks.

EN

JEFF NEUMAN:	Sure, Kathy. I'm not going to address the composition of the IRT at this point because I think we will get into that in a later point, but I actually wouldn't think closed generics would fall into C. I actually think that would fall into D, as … oh, okay. Well, I could see how you might think it if it is construed as a change as opposed to a new proposal.

So, if it fell into C – so let's do that. So the standing IRT in this one … the collaboration with the community is meant to start with first going to the standing IRT. The standing IRT then would make a recommendation. Let's say it recommended that additional consideration is needed. Again, the GNSO [always] overrides this anyway, but let's say they recommend that additional consideration is needed and they go to the GNSO. So, at that point, it would be the GNSO Council deciding on how to handle it, whether it's an input process, guidance process, EDPD, PDP – whatever it is. So that's how I see that going.

I think we should – I'm looking back at the language of the collaboration with the community. That language from the initial report was really meant to – if people really vehemently disagreed with a committee, a standing IRT, then it was really to make the point that we had to figure out some mechanism of collaboration, that that was the most important thing.

So I'm almost of the mind to actually delete those sentences, those last two, that start, "The collaboration of the community …" and just put those in as required processes. So it would go to the standing IRT, and then the standing IRT would make a recommendation. Again, the recommendation can be overridden

by the GNSO, but it's really to point out that this is not something that ICANN staff could do alone.

So my proposal would be to delete those two sentences and figure out how we can just emphasize the point that this is meant to be a community-plus-staff decision, not just staff. I hope that makes sense.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Jeff, can we keep those two lines and put them somewhere and just put them in hold so that we're still looking at them later. Put them all at the bottom and say, "Cued up for deletion but some kind of equivalent replacement"? Because you never want to replace consultation with the community. And here the community is standing for different things. It's staff communicating with the standing IRT, although normally we mean communicating with the general public.

So let's just keep it. If we delete it, we're going to lose the essence of some important concepts. So can we move it down and say, "Cued for deletion but we need some equivalent"? Just so we don't lose it because this is important.

Also, can we commit to coming back to this a working group session later on? Because this is really important, and a lot is going to depend in what we do in D below. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Thanks, Kathy. We'll note that and hopefully develop in some text that includes "The whole point of this to have a

EN

collaborative process." So we won't lose that concept, so we'll do that.

Christopher, you are in the queue next, so please.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, Jeff. I heard that you don't want to discuss the composition of the IRT or SNAG or whatever now, but I feel that the issue is already on the table. Look, if Kathy is right that your IRTs are mainly registries and registrars—

JEFF NEUMAN: Can we – sorry, Christopher. I really want to save that question because I think it's up to us to decide how these are going to be constituted. So I appreciate Kathy's comment on how they've been in the past and for certain things, but I don't want to address it until we talk about the composition, which is after this topic, if that's okay.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Okay. We can come back to that, but I just put down a marker, which I've already mentioned: that the transparency, independence, and accountability of whatever this entity is going to be is absolutely crucial. Otherwise, it looks potentially quite incestuous. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN:	Sure. Thanks, Christopher. You have the link to the document now, but we'll send it around on e-mail as well. You'll see some pointed questions about later on in this document that talks about both composition and essentially accountability as well.
	Let's go onto Part D. These are new proposals that have potentially fundamental policy changes. We've put in some examples here, and you'll see the language in the second – I'll go through these. Let's say ICANN, like they did in the last round, said, "Okay. We're going to come up with this new thing we're calling [PICs], which nobody have ever thought of before, or it was very new. We're emphasizing the point in sub-bullet 2. "These new policy-level changes to the program must" – so it's not "may" – "be referred to the IRT. Then staff will collaborate with the community to consider the issue and agree upon the mechanism by which the solution …" So, again, you have these options from the standing IRT. All the changes we discussed in the previous bullet, in C, will make down in here was well, so we don't have to go over those again. We'll just make all of those in here.
	Questions or comments about this one? It's really similar to the previous one but more of an emphasis that we really need to involve the community for these types of changes.
	Kathy, please?
KATHY KLEIMAN:	Yeah, except the community, as we're talking about it, is really reaching out to the IRT. It's staff reaching out to the IRT. That's

what we seem to mean when it says staff will collaborate with the community. Staff will talk to the standing IRT.

Then the IRT acts as the gateway for what level of change this is. This is really the first bullet point, not the last bullet point, because this is where the gateway is. And I think we got the wrong gateway. I don't think the IRT (the Implementation Review Team) has the authority or the right to be deciding that something is a possible change or something is not. I think someone else needs to be sitting there, presumably the actual community, which is not going to be part of the IRT. Members of the community sitting there to look at anything that falls into C and D to see is it – that you have a new group. It may include members of the standing IRT but it can't be the standing IRT. It would include members of the Council. It would include members of the non-contracted parties. That how I really think you should be deciding, is it policy, is it not? And then deciding, does it go to the standing IRT for implementation because it's not policy or does it go up to the Council for consideration?

But, right now, everything – the gateways, the standing IRT … You've got lots of objections on the books on that one. So thanks for the clear discussion, the clear language, but now let's talk about who should really be doing 1, 2, and 3. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thank you, Kathy. I'm trying to think about … So I understand your reservations of past IRTs, which is why partially I wanted to change the term of what we called it, because there is a preconceived notion, not just from you but from lots of members of

the community, as to how an IRT has operated in the last several years. So that kind of … what is the word I'm looking for? It biases the discussion by part of it being called an IRT.

The hope is that we can get the composition of this standing panel right so that it is representative of the community that can efficiently and quickly make recommendations to the Council and to the community. But ultimately, it's the job of the GNSO Council to say, "Okay. You're right. This is a policy issue. Thank you, standing IRT. We're going to take it from here, and we're going to use one of our processes." It's really meant to ensure that there is a gateway.

If we could solve the issue of the composition – I want to make that assumption first, that we can come up with an acceptable composition to this IRT – does that take away the need to … because there is no mechanism to just … if you had to just use the GNSO Council and refer everything to the GNSO Council, the GNSO Council is almost stifled by its own rules and procedures, and it would add a number of months and bureaucracy to something, where a smaller group can make a recommendation and deliver it to the Council. Again, the Council can accept it or not. But it's an easier way or a more efficient way to get things to the Council if needed.

Maarten, please.

MAARTEN SIMON: Thanks, Jeff. I've got concerns with adding further layers on here because it just adds more complexity rather than tries to simplify

and make it more predictable. So I would have concerns if we had to add further layers beyond what's suggested here, even the IRT. I think the focus should be on how do we make sure the IRT functions correctly, is composed correctly? We're already started to build that through, what we've gone through in some of the meeting today. You zone in on the stuff that needs to be decision process through the IRT. You reduce some of the elements by clearly identifying what does not go through the IRT.

So I would like us to think more holistically about this as we go through that process. There should be a funnel. As items drop into this bucket, which need IRT processing, this is more complex and does require consultations. Whether that's part of how we compose the membership of the IRT is a very important question that we need to cover later.

But I think, in principle, I would like to see us agree that we don't need to add layers. And I can't recall now, from all of the responses that came through on the public comments, that there was a driving need to change that idea to add another layer. In fact, when I read through the comments, my rough opinion was that it was not to create another layer of bureaucracy and complexity. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Maarten. We're getting to the last four minutes of this call. Ultimately, to finish off with Maarten's comment, there certainly were a number of groups that supported the recommendations in the initial report, but there were also some significant opposition. But I'm hoping, through the clarification that we're doing, we could

resolve some of the or most of the concerns that were expressed in the opposing or dissenting views.

To that extent, what I'd like to do is to form a smaller group that could further flesh out this document obviously to present to the full working group at a later time. But I'd like to, for those who are especially interested, and certainly all the people that have been contributing during this call, certainly recommend – it seems like you're interested in this topic, but of course anyone – to work on some of this stuff offline. It's really to make improvements to this document. It's going to come back to the full group. If we can get some people who have been really thinking about this issue to volunteer for this, I would really appreciate so that it's just not me and Cheryl and leadership trying to revise this document. I think we've made substantial progress on this call – I think – so to keep that moving.

So I'll send out a note, probably in the morning, my time in Bangkok, to get some volunteers. Again, it's not intended to replace any work from the full working group but really to help it along.

I see that Kathy is signing up, and I'm glad you are because I was going to recruit you are draft you if you didn't voluntarily sign up. I understand there's lots of other things going on, so if you can volunteer for it, great. If not, don't worry about it. We will present it to the full group. Certainly, you can express your views and comments on the full list anyway. But I don't want to lose this progress that we've made.

So just to recap the action items, staff is going to back and incorporate all the comments and stuff that they haven't already masterfully done on the fly into this document. We'll resend it out and ask for volunteers to form a smaller group to just really work through some of these issues and hopefully improve the text so that we can start on, next week, going through clarity and some of the other topics, which I think, once we have this done, we can make faster progress on the other items because we'll now know how some of these other elements may be handled in the future.

So we're certainly taking note of the people that are volunteering now on this chat. I see Christopher, of course, Kathy. And anyone else, feel free. We will send out a communication because a lot of people weren't on this call or there were some people not on this call.

So I want to thank everyone. I think there's been some really good progress. Let's talk next week. But please keep dialogue up on the list. Thank you, everyone.

Before we hang up, let me just ask if Cheryl or Steve have anything else they want to add.

Nope. Cheryl is okay. Steve, anything I might have forgotten?

Nope. Great. All right. Thanks, everyone. Have a great week. Talk to you next week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]