

ICANN Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group
Monday, 27 February 2017 at 1500 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WG call on the Monday, 27 February 2017 at 15:00 UTC. 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. Attendance is available at:

<https://community.icann.org/x/l7HDAw>

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-27feb17-en.mp3>

Coordinator: The recordings are started.

Michelle DeSmyter: Great. Thanks so much. Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures call on the 27th of February, 2017 at 1500 UTC.

In the interest of time today, there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants online. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room so if you're only on the audio bridge please let yourself be known now. Thank you.

As a reminder to all, please state your name before speaking per transaction purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I will turn the call back over to Jeff Neuman.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you. Hello everyone. Welcome to our call. Before we get started I just want to remind everyone that we also do have a call planned for next Monday as well so for whatever reason you do not have an invite or you do not know about it please let us know and we will make sure that you get an invite.

The purpose of these two calls, in addition to what we have on the agenda, really is to make sure we have CC2 finalized so that we can get the questions out before we all start leaving for ICANN 58 in Copenhagen.

Okay, with that said, the agenda for today will be, as usual, going over any changes to statement of interest. We will then get a review of what's going on in the work tracks. And then the bulk of our time spent on talking about CC2, or Community Comment 2, and then we will spend a couple minutes before the end talking about ICANN 58 and some of the sessions that you should have received an email from Steve Chan talking about sessions that are relevant to us in Copenhagen. So we will spend a couple minutes talking about that.

So before I go on to the statements of interest, is there anything else that anyone wants to add to the agenda? Okay, not seen any hands I will go to the statements of interest. Any changes to statement of interest that someone would like to disclose here? Again, seeing no hands raised or anyone on the phone.

Let's go to updates of the work tracks. So this week we have Work Tracks 1 and 2 that are meeting, so why don't we start there? Who do we have from Work Track 1? I know we have – I see Sara – I don't see Sara. Yes, sorry there you are. Sara, thanks.

Sara Bockey: Yes, this is Sara Bockey for the record. Work Track 1 will be meeting tomorrow I think at 20 UTC, if I'm not mistaken. And we will be discussing the Application Guidebook touching back on systems and communications and taking any additional feedback regarding our CC2 questions to get those

finalized. So that's what we have on the agenda for tomorrow. I hope folks can join and provide input. That's all I have.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks, Sara. And just before we go on, so none of the work tracks are actually going to be looking at the CC2 questions, but really the role of today and next week is for the full group to go over the questions. They have now officially been passed on to us as the full group so we will not be going over the CC2 questions in any of the work track calls for this week or next week.

Avri, I see your hand raised.

Avri Doria: Yes, just a quick point on that. They won't be going over them, but should there be clarification questions or something that this first reading decides to send back to the group saying they need to help in terms of resolving those issues. So I just wanted to point that out. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Avri. Good point. And yes, if we do end up sending any of them back for clarification than they will be addressed on the work track calls very thank you for that. The next group is Work Track 2, and do I see Michael on the phone? I see a Michael, I'm assuming that's Michael Flemming, yes, oh there you are. Michael.

Michael Flemming: Yes, I'm Michael Flemming. I'm not sure who the other Michael is. But, yes, so Work Track 2 this week, we are planning to look at the closed generics this week. We've been moving along very rather well over the past few weeks. So we're just going to try to keep up speed over the closed generics. And if anyone does have any questions on the CC2 for Work Track 2 today than please bring that to the next meeting and we will try to provide some clarifications if we can. So and, sorry, our meeting this week is on Thursday at 21 UTC. So I will look forward to speaking with everyone then. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Michael. Karen, you were Work Track 3, or Robin, whichever one wants to give an update? Okay, Karen, thanks.

Karen Day: Okay. Hi, this is Karen Day. We are in the middle of looking at string related issues in Work Track 3. We have a couple of a strawman proposals in front of us. We looked at string similarity on our call last week. Next week we will be looking at a proposal we have for confusing string objections and confusing similarity objections, excuse me. And the (Sword) tool, and we will also next week be doing our introductory look at community related issues that are in Work Track 3 such as community applications and community priority evaluation and community objections. And our next call is Tuesday, March 7 at the same 1500 hour. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thank you, Karen. This is Jeff Neuman again. Work Track 4, we have both Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Rubens on the call. Who would like to give the update?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Rubens, do you have audio? If not, I'm happy to do it. Okay, just assuming Rubens isn't set up for audio, which sometimes happens, connectivity is an issue from time to time for us all.

Work Track 4 met last week and we had a guest presenter, (Don Holland) that talked to us about some of the aspects of universal acceptance. And it was very good to get that done before we look towards are next pieces of work and discussions at the Copenhagen meeting. And we also, quite thankfully, got through our CC2 questions.

We, I don't believe, are meeting before the Copenhagen meeting now. If we are, I won't be there because I'll be on a plane. So I think that's it for me. Rubens, are you able to make any additions?

Avri Doria: He said he couldn't speak.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: As I say, it happens. Thanks, Avri. Oh, yes there it is. My chat only just popped that up. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks, Cheryl. And then with that is there any questions from any of the participants for any of the work tracks? Okay, I'm not seeing any, so then I'm going to turn the call over to Avri, walk us through reading Number 1 of the CC2 document. Karen, your hand is up. I'm assuming that's an old hand? Yes, okay. So, Avri, you are up.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. This is Avri Doria speaking. And it's my task to try and take us through the first reading of CC2. We need to do two readings before we send it on to comment and put it out. And we are scheduled to try and do that before the upcoming meeting so it's very important that we get through it.

In terms of going through it, what I want to suggest is that I'll go page by page, I'll discuss any of the open comments on a page and the PDF does have them. I'll probably just get over any of those that are just editorial changes. And I'll ask if anyone else has any issues on a page before moving on to the next one. Does anybody object to my doing it this way? I see no hands and hear nothing. So - and I got at least one green check, so thank you.

So starting off on Page 1, Page 1 is the cover letter is essentially and any changes that I see on it, actually I don't see any, so yes I do, I see an editorial, so any issues on 1? Moving on, and, Jeff, please - I will take a look at the hands and not probably that much the comments so please jump in if I miss something.

Okay, on Page 2 there are a bunch of editorials. There were changes so for example changing "allowing" to "enabling" and such as that, "achieving" oh no that one's editorial. So just be aware that some of those editorials may have content.

There is a comment I stuck in, and it's just basically that we always refer to accreditation programs but in the subject heading I'm just wondering whether we shouldn't be more explicit and say something like Registry Services Accreditation Program so that people don't think we are looking myriad ones just from the chart. I don't know if anyone has concerns with that.

Also just a recommendation that we spell out RPM because while most of us know what it is, not necessarily everyone in the broader community will know that. So just a general note about anyplace that we have an acronym in first use, we should probably spell it out so that any of those that aren't quite cognizant of acronyms are not uncomfortable.

Any comments on Page 2? Yes, Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Not on Page 2 but just requesting if possible that you move from one page to other page (unintelligible) change that page from the screen. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you, Kavouss. And we have it that the screen is currently unsynced so that people can move around themselves through it.

Kavouss Arasteh: Okay.

Avri Doria: For me to actually comply with your request I would have to sync it. Also...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...so, Kavouss, thank you for speaking up. It reminded me that you had specifically asked that the chairs make note of people speaking slowly, trying to emphasize every syllable, though I must say that is a difficult request but at least speaking slowly. And that we all, that's all of us, make our comments short to the point with suggestions. So you asked us to specifically pass on that request and I've done so.

Okay I see two hands. Kavouss, is that a new hand? Susan, please go ahead.

Susan Payne: Thanks. Yes, Susan Payne for the transcript. Yes, just in relation to 1.1 and the term “accreditation programs” and apologies, I haven't checked the chart for but so my question is are we required to use this term, “accreditation” by the charter or use the term that we've intended to be adopting instead when we talk about this which is something like certification? Since when we first began talking about this topic, accreditation caused concerns around what was being proposed.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I'd have to go back and check the charter to be sure. Steve or Emily, do you remember offhand? Yes, Steve, I see your hand.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Avri.

Avri Doria: Please shut off the echo?

Steve Chan: Thanks for that. So the – the words here are actually pulled from the charter. So what I did is actually in the document here in parenthetical I've put a Registry Services so I don't know that we're necessarily beholden to use the charter terms in this regard, but I think it's probably helpful to maintain consistency. So, yes, the history is that these are the words pulled from the charter, but I think it's up to us if we want to make it more descriptive to make it more helpful for people. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. Perhaps it's possible on this one, and I see Susan's hand is still up, but perhaps it's possible on this one to include a footnote. By the way, the echo is really annoying. To add just a footnote that the term is under discussion in the group etcetera. But, oh no, Susan, your hand is down. But I think keeping the words as they were in the original document is good.

It may also be worth adding a note that says this terminology is - and maybe this is the only footnote that's needed - the terminology used in this chart is based on the charter and does not necessarily reflect the state of discussion in the group at the moment or something like that. Anyway any other comments on Page 2?

Yes, Jeff, I see your hand.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Avri. This is Jeff Neuman. In the spirit of a comment I probably should have made earlier, if people have commented it would be great to volunteer to take that back and get a written revision, if that's something that you can do. So I will take note of what was just said on the terminology and I will volunteer to help come up with that note, Avri, so you can put me down for that.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. I trust that either Steve or Emily will take note of that. Thanks. Okay, so moving on, no more hands, no more comments, Page 3. On Page 3, we start to get down to the Section 3 where we start to have some discussions, but let me see if they're all - they seem largely clarification wordings to me. There is the addition of next-generation, there is replacing data with directory. And there is replacement of constituency with SO/AC SG/C which has been our common practice. Any comments on Page 3 or its comments?

An assumption I am making is that after we've gone by a page and there have been no objections to recommended changes, but those changes can be accepted. Okay, no Page 3, moving onto Page 4. That's a very short page. Please forward your comments in and put to us by date. Date have been highlight so that somebody will indeed put in the proper date. I am sure that Emily or Steve will remember to do that but thank you for highlighting it so that we remember.

Okay, and I don't expect any more changes on 4. So now we move to Annex A, which is where the meat really starts. So on Page – and this is now Page 5, the first real changes, as a sentence added that says that such a program would be on a voluntary basis and would not approve - not preclude approval of registry's own RSP or the approval of additional new RSPs.

There's a deletion of 1.1, with a replacement question, "What do you see as the benefits and risks in implementing such a program?" And then there is a beginning of a section that continues on to Page 6, so I will hold out for Page 6. Other than the highlight two lines at the bottom, any more issues on Page 5? No? Okay so then moving on with Page 5, we have a highlight section that talks about some of the potential benefits and some of the risks, etcetera.

And then we have Greg's comment, "We are asking for benefits and risks but we only list benefits. We should either eliminate the discussion of benefits or present a balanced discussion of both benefits and risks. I would favor eliminating this discussion since this is the only question where we provide a model answer."

Seems a good point to me. Is there any objection to following the suggestion? Yes, Kristina, I see your hand.

Kristina Rosette: Thank you. Kristina Rosette for the transcript. My comment was actually for Page 5. I just didn't get my hand raised in time. Apologies.

Avri Doria: Apologies for moving too fast.

Kristina Rosette: So, it has to do with the new sentence that's added about 1.1.1. And it's really just a suggestion for clarification. And that would be I think it would be helpful to add after "operators" to phrase as its, so between operators and owned so that it would read, "Would not preclude the approval of the registry operators," I'm sorry it should be, "acting as its own RSP."

Avri Doria: Does anybody object to that change? Hearing no objections, see no hands, and if I do go too quickly I will go back any time, so thank you, Kristina, I see no objections.

Kristina Rosette: Great, thank you.

Avri Doria: And we'll go on. Okay, thank you. Okay, going back to the question that I asked about Greg's suggestion that we drop the yellow expanded -- do the yellow, I am by the way looking at the online doc as opposed to the one in the screen because it is so much easier to see. But yes, this section is highlight there. So any objection to dropping that paragraph as suggested by Greg? Yes, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Gas thanks. I'm just looking at the comments in the chat. And Greg said that he put in some risks. I don't see those risks. I'd rather put in both the benefits and the risks then deleting that paragraph just to show that we've done some thinking about this, and maybe start thinking.

So we've Greg, if you could just resubmit those risks maybe then we can kind of balance that out. But I'd be much more in favor of putting in benefits and risks then just deleting everything else.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you, Jeff. So, Greg, are you on the call? Greg is on the call. So, Greg, do you accept the challenge to give us some of those risks to include in that paragraph? Or just resubmit what you already sent and perhaps we can already find that in email. I don't see it in the document. But perhaps they were submitted in the sub team. So Greg, will you help us. I see you were typing. I see Jeff is typing. Okay, Greg is basically still preferring the elimination of the single model answer.

So any other comments on this? We've had one speak in favor and one speak against. Basically comments like we should not be amateur antitrust

economists. Any other comments or – okay, I don't see any other comments. So what I recommend is I guess it's – oh, Kavouss, please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I have a comment on Paragraph 1.1.10, if you are still on this Page 6?
And...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Oh yes...

Avri Doria: Okay, yes, we're not quite there yet. We're not quite there yet. We're still working on this previous issue. But I'll come back to you as soon as we have finished on this.

Kavouss Arasteh: Good.

Avri Doria: Okay, I still see no comments on the point between Jeff and Greg. So perhaps, Jeff and Greg, you can discuss this, see if you can come up with a paragraph that works and that Greg thinks is not amateur economizing or economizing. And we'll come back to it as an item, but this can be listed as an item to be resolved before the second reading. And since only two people have voiced interest in this issue, I will ask Greg and Jeff to get together on it and see if you can't hammer it out.

And I see Jeff, that I will work with you. And Greg's question, "Will you provide model answers for the other questions?" My first dance around that will be probably not at this point. So that may be a point in a discussion between Jeff and Greg.

Can I move on from this one now? We have a lot of these to get through. This is now marked as an issue to be resolved before second reading. And let's not get into the details of the question now, if that's okay. Any objection to that? Okay, let me see if anybody put in any of those red markers. I see no

red markers so I will move on and just ask that this be notated as an off-line issue before the next reading.

Okay continuing on Page 6, I get to -- we have several questions, one of them for 10, that we have text changes at 1.1.6, 1.1.7, 1.1.8 and 1.1.9. And are there any - and there is also a pending question on 1.1.6 where Donna said she didn't understand the question. And I think I added a note, I don't either. So perhaps someone can speak to that confusion of 1.1.6. And it will still get back to you, Kavouss, on 1.1.10 when we get there.

Okay, Kavouss, is your hand still a 1.1.10? If it...

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, 1.1.10 and...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Okay, okay, that's okay.

Kavouss Arasteh: ...on 1.1.8 before 1.1.10.

Avri Doria: Okay then I'll get back to you...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...at 1.1.8. I'm on 1.1.6 at the moment, so I will -- I just didn't want to ignore your hand. Okay, Jeff, please.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. I think this was my question and I am looking at the wording and it's probably not clear. I guess the question I was trying to get at was essentially that there is another -- that there is a process in the agreement working on material subcontracting changes. So if a registry operator wants to change out its backend service provider, ICANN is working

on a process to do that without necessarily having to do a complete review from scratch of the new registry service provider.

And I was I guess trying to make the point that we could take some of the lessons learned or the findings of that group and potentially incorporate them into a work that we do so that we wouldn't be developing two different types of tests, one for switching out a backend provider and one for adding a provider to this preapproved list or program. If that doesn't make sense I'm happy to take wording changes or drop the question completely. It's fine either way. But that was the point I was trying to get at, whether there is a belief that we could use some of that process to feed into this, but not sure we need to ask the question.

Avri Doria: Okay, any other comments on that? Are people fine with removing 1.6? Or does someone want to volunteer to help reword it? Okay, Jeff is fine with removing since he put it in. Are there any – and I see no objections to removing it so let's scratch 1.1.6.

Moving on, any issues with 1.1.7? Okay. Kavouss, we're at 1.1.8, please, your issues with 1.1.8.

Kavouss Arasteh: One, one eight, I suggest to replace continuous by (theoretical) basis. Should there be a process to reapprove (RC)s on a (theoretical) basis but not continuous. You could not have continuously approval, but we – you reapprove from one second to other second. Is it continuous? Then...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Kavouss Arasteh: ...perhaps it is meant by periodical in a long time and then you ask what is the seeds of all between each year approvals if I am properly understood. So I have the...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Kavouss Arasteh: And that's a problem with continuous. Yes. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you for that. Anybody object to changing continuous to periodical? I don't see any hands or protest on it so go ahead with that. Oh yes (Christina) please.

(Christina): I'm not necessarily objecting to changing it. I guess my concern would be that depending upon how those periods are configured and how much time there is between them, I mean, for example if there was a one month window every year where new RSPs could be approved I would think that that would not be very helpful.

But if it was, you know, the first three weeks of every month it would be possible to apply for some kind of – and whatever we're going to call it, certification, accreditation, whatever, I think that would be fine. So I would prefer that...

Avri Doria: Okay.

(Christina): ...perhaps what we do is maybe change continuous to rolling and in lieu of that it addresses Kavouss' concerns. But I'm just hesitant to move from continuous to periodic without having greater clarity as to how often the periods would be.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you (Christina). One thing I do note – the next sentence in that question does ask about how often and what should the process be. So at – your question is actually built in there for input and further discussion, so does that in any sense change your issue?

Kavouss Arasteh: Avri what was the suggestions? Is...?

((Crosstalk))

(Christina): Yes I would be – yes I would be fine with that. I was actually...

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes.

(Christina): ...reading the question differently to suggest that the actual process of becoming accredited in the first place – so – and I don't know so never mind.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. So Kavouss' suggestion was to change periodical to rolling but I think (Christina) has withdrawn that, but I see Jeff's hand who wants to contribute something to this discussion.

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes thanks. And just to – sorry, this is Jeff Neuman. Well yes the point of this question was for like a renewal process or, you know, it's approved. You know, does it have to get reapproved next year, two years, three years?

That was what I was hoping by drafting that question but if that's not clear I'd welcome any changes to that. But that's - the point of the question is, you know, once it's approved does it have to go through another process on a periodic basis to be reapproved? Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. So at the moment I think we're at a place where we have accepted periodical with the secondary question and invite any comments for clarification to what's written there before our second reading, but let's not try to wordsmith it here.

Okay any objection to moving on? Okay then – and I'll come back to you at 1.10 Kavouss assuming that's why your hand is still up.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Right. Okay at 1.1.9 any objections to 1.1.9 being accepted? I see none and no hands. Okay we're at 1.1.10. Please Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes 1.1.10. In the second line after grandfathering there is a word. It is work. How would such banks really work? Are we talking of what is implementation, application, function? What do you mean by work because there are different – an outcome of that?

You have some grandfathering. Then you have to establish how it would be implemented. You have a grandfathering – how it could be – function. So I just wonder which one you meant.

You meant the functioning of grandfathering from the implementation point of view or from what? That is a word – the suggestion by work – grandfathering works.

Avri Doria: Okay. Okay thank you.

Kavouss Arasteh: And the functions.

Avri Doria: I think the...

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...grandfathering referred to organizations that functioned as RSPs so it would be that but I'll ask anyone that wants to add further clarification. So it's the grandfathering of an entity who has been certified, accredited, whatever the word we're using is.

Kavouss Arasteh: But I suggest that replace the work by functions and implemented. In cases...

Avri Doria: Thank you. Jeff?

Kavouss Arasteh: ...like that we have these functions. Yes. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes we're approving – right. Not functions but organizations or entities. Jeff I see your hand is up.

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes I think – sorry, it's Jeff Neuman. I – you're right Avri. That – the point was about entities that were – that would be grandfathered in and the grandfathering – maybe we can make this question a little bit clearer.

If – for - organizations that already act as an RSP for an existing delegated TLD is really what we're talking about. I don't know if we want to clarify that or it – but that's what we're talking about.

Avri Doria: Probably worth making a note for clarification. As Rubens said in the chat anything that the people in this group feel they need clarification for. Others may need clarification though at times there may be a penalty in knowing too much about the subject that thought requires a clarification.

But we really should try to make sure so I would mark this one as acceptable in essence, but it needs a little bit of wordsmithing before the second reading. Okay?

Any other issues on that one? I see none so anything else on Page 6? Now there's a – is that a comment? There's a Greg Shatan comment on the title here that says, "Do we want to ask about improved publicity and outreach to potential supported applicants and improved processes for applying this support?"

Many of the concerns about this program that I heard focus on these issues." So if I understand correctly Greg that would be the addition of some additional question. Is that the point of your comment?

Gregory Shatan: Yes it is. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Is there any comment on adding some question/comment that covers what essentially Greg put in the comment? I see no objection to adding that so for the moment we can almost take what Greg wrote and turn it into a question and add it. Is there any objection to doing that before the second reading?

And I see no objection to doing that so that's another one of our action items before a second reading. Yes Kavouss I see your hand.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. I apologize. I have some difficulty to understand the meaning of 1.2.3. "The working group has noted that even in presence of a well-funded, well-communicated comprehensive program, potential applicants may still not believe applying for a gTLD is in their hands and – in their best interests." So what do you mean by this? The applicant still not believe. Are we base it on...

Avri Doria: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: ...for applicants?

Avri Doria: Okay thank you.

Kavouss Arasteh: What do you mean by this?

Avri Doria: Okay thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Once again you're slightly ahead of me but let's – let – we'll get to that question now. So we've finished on Page 6 and we've moved on to Page 7. Just want to check.

Was there anything else on Page 6 as I was doing the move? Okay no, so then we do have the question by Kavouss that requires clarification in 1.2.2. But – and I think that that’s a good point.

The applicant support program is mainly focused on – so just clarification on that of what other support mechanisms might be being referred to and just clarify that question.

But I want to go back now and so that should probably get marked. Anything that’s a clarification should get marked as a – something to be done before the second reading.

But in 1.2.1.2 Greg had put in a comment about the word – he did not follow the jargon in this area. Sorry. Oh in terms of the meaning of least developed versus such than – and basically people are sort of using UN language and so that strikes me as yet another call for clarification of what we mean by developed, what we mean by developing, what we mean by underserved, et cetera.

Is that a correct interpretation Greg of your question? Okay I hear no other comments on that so I’ll assume that I got it right and there’s a place where we can...

((Crosstalk))

Gregory Shatan: Yes. Sorry Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Gregory Shatan: That’s right. Just wasn’t sure whether this should be called developing or developed. I don’t know what a developed – if a developed but struggling region is one that – was one developed and didn’t struggle and is now

backbiting. Again a different kind of amateur economist that I – I'm not qualified to play.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Right. Yes.

Gregory Shatan: ...anti-trust accounts.

Avri Doria: Okay yes. I thought we were using the UN terms and if we are we should give a reference to them, and if we're not we should define our terms so thank you.

Are there other notes? Okay there was a note on 1.2.4 and Kavouss you have your hand up on this issue?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. I'm sorry. Perhaps I meant to announce I was - meant 1.2.3 but not 1.2.2. I did not have any problem with 1.2.2 but 1.2.3 in the last part. "Are there additional applicant support," and then is there – the comment we have, "success," and then we have, "metrics that should be evaluated," or so on, so forth.

So we – first are there any other support on this? Before asking please explore that. What support do we go to the success – what does success mean? Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. So I guess that's another request for clarification of what is meant by a success metric. I think that's become an ICANN term of art lately for how do we know when we've been successful.

Oh we use metrics of success but perhaps it is good to get into a little bit more detail. I see Steve who has his hand up and is probably going to answer that one. Please Steve.

Steve Chan: Thanks Avri. This is Steve. And so I actually wrote this question so I can hopefully try to provide some clarity and then we can of course make it more clear in the wording.

So the – what this is trying to note is that a lot of folks have identified the lack of participation in the applicant support program as, you know, one sense of why it's seen as a failure or unsuccessful I guess is maybe a better word to use there.

So what this is trying to get at is that even if this program is, you know, quote unquote perfect it's got all the things that you want to have in terms of funding, in terms of communicating to potential applicants.

And that report from AM Global – it indicated that even if all those things are set up right there may be certain – there may be reasons why potential applicants in those regions still do not want to actually apply.

It just might not be in the best business interest or they don't see the opportunity, whatever the case may be. So there's – trying to look beyond just whether or not there are applicants taking advantage of the program. Hopefully that helps explain it. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. May need a little bit of wordsmithing before the second reading. Does anybody have any question or objection on the way the question has been explained by Steve?

Okay then moving on we had – then we had a suggestion of a question 1.2.4, which was an open-ended question on applicant support. Does – and that was suggested – let me go back here in the comments.

It was - Jorge suggested, "Can there be an open 1.2.4 question requesting any other suggestions for improving applicant support?" I translated it. Does anybody object to adding this open-ended question?

Seeing no objection/hearing no objection let's add that point in. Okay and moving on – okay in 1.3.1 we have a deletion of a line. There had been, "among others, seemed to be developed after the launch of the program. Do you agree with this assessment?"

And basically that was deleted and basically it was replaced with, "among others, seems to be developed after the launch. Do you agree with this assessment with the legal agreement, et cetera?"

Does anybody object to that change? I see nothing. Okay. Moving on to the next comment is Greg's comment still in 1.3.1. Their TLD applications – Greg asks, "Referring to changes made after the AGB was final but before applications were submitted, after applications were submitted or both, did this impact the applications themselves or the post-application process?"

So if I understand correctly Greg you would like the question sort of amplified and clarified a bit about the fact that changes did occur at two different times, and ask whether there's any difference in the effect on when those changes were done? Is that a correct note of what you'd like to see changed in that one?

Gregory Shatan: Yes in part. The other point is from the point of view of the applicants we're talking – saying, "Many applicants have argued that these changes impacted their TLD applications," but it's not clear at what point this impact occurred to the applicant.

And maybe we're asking about all of those but we're not asking. That's a statement of fact or of argument. So in terms of setting the scene I'm just – it just was not clear to me whether this statement related to changes – to which

changes it related to and where did it relate to the application process for these applicants who were complaining that the rules were kind of changing along the way? But yes there definitely needs to be some clarification...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Gregory Shatan: ...on both points.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. So yes there's a note for clarification on the points. Thanks for amplifying it. This is me speaking. Personally I think we'll have – we'll find that different applicants had effect at different points in their process, but it is definitely worth clarifying. Kavouss I see your hand. Please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes my hand – it's about a general issue of these changes. Once the program has been launched and application comes, any changes should not have retroactive application to those applications which already been launched or already submitted.

So changes should not have retroactive application to whatever has been already received. It might help if we can think back on whatever has not been received but would not be into the past.

Usually this is a process that everybody agrees that - no retroactive applications. Once you apply for something you base yourself on what was before but not what's coming after. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you Kavouss. I think that would be a very fine answer for someone to submit to this question, but I'm not quite sure how it fits into the asking of the question.

So perhaps someone wants to add part – the question is - and I think this fits in with Greg's question perhaps is does – do changes made after an

applicant – application has been submitted have a specially deleterious affect or some such comment or some such question.

But - yes but don't want to necessarily put solutions into these questions, but it's quite a reasonable solution and certainly can be discussed in the policy formation once we get the answers to the questions.

And yes people have spoken about how Kavouss is difficult to understand. I have managed I think to understand what's being said. It's one of the reasons I'm repeating things but it sometimes does sound like you're speaking underwater Kavouss. Apologies for that.

And we have Trang's comment. "Application changes are sometimes needed for applicants to address issues raised against their applications, for example to address GAC early warning."

So that would also be part of the solution space and understanding, and this is back to that overarching issue discussion we had of where does flexibility and predictability start?

So I think this all gets bound up in that question and should be clarified in the asking. Any other comments on 1.3 before I move on? Okay by the way we're – we have like 36 minutes left to this meeting and we are still on Question 1 but let's see where we get to.

I just wanted to do a time check. Okay in which case I'll move on to 1.4 with the notion that 1.3 needs clarification. 1.4, application fees. We have a comment from Greg.

"Overall I think this section suffers from failing to distinguish between the concept of cost recovery and the implementation of cost recovery, which seemingly resulted in a miscalculation leading to fees that were arguably well in excess of cost recovery.

In other words cost recovery may be a great idea but the execution got it wrong. Some of the questions are about cost recovery concept and others about how it was executed but they are jumbled together.”

So that’s a question for clarification for the whole section and then I see no hands. Greg has a further comment in that the coda to, I mean, the chapeau to this – oh no there’s a Donna and there’s also Donna Austin comment.

I’m not quite sure how to deal with these comments in line. “But I don’t think we can say that the cost recovery concept resulted in excessive fees. Rather it was due to execution – off target projections of costs since an ideal cost recovery basis would result in neither a surplus nor a shortfall.

Of course since this had never been done before projection was more than science, and presumptions may have been made in the most conservative manner to avoid any potential shortfalls.”

So I think that that fits into that whole discussion that Greg already had about differentiating between the notion of a cost recovery program and the implementation of a cost recovery program. Kavouss I see your hand up.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. Do you hear me now and not underwater but normally? Do you hear me please?

Avri Doria: I hear you but it is difficult to...

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...barely hear you.

Kavouss Arasteh: Okay I try my best. I had serious difficulty with application of cost recovery because it is very, very difficult to implement and very difficult to have assumption for the use of cost recovery.

I have done this exercise elsewhere for other issues for five years and after that everything was based on just a guesstimate and not reality, so it should be taken with caution. It's very difficult to and complex to implement. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you again Kavouss for what would be a very fine answer to the question; however trying to avoid answering these questions at the moment. So I don't see any objection to taking Greg's suggestion to do a rework of this to cover the separation of policy from implementation and I see some agreement with that.

Okay. Any other – let me see. And there was one other comment here that – and this is in 1.4.2. There's a question that says, "Noting that considerable surplus remains," and Greg asks, "Is this true?"

ICANN's reserves are about 1/3 of what they should be for nonprofit corporation of its size. How can these two data points be reconciled if they are both true?"

I don't have the answer to that and that's therefore a question that would have to go to someone in the Staff or the – or as it's sometimes called the organization.

And I don't know if anybody has an answer for that now but we should flag that question and correct it if it is inaccurate. Kavouss is that a new hand?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes a new hand. I suggest that either delete considerable or replace it with something else. It is difficult to say what considerable surplus means: \$10 billion, \$100 million dollars?

So if you replace considerable by something else or delete that - there's some surplus but not considerable because we don't know. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Does anybody object to dropping the word considerable? It is a matter of opinion so – okay I see no one objecting to considerable so I suggest we accept Kavouss' edit on that line.

So any other comments on this beyond the need to clarify and any other comments on Page 7? I see no comments. I see no objections so I'll move on to Page 8.

Okay Page 8. The first comment we have is on relating to legal and other contingencies. Greg asks, "Were there others or was it only legal?" Again that would be a question for those who know. I don't know.

So basically Greg is your suggestion that and other be removed if we cannot identify another one?

Gregory Shatan: This is Greg Shatan. Yes that would be my suggestion. I'm thinking right now that lobbying was also included in that third bucket, which would be at least technically a non-legal cost but it would be nice to make sure.

But since I'm now recalling that lobbying was in there I feel we're probably okay leaving it in unless I'm wrong.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. So we'll just clarify whether there were other contingencies, and if there was at least one other contingency in the calculation we can leave this.

Okay, moving on. Now Krista added some text. "With cost recovery in mind should there be a floor or ceiling minimum?" Oh no that's the old text. "What are the implications of having a strict cost recovery fee?"

And this is again something that Kavouss has already given us a possible answer to so that – but Greg asks, “What does this mean?” I’m not sure I understand the question.

I think it’s sort of one of those semi-open questions of are there implications in having a strict cost recovery fee? And I guess that means one where it’s been carefully calculated down to the coin. I don’t know. So I guess...

Gregory Shatan: Yes this is Greg.

Avri Doria: Greg.

Gregory Shatan: Just briefly yes I think the – my point there was just what is a strict cost recovery fee versus a non-strict one? I don’t know if these are, you know, terms of art or if we’re just kind of making them up as we go along.

But I guess – and I’m assuming by the way that this was in fact a, you know, called it cost recovery or that was a, you know, a projected cost recovery. In any case it’s always going to be projected so I don’t know how – what a – what’s a strict one versus a lax one and why one that’s not done particularly well would be good. And I’d - is it proposed somewhere that there is a strict cost recovery fee, if it’s asking for the implications of it for the - at no point do we suggest that that’s actually what it is, a strict cost recover fee. So the question seems to be getting ahead of itself.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. (Krista), if I can since the edit was yours, do you believe that on hearing the questions, can you clarify the question or can the question be removed? So (Krista) answers in the chat i.e., no other activities would be included to increase the price over some minimum.

So (Krista), if I understand that, does that mean that in policy one would state what the items included in cost recovery were and then the implementation

would be expected to strictly adhere to only including those costs in that? And so strict really means policy directed inclusion of types of costs or something. And Kavouss has his hand up, as does Jeff.

Kavouss Arasteh: I am on 17.1 if you are there. If you are not there, I'll wait.

Avri Doria: No. We're still on 14.3. So Jeff...

Kavouss Arasteh: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...please if you're on 14.3.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. This is on 14.3. And I think we should probably move on but - because this was subject to a number of discussions within Work Track 1. But (Krista)'s point essentially is, and we could maybe remove the word strict, but the question was if you just did it on cost recovery, the potential was that the cost of applying or the fee applied would be really, really low or could be very low.

And therefore, would you want some sort of floor on the pricing to make sure that was not too low so that squatters and others didn't come into the space? So I think (Krista)'s point was what are the implications of (just) doing it on a strict cost recovery - strictly based on cost recovery as opposed to based on cost recovery plus something else.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: But I think we can remove the word strict and then move on.

Avri Doria: Okay. And mark this one down for further clarification before a second reading. Okay. Moving on.

Greg Shatan: Avri, if I could interrupt.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Greg Shatan: Greg.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: ...I did not get that implication about the, you know, about gaming or squatting or if the price is too low, we let in undesirables. That - if it's an implication, it doesn't make its way into the text for anybody who is not in Work Track 1 or at least not for me and probably not for any reader and an SO/AC who's not even in this group.

So if that is an implication, we should cite it because it's the - if anything, I read this as looking for somehow ways to lower the fees because, you know, they were too high based on the actual cost rather than the projected cost.

And the idea that there should be a fee for reasons other than, you know, financial reasons, you know, to create a good faith barrier to bad faith entry I just didn't get that at all. So...

Avri Doria: Okay. Understood.

Greg Shatan: ...I'm not (unintelligible). So that should be - if we want to - if we want to be able to think about that, we should tell people that's one of the things we're thinking about.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. So take that as a note for the clarification purpose since this one is now marked for further clarification. Okay. Moving on. I'm not quite at 1.7 yet.

I've got a comment on 16.2, which is a Greg comment. This seems to be buried version of the question of rounds versus open applications. Is that the

intent of the question or is there something else it is meant to get at? If the former, a potential change of this magnitude should not be buried like this.

Okay. On Question 2, which was is the concept of fixed period of time for accepting applications the right approach? I don't - okay. I don't know that I would read it that way myself because the overarching question was asking about whether there should be - I don't know. Other opinions.

I think I'm halfway between thinking Greg is right and halfway thinking that there may be a reason to ask it. Jeff, I see you put your hand up so hopefully you're coming to my rescue.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I didn't draft the question but I think it was to get at when we were having discussions that it was decided that for the - or not decided, sorry, discussed that three months may be an appropriate length of time to shop applications for the first application window but potentially for future application windows it could be a shorter period of time. I think that was kind of the fixed versus variable but agree we have to reword it.

Avri Doria: Okay. So yes. This one is marked for either clarification or removal as it gets more discussed I would say. Any objection to marking it that way? So if we can't clarify it to where it's not contrary to the overarching question but is more of a follow up to the overarching question based on some of the possible solutions that have been discussed, then there is a question worth asking.

If it is just a re-asking of a previously asked overarching question, then it should be dropped. Okay. Okay. In which case I am at 17. And Kavouss, you have your hand up about 17.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. My hand is about 17 but on the substance but not on the wording.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Kavouss Arasteh: It's (the same) position that I have here is not clear for the reader when this issue of first come first serve come. I am not in favor nor against that. But the first come first serve approach is only applicable when a round is open and continues (forever). In that case in order to have some order on that, you need to establish some (good) amount, which would be first come first serve.

Like with those who've come before have some priority with those come after. But the depiction first come first serve does not apply. It is not clear in this part what you are really talking about. First come first serve in my view it only applies when you open the round and this round continues forever. Then we establish first come first serve approach. With a fixed round approach that does not apply.

Avri Doria: Right.

Kavouss Arasteh: Did you (unintelligible) or not. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Yes. I think this question is asking the hypothetical since the decision has not been made on first come first serve versus the periodic possibilities that have been discussed and is asking hypotheticals to basically better understand some of the implications and also taking into account what has been discussed amongst - in the group about possibly starting off in one format and evolving to the other. So I've read this as a hypothetical question. But Jeff, your hand is up so please.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. So this is talking - Jeff Neuman. This is talking about the queuing of applications for review. So I think here first come first serve means first in first evaluated as opposed to getting the TLD, which is think is - goes to one of Greg's comments later on.

We're not talking about that if you're in first you get the TLD. This is talking about if you are in first, you get evaluated first. How that gets coordinated

with (contention sets) I don't know. But that's what first come first serve was supposed to mean.

Avri Doria: Okay. So that would be a clarification issue. Kavouss, I assume your hand is new.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. I'm sorry. I was not clear. I am not evaluating first come first serve whether good or not good. I'm saying that first come first serve is only applicable when you open a round that that round is continuous. First come first serve in any case would not be applicable when you open a round for each month and after that it is finished. This is what I wanted to say.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you.

Kavouss Arasteh: If it is clear somewhere - yes, thank you.

Avri Doria: Yes. Thank you. And I think that Jeff did clarify that and that that first come first serve will be replaced by something like first submitted for ordering a processing or some such thing. So this one is marked for clarification. And I think that takes your point into account before a second reading.

Now there was also - Greg had some questions on this. I want to see if they were covered. First come first service implications. A lot more than evaluation ordering if rounds are not used. And yes, that's been acknowledged in the subgroup.

If we are only asking about the impact of queuing on time to delegation, we should limit this section accordingly. If we are getting into priority for award of TLD, for example, like muni applications or first to file, that is a much different issue and at least should not be scrambled up with the relatively short-term issue of total process time recognizing that it is no small problem except when compared to not getting the TLD at all.

I'm not sure that that last statement would be agreed to by all applicants but that be as it may. So this looks like it feeds into the clarification exercise that is needed on this particular sentence.

And accepting that, is there any objection with leaving this marked for clarification taking into account Kavouss' and Greg's comments on it for clarification? There may have also been comments in the chat that I have not kept up with on this. And I don't want to go through them at the moment. They are in the written record. And I ask those working on the clarifications to take them into account. It's obvious this one needs clarification.

Any other issues on Page 8 before I move on? Okay. Moving on to Page 9. In Page 9 there was a sentence added by Katrin Ohlmer, which was if you think they should be prioritized, do you have suggestions on - do you have suggestions on how to determine the prioritization? I added the word on between suggestions and how while reading.

Anybody object to that sentence being added? I see no objection on adding that sentence with my slight modification of the word on. Okay. Moving down. I'm now at 19.

And 19.2 I have a comment from Greg. Improvement on this issue should be asked about in the application support. So the question related to 19.2 metrics to understand the level of success of communications were not established. Do you have suggestions on what success looks like? In particular, lack of awareness around the applicant support.

I think that that question - moving that question does make sense. Does anyone object to that question being included? And I think it may already be included there but if not, include it there non-redundantly and remove from 19.2. Yes Greg, I see your hand.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg. I think it's fine to leave it here as an example. But just if my recollection of the applicant support process question was that we didn't really ask about success of communication back there. And I think I commented that we didn't.

And so the point is more that we need to make sure that if we're using it as an example in 19, we're actually asking about it in the applicant support section.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. So I misunderstood. And I thought though that from our discussion we did say that it would be - need to be dealt within clarification. But so you're saying in particular should be replaced for example, did...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: Yes. I think so. And also at the time I made the comment, we hadn't yet, you know, confirm that we would...

Avri Doria: Yes. No, I understand. I'm not - yes. I understand. Thank you. So any objection to changing in particular lack to for example does or did lack? No objection to that? And to making sure that we have included the question itself in the applicant support area.

Okay. Any other questions on Page 9? Okay. Moving on to ten. Okay. Ten starts Work Track 2. I want to note that we have 12 minutes left on this meeting. It would be incredible optimism on my part to think that we were going to get through Work Track 2 and 3 and 4 in the next 12 minutes.

So I'm wondering whether it makes sense for me to turn this back to you Jeff and basically turn it back with the question of since we still want to get this out by the document deadline that we still want to be able to have a second reading of it before getting it out, do we need to schedule another meeting

just to go through the rest of this document between now and our next planned meeting.

And if no one has any objection, I will turn it back to you now. You can then tell me no, start on Work Track 2 or deal with the issue of what do we do next.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks for the easy question there Avri.

Avri Doria: Hey, I gave you a suggestion.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I think we may just schedule another call for this week for those that can make it. But would strongly encourage people to read through the questions and to get edits over, you know, email or put it in the document itself.

So we will look at something to do later this week when we can find the - if we can find the time. So we'll work on that or potentially something next week. I know we have a call on Monday anyway scheduled so maybe two calls Monday and Tuesday. But let's - we'll take that back fairly quickly and get back to everyone on that.

I do think it's a little - be sure to start Number 2. But I do want to get into the point of our session at ICANN 58. So Steve Chan, you want to just start with just a quick description of the different sessions that we have and then we can get into talking about how we're going to use the first block of time?

Steve Chan: Sure. Thanks Jeff. This is Steve Chan. Excuse me. So I had sent around in email detailing what sessions are directly related to this working group. So there is a face-to-face on the first day of the meeting. It's scheduled to take place from 8:30 to 11:45. I'm not actually looking at the times. So I hope I'm getting this all accurately. But as I mentioned, it's sent out in the email.

So the intention of that meeting, and I think maybe Jeff will touch on this in a little more detail, is to likely use the CCT questions as a basis. I don't think we're going to, you know, talk about all of them necessarily.

I think we'll want to focus on some that are, you know, where maybe some of the conversations should be focused on. So I think we'll probably develop relatively equal times to each of the work tracks. So that is the face-to-face meeting on the first day of the meeting.

We're also looking at a more of an interactive session with the community where they're able to ask questions to the leaders or other participants of the group. That's set to be scheduled on Wednesday I believe from 5:00 to I think 6:30. I'm testing my memory here. That one I think was actually left off the schedule inadvertently. It's going to be put on there in the near future.

And there's also a new gTLD program (in this) review, which is not a dedicated session and so I didn't necessarily go into chronological order but that one is not directly related to this group.

So for us there is a face-to-face session on the first day and then there's also a second session, which I mentioned is more of a community facing outreach session on Day 5 on the Wednesday. I don't know if you're looking for more than that Jeff but hopefully that's helpful. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks Steve Chan. Sorry. It took me a second to get off mute. Yes. That's what I was looking for. So as Steve Chan said, the first session is in the morning on Day 1, Saturday, which is less than three weeks away now.

And the plan is to - for that session really is to go through the (CCT) questions to make sure to clarify for the community (to go to) questions, no necessarily to draw answers to those but really to explain the questions, the context, how we got those questions and then make sure that the community understands what those are.

I think there's time to get some sort of answers or some sort of feedback on those questions. I know that there are a lot of questions here. I know that, you know, 40 days to respond may not seem like a lot (for a) number of groups. So we should expect to hear some complaints I'm sure with the amount of questions.

But if you go back in time and we'll explain this too in the session. You know, all PDPs call for input from all constituencies, stakeholder groups and advisory committees on the entire subject matter of the PDP.

Normally that's done in advance, as the group is being setup for the first 30, 45 days. What we did here is decide to split it into overarching issues and then the specific issues. So that way giving kind of two public comment periods before we do the preliminary report. So that's the context of the questions.

With that said, I think that's pretty much the update. The leaders are going to meet this week and talk about how we conduct those other sessions and we're, you know, going to give - depending on the number of questions, we'll try to create a proportional amount of time for each of the work tracks to do their clarifications.

And I'm just trying to read the comments here. Avri, is there anything that in the comments I should repeat here? I've not been paying huge attention in the last couple minutes.

Avri Doria: Right. Well there was the one point of - this is Avri speaking. There was the one point of in our scheduling we should account for the fact that there's a number of us, myself included though I had forgotten, who will be in a IGF meeting the last three days of the week. And that meeting goes from - I believe it's 9:00 to 12:00 and 2:00 to 5:00 UTC.

So we would lose a certain number of people in that time zone. But other than that - let me see if there's anything I missed. I don't think so. Yes. No. I think we're fine.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So we'll try to find the - a good time for us to do the - to complete the first reading and the questions. And, you know, again, please (go in) - you all have the link to the document. Go in, make comments, suggest edits.

Really at this point suggestion of edits would be best unless you think a question should be eliminated or - then obviously there's no suggestion other than eliminating questions. So if people can respond to that. Right now we have four minutes - oh Kavouss, you have your hand up. Yes. Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Would we (have) clean document before the start of the ICANN (unintelligible) in Copenhagen or not? Thank you.

Avri Doria: We are trying. This is Avri responding. That's what we're trying to do. What we're trying to achieve is there's a document drop-dead date for submitting documents for the ICANN meeting. I forget what day it is. Steve Chan I'm sure knows. And what we're trying to do is get through our two readings so that yes we can put out the clean set of questions for people to answer before the Copenhagen meeting. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Avri. And then just to add onto that. We are not officially starting the clock on the public comment (bid) until after the ICANN meeting. And so we're not going to have the public comment period interrupted by the ICANN meeting.

So what we'll do is we'll count - we'll count the number of days after the meeting ends. So responses will not be due until the end of April potentially. Any other questions?

Avri Doria: This is Avri again. And Kavouss has his hand up. But I wanted to make one question/point on that. Since we're not starting the...

Jeff Neuman: Yes, please, Avri.

Avri Doria: ...yes. Since we're not starting the comment period until after, it means that (GO), we will go in there with a clean set of questions. It does not mean that the discussion then might not affect a question if we find something that needs further clarification.

And the other point I wanted to bring up is I think we saw just going through one here several issues that were controversial enough for comment and discussion. And so recommending that we consider those as the point issues that we spend a little bit more time on when we are in Copenhagen at the meeting. And Kavouss does have his hand up and I used up almost all the time.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. Very, very quick. (Exactly) need to have a second meeting before the ICANN Copenhagen. But if not, even the first meeting having the document would be very good for - but not having something not at all. So - or anything at all. So finish this second meeting before ICANN so for (some good). If not even (unintelligible). It should be put in at ICANN meeting, (that's okay).
Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you for that suggestion. It does make sense. If we fail to finish the complete pass before then, then yes, we will put out something for discussion continue but I'm pretty optimistic that we'll find a way to get a clean copy before then. We'll see. I'm professionally optimistic as a co-Chair.
Okay Jeff...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Avri. I am optimistic as well. We've now hit the end of our time. So I want to thank everyone for participating and encourage participation online in the Google doc. So thank you very much everyone and we can stop the recording.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

END