

**ICANN**  
**Transcription**  
**New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP - Sub Group C**  
**Thursday, 17 January 2019 at 21:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso-new-gtld-sub-pro-sub-group-c-17jan19-en.mp3> [audio.icann.org]  
Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p389mq2383z/>

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/2IWBq>  
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Operator: This is the operator. The recording has been started here as well.

Great, thank you. All right. Well, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Subgroup C call held on Thursday, the 17th of January, 2019. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge at this time, would you please let yourself be known now? And hearing no names, I just want to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I will turn it over to Michael Fleming. You may begin, Michael.

Michael Flemming: Thank you very much, and everyone, welcome to another episode of Subgroup C on this wonderful, beautiful Friday morning for myself, Thursday evening for others, and we welcome you, and (inaudible) time. We have come a long way in our journey of going through the wonders and adventures of Subgroup C material, but we are now starting to reach the end of our journey. We are beginning on the last bits of material that we have. We have about four more topics to go, and yet these topics are rather small, but nonetheless very important to discuss. So, let's begin, shall we? If you are joining me on the -- excuse me -- the Google doc, then we are on 2.10.2, Registrar Non-Discrimination/Registry-Registrar Standardization tab, or if you are joining me on the slides here, which I have not seen coming up, then we are not on this slide. Looks like it's being loaded. We are starting right at the top here. So, feel free to follow along and join us as we go through this.

Now, I will be looking using the Google doc, and I will not be looking at the screen directly, so I will stop at appropriate times, and then I will allow for input of certain material. So, let us begin (inaudible).

Starting from the top, and our first question, 2.10.2.c.1, "Recommendation 19 should be revised to be made current with the current environment. Registries must use only ICANN accredited registrars in registering domain and may not discriminate among such accredited registrars unless an exemption to the Registry Code of Conduct is granted." Excuse me. So -- and agreeing with these requirements, the BRG, Neustar, and the Registry Stakeholder Group. Not a whole lot of specific developments in this material that it's provided, so we shall take it as is. Does anyone feel that we need to review any of the comments here that have been posted? Kristine, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks a lot. This is Kristine for the transcript. I just wanted to highlight that the Registry Stakeholder Group here has a new idea which should be flagged in blue, so the suggestion that the registries have the flexibility to register domains under certain circumstances. I do note that this also falls in line with the supplemental report that came out, so those five additional topics, this is sort of captured in that. But there is a new idea here that I just didn't want it to get lost. Thank you. Michael, you're muted.

Michael Flemming: Thank you very much. I've actually not unmuted myself yet or started speaking. I was just analyzing the comment. Thank you very much, Kristine. Let us take that as a new idea. And apologies if I'm a little bit slow to respond. It's (inaudible) here, and there is no coffee stimulating my mind at this point now. I'm starting to see why that might have been an important beverage to drink. But thank you very much, and I can definitely see where we need to highlight that, and that has to be done. So -- and the appropriate adjustment has been made per Kristine's suggestion. Thank you very much.

Moving on to 2.10.2.e.1 then. "In response to feedback community comment 2, Work Track 2 members have suggested that .Brand registries, as well as any registry operator granted an exemption from the Code of Conduct as set forth in Specification 9 of the Registry Agreement, should not only be able to limit the number of registrars that they have to use, but should also have the ability to receive a complete exemption from using any ICANN-accredited registrars at all in the operation of their TLD by making them equally exempt from section 2.9 of the Registry Agreement. And in connection with the above proposal, the Work Track is soliciting feedback on the following."

So then, we have a comment from FairWind Partners, "See below for relevant sub-comments." The sub-questions to this discussion topic, or solicitation for more feedback, seemed to put it in the area of agreement, so we will reference that as is below and just leave this alone for now. And -- goodness gracious. Excuse me -- the Registry Stakeholder Group explains the diversity of views within the Registry Stakeholder Group on the issue of vertical integration. It seems that there are some who have been previously active ICANN policy development, such as brand owners. So, let's perhaps just take the comment as full.

But with the new gTLD program, the Registry Stakeholder Group expanded with the entry of new registry operators. Their new members include many that are active in PDPs, such as brand owners and others who previously participated in different capacities. There is not one single view on the question of vertical integration of registries and registrars. Some members favor vertical integration and would support removal of further restriction, and others had favored the retention of those restriction. So, no specific feedback in regards to this. Excuse me.

The question, 2.10.2.e.1.1, "Should a complete exemption be available to these registries? Please explain." The BRG supports the complete -- a complete exemption. FairWinds supports this. The Registry Stakeholder Group supports this, and noting that they are a group of very diversified opinions, they support this. Google also supports this, and the Registrar Stakeholder Group, while this is marked as divergence, they do agree with this if it follows certain circumstances, or certain conditions where DNS is completely controlled by set brand, as well as the registrant, tech, admin and billing contact matching the brand. So, that is indeed important information. Sorry, that is indeed important to consider their response. Do we need to discuss any of these comments in their current nature (ph)? Steve has clarified something specifically in the draft staff assessment, that we were thinking there's sort of an introduction to the more specified -- specific registry comments below. So, there has not been current specific assessment dig into (ph) this. Thank you, Steve. That does help while we go through and consider these. So, I do not see any specific feedback, so we will take that as is.

Next section is 2.10.2.e.1.2. "If complete exemptions are granted, are there any obligations that should be imposed on .Brand registries to ensure that any obligations or registrant protections normally found in Registrar Accreditation Agreements that should be included in .Brand Registry Agreements if they elect to not use any ICANN-accredited registrars?" So, we have agreement from MarkMonitor, believes a 100-domain limit is sufficient, and it's more or less in agreement. The Registrar Stakeholder Group is agreeing with this, generally, yes, of course noting their previous related comment that -- to not allow third parties to manage DNS at any level. And ICANN must be aggressive in

its management of TLDs to ensure that TLDs can be run as officially closed. So, a new idea in some aspects.

The BRG agrees with this. Yes, FairWind does not support additional requirements. And Registry Stakeholder Group does not believe that any further additional obligations are required. So, more or less agreement throughout the mix here, with a little bit of spice on conditions from the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Do we have anyone that wants to relate to this? Kristine, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks, this is Kristine. I'm not entirely sure of the best way to -- that we would handle this, but looking at the comments by MarkMonitor and the registrars, specifically MarkMonitor, I'm not entirely sure that we're speaking apples-to-apples here. So, I believe 2.10.2 is about registry operators, .Brand registry operators that register all domain names to themselves forever and ever without using a registrar. I don't believe there's anything in this recommendation or this -- whatever this is that limits the number of domain names to 100. The 100 domain names that a registry can self-allocate is available to all registry operators already, gTLDs, whatever the category.

So, I think there's a little misunderstanding here, so I wonder if we need to back to them and get some clarity, because we're not talking about the 100 they already get. We're talking about if they want to have 5,000 domain names registered to their .Brand, they get them registered to themselves. And so, I think there's some confusion there, specifically also similarly in the registrar comment. And this same comment applies to the category above, as well. They've said, assuming the brand owner is a registrant, admin tech, and billing, but that doesn't necessarily jive with what's currently existing in the policy, which is with brand owners and their licensees. And sometimes people have lumped that together, and that's fine, but I think we should go back and make sure that the registrars aren't saying brands-only, and then they're generally keeping the brands and their licensees in one big lump. I just think it's unclear based on the way that their comments are worded, and they'd hate to get it wrong. Thanks.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, Kristine. I can see -- that is very helpful, and I do appreciate that. I can see where there might be a bit of misunderstanding for how this question would you say, perhaps caused certain changes to be applied in the Registry Agreement or the New gTLD program due to its simplicity in not covering in detail specifically what those changes might occur. And that is why there's likely a misunderstanding on behalf of -- well, not necessarily misunderstanding, but that is why MarkMonitor and the Registrar Stakeholder Group take into account certain aspects. Excuse me. But, they -- what is in their comments, especially in MarkMonitor's side, there's already the 100 domain limit aspect. But

indeed, this question would probably explore the aspect as -- whether or not we need to increase those questions, but that is definitely a discussion to be held at the full working group level. And I feel that it would be beneficial to seek clarity on some aspects if others feel necessarily for perhaps MarkMonitor, if they fully understand the relevance of this.

The Registrar Stakeholder Group, I think it might be beneficial to reach out perhaps, but I do feel that they understand the nature of the question, but perhaps not the nature of how a .Brand operates in full. Does anyone else feel that we need to take this -- maybe ask it before we take this to plenary? And Cheryl, you have -- think that it would be beneficial to do so. And Kristine, I agree with you as well. I hear a microphone, and if you'd like to jump in, please feel free, whoever, (inaudible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It was me, Michael. I was just going to say I wanted to be clear. I think it's worthwhile asking them to clarify their answers. I'm not doubting that they understand the question. I just think it would be nice if we had some embellishment and certainty before we take it to one particular type or classification of response or another. That's all. Thanks.

Michael Flemming: Indeed. I do agree with that, as well. So, it does seem to be beneficial that we do seek clarification that they fully understand the question while, of course, detail the effects of making this change in the registry but fully (ph) exploring the question perhaps whether or not they fully understand the question and how it is applied to .Brands. Indeed. Let's make that an action item. All righty then. Let's take that, and staff is putting it as an action item, so we would greatly appreciate it. We'll move on that during the -- well, before our next meeting hopefully.

Further comments from -- oh, we've already covered those further comments. So, if we feel comfortable, we can move on to the next question. We are now on line 22, 2.10.2.e.1.3. If you're joining us on the Google docs or the document shared in Adobe, we're on page three, soon to be on page four. So, "Work Track members have suggested that input from the Registrars Stakeholder Group, as well as the Brand Registry Group on this topic, would benefit further deliberations and any final recommendations. The Work Track makes note that feedback from all parties will be fully considered and contribute to further developments." Excuse me.

The BRG's response is that they'll be happy to contribute further if required. .Brand applicants were reluctant to voice their views in public prior to 2012 round. And these same hurdles also apply to future applicants. That is why the BRG is able to represent views of its members, both existing .Brand operators and future applicants to help guide such changes to the subsequent procedures, or for subsequent

procedures. And the Registrar Stakeholder Group quotes their above material.

And the next question, 2.10.2.e.2, "Are there any additional situations where exemptions to the Code of Conduct should be available?" And we have a response from Registrar Stakeholder Group on this. It's kind of a new idea. And their response is "No." So, do we feel that we need to discuss either of those questions specifically? The responses (inaudible) in regards to question 1.3 and e.2, not a whole lot to work with specifically there since there's not much contribution. But I feel that we can take it as is without discussing the complexity of their question and replies.

We are now on our final question for this evening, which we are now on page four, Cheryl, very enthusiastic. I do appreciate it. And we are on question 2.10.2.e.3. I might have put an extra point in there, but I hope you can follow along in the text. "There are provisions in the Registrar Stakeholder Group Charter that some feel disfavor those who have been granted exemptions to the Code of Conduct. In the preliminary question above, would it be better to rephrase it as, 'Unless the Registry Code of Conduct does not apply' rather than, 'Unless an exemption to the Registry Code of Conduct is granted'?" We have a response from the Registry Stakeholder Group, is that -- Registrar Stakeholder Group, sorry -- is that these -- this -- changes have recently been made to the Registrar Stakeholder Group Charter. In fact, I believe it's in public comment now, and that exemption should be requested, evaluated, and allowed/denied through community process and with complete transparency.

Now, noting that this -- I wonder if -- I'm not sure if it's the exact change, this relevant change that's in public comment right now, but there seems to be opportunity to seek further clarification on this at a time -- at an important time. Do we need further clarification? And do we feel that this comment is sufficient to answer the question that has been put forth? Would anyone like to help analyze that aspect? Hearing none, I will take this -- Kristine, you're typing. Thank you so much. Oh, GG Levine, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

GG Levine:

Yes. I would disagree and say that the existing language, unless an exemption to the Registry Code of Conduct is granted, is more explicit, whereas to say the Registry Code of Conduct does not apply would refer -- sounds like it could be more subjective. But, that's not really the information you were looking for, is it? Was that the kind of interpretation you were looking for?

Michael Flemming:

Thank you, GG. I'm not sure. It's too early for me to get into debate about the material specifically. But whether or not their reply is sufficient to -- basically they're saying that their charter has been changed, and that

this specific question is perhaps no longer relevant to this aspect since the pages (ph) have been made. I think that's what--.

GG Levine: --Okay. All right. I apologize.

Michael Flemming: No, no, not at all. I understand. It's been a rough day for probably a lot of us -- or it's been a long day.

Kristine says, "I'm not super-clear either, and I have no idea why we'd develop policy making the Registrar Stakeholder Group's charter make more sense. Steve is probably having -- sorry, is probably providing more sufficient advice on this. But I think that, well, we've given enough time to this one questions. Perhaps we should leave it as is, and -- but let's move on now that we have no further specific feedback.

Now then, we do have some other comments here that should be brought up as they do pertain to this a little bit (ph), and both of our comments are from Christopher Wilkinson, who in his first comment felt that -- general reservation about -- he had general reservation about neutrality of Registrars among Registries under the current conditions of vertical integration, and then highlights concerns about competition and diversity. He believes that registry/registrar cross-ownership contributes to this issue. And his concerns highlight that -- I have a hard time making this into shorter words, putting it into my own words, so I'll just read it as-is, that it would appear that the degree of concentration that has taken place in the DNS market was facilitated by the flawed decision in 2010 to replace favoring vertical integration between new independent registries with a policy favoring cross-ownership between registrars and registries. The economic consequences of that decision may be quite far-reaching and should be reconsidered by ICANN, small little I there.

His comments, Kristine, is indeed a -- difficult to interpret specifically since we -- this was made during general comments and not specifically in highlight to a certain question. And box -- there's a tissue box here somewhere -- and that it is difficult to say whether or not -- where it's coming from here. So, yes that the cross-ownership was a discussion that we had originally in Work Track 2, and I can say that our first premise was that nothing -- registry/registrar cross-ownership, the vertical integration aspect would not be reversed. We were not discussing that in any way, shape or form. We were looking at the aspect of how it has come to fruit, or come to light during the current round whether or not further changes should be made to help assist that.

Now, Christopher's comment does look specifically at reversing it, so I think that we can just take his comment as-is in the relevant aspect of the conversation that was probably at the time. Unless others feel that we should seek further clarification, I don't feel that we need to do that

specifically, as I believe that the full working group will be able to understand at that time while taking his comments into nature. And I believe Christopher will probably be there to provide any more specific feedback that'd be necessary at the time. Just seeing if there's anyone that wants to offer any additional input on these comments and now we see them at the current time.

So, Justine, as you put in the chat, I'm responding to that, saying that there's probably not the necessity to ask Christopher to clarify his comment, but perhaps there are others that disagree with me. I see no responses, so that is registry/registrar non-discrimination, registry/registrar standardization. Let's move on to the next category in just 30 minutes. That's a good stopping point for that one.

We are now on registry system testing, the next tab, and the -- excuse me -- the relevant page in Adobe Chat has -- sorry, the Adobe has been changed as well. So, first question, 2.11.1.c.1, "Registry System Testing should be split between overall registry service provider matters and specific application/TLD testing." Agreement from the BRG in this. Further comments are explored in additional questions. Now then, thank you for joining us, Kristine. I hope you can be back with us shortly, as well.

2.11.1.c.2. So, Remove a better part or all self-certification assessments. So, there's support to removing the self-certification assessments. ICANN Org supports this as well and offers a new idea, that it should be noted that some self-certifications, such as those related to load testing, should be retained as operational testing would be a disruptor (ph) and not favorable, and it is important to do load testing to ensure that the infrastructure can handle expected traffic. Registry Stakeholder Group also supports this aspect, not necessarily ICANN's comment of the new idea, but removing the self-certification. But removal -- so there's bit of a mixed opinion, actually, from the sounds of it, that there's one Registry Stakeholder Group suggests that the proposal should be qualidated (ph) or stipulated to removal of the assessment -- sorry, for that this should apply to establish a registry operator, so exhibit the exact same business model rolls across the TLD, that there's opposition with this viewpoint within the Registry Stakeholder Group as well. And yes, and at least one Registry Stakeholder Group agreed with this proposal, as well.

So, yes, Steve has highlighted, "There is no single Registry Stakeholder Group position," so there's a common theme for the Registry Stakeholder Group comments, that there always seems to be opposing view within their current -- within their organization, but agreement as well. So, it's a very colorful comment that we will have on each of these. So, let's -- it's difficult. In some terms, it would be natural to seek clarification for each comment in some aspects, but seeing as that they have already gone

through the process of answering this, I'm not sure if doing the clarification would get this any more -- give a single position on this. So, perhaps taking it as-is would be best as it is discussed in the full working group. So, let's just take that -- those replies as there seems to be no specifically -- request to discuss the material.

Seeing where we are. We are on 2.11.1.c.3, line nine. "Rely on Service Level Agreement monitoring for most, if not all, overall registry service provider testing." The Brand Registry Group agrees with this. The Registry Stakeholder Group, again, mixed. One registry said the (inaudible) member agrees with moving with this. Another one believes the question should be clarified and explained, if this proposes a removal of PDT, pre-delegation testing. And one member said, if that is the case, that there should -- there are concerns as whether or not SLA monitoring is not extensive. And then another offered a new idea, that since RSP pre-accreditation program is not currently approved, reference should be made to registry operators and not RSPs. And another one opposes this view. Since -- sorry, another one opposes this view and says pre-approval seems to be the leaning of the working group, but reckons that if it's not approved, this proposal should be changed to the next available aggregation level, which is registry service provider for a number of TLDs in a single subsequent procedure. So, a very complicated response in that, and I see no specific chats or hands raised in regards to that, but we can always come back to it at the end of this section.

ICANN Org clarifies that our recommendation was that some tests could be removed from the Registry System Testing in favor of ongoing monitoring of TLD operations against a broader set of existing contractual technical requirements. Their concerns highlight that ongoing monitoring to predict potential performance issues in order to remove some tests from PDP and to improve the chances of proper operation of TLDs. ICANN recommends relying on ongoing monitoring of TLD operations against existing contractual requirements. ICANN already is planning to improve its active monitoring capabilities to cover as much as possible. Consideration should also be given as to whether repeated breaches should result in stricter penalties for registry operators or RSPs. So, I think that was the initial recommendation, I believe, but ICANN Org would like to clarify that the recommendation was that some tests could be removed. Hello, Jeff, thanks for being here on a mobile (ph).

And then, the SSAC supports divergence in this. So, they support for discovering major failures before delegation instead of TLD being in operation -- before, sorry, the TLD is in operation. So, in general, it is preferable to discover major failures before delegation instead of after the TLDs are in operation. So that's indeed a divergence. Do we feel that we need to discuss any of these comments for further clarity? I see none. If Kristine does come back before we're done, perhaps it may be helpful --

perhaps she would like to jump in on some of the Registry Stakeholder Group comments, but I will leave that option for when she makes her return.

Next question, line 14, 2.11.1.c.4, "Limit Internationalized Domain Name (IDN) testing to specific TLD policies. Do not perform an IDN table review in Registry System Testing." So, there's support for this from BRG, Brand Registries Group, Neustar, and the Registry Stakeholder Group. However, there are concerns that, in practice, the PDT, the pre-delegation testing, execution related to IDNs actually exceeded the stated boundaries in that the testing team both expanded the scope and insert judgment into the expected results. Excuse me. And then, ICANN Org, their recommendation was removing IDN table review if the table -- if the -- sorry, the registry is using pre-vetted tables that have been pre-vetted by the community, indeed. And then, they highlight their previous comment in regards to this that was provided. Did we feel that we need to discuss any of those responses in further detail, or can we take them as-is? Let's go forward (ph). I don't see anyone raising their hands, so we will take them as they are and send them off for the full working group to consider and weigh in responses.

So, we are now on line 19, question 2.11.1.c.5, "Include additional operational tests to assess readiness for Domain Name System Security Extensions (DNS SEC) contingencies, key rollover, zone re-signing, what that includes. Now, the Registry Stakeholder Group, they explain different views. And I feel that we can only take this if we read it full. Excuse me.

So, at least one Registry Stakeholder Group member believes that this approach is inconsistent. Rollovers in PDT testing will not reflect the realities of operations. that is, it will be an effort that may not be predictive. Since DNS infrastructure is frequently shared, this may introduce security and stability risks due to side effects to existing TLDs that could emerge through execution errors. To test readiness for DNS SEC, at a minimum, and RSPS should be able to demonstrate the ability to transition the signed zone of a TLD onto their system and transition the signed zone of a TLD off of the system. During the registry transition process, the act of rolling a signed zone is intricate and should be considered a key part of registry testing. And then -- excuse me -- this whole paragraph is opposed by at least one other Registry Stakeholder Group member. While those two tests seem to be enough for the time being for at least Registry Stakeholder Group, the same members suggest consideration of algorithm rollover exercises in the future when enough experience in this specific maneuver gets established in the operational community. So, again, a lot to consider in that. I feel that we can send that on up, as well, to the full working group unless anyone would like to discuss the material. I do not see anyone raising their hand.

And we are now on the next question -- excuse me, (inaudible) -- wonderful, delicious water, and we are on page three and line 21 of the -- sorry, I'm (inaudible) Google doc -- 2.11.1.c.6, "Possible language: applicants must be able to demonstrate their technical capability to run a registry operation for the purpose that the application sets out, either by submitting it to evaluation at application time or agreeing to use a previously approved technical infrastructure. Could mean in the same procedure or previous procedures if an RSP program exists. Excuse me. So, supporting this possible language is the BRG and Neustar. And then, the Registry Stakeholder Group explains different views again. One Registry Stakeholder Group suggests that, if an applicant is choosing to use a previously approved technical infrastructure, then the applicant should be required to identify that service provider at application. And another opposes this, stating that it would serve the interest -- only serve the interest of registry service providers while leaving approved registry operators to later choose a registry service provider increases competitiveness in that field.

Now then, I don't -- do we need to discuss the material provided? I see no responses. And that will -- I see no one raising their hand to discuss the material, and so I will move to the last question, which is very long in nature, as well as quite a mixed response as well from the Registry Stakeholder Group. 2.11.1.e.1 -- sorry, we are on line 25 and the last page of the material provided in -- sorry, the document in Adobe. "ICANN's Technical Services Group provided some recommendations to Work Track 4 on what it believed were improvements that could be made to improve its testing procedures to attempt to detect operational issues that its Service Level Monitoring system has uncovered with some registry service providers. Although the Work Track discussed this letter in some detail, the Work Track has not reached any consensus on whether those recommendations should be accepted. Therefore, we would like feedback from the community on whether any of the recommendations should be adopted by the Work Track in the final report. More specifically, we seek feedback on recommendation numbers 1, PDT operational tests; 2, monitoring; 3, third-Party certifications; 4, audits, 6 -- whoa, they skipped five. Maybe that was intentional -- 6, frequency of tests; 7, removal of testing IDN tables; and 8, consideration of number of TLDs. Some of the other recommendations, including number 4, RSP pre-approval, are discussed in section 2.2.6 on Accreditation Programs, RSP pre-approval.

Excuse me. Now then, again, we have quite a diverse -- that was the word I was looking for, not -- diverse response from the Registry Stakeholder Group. There's no single position they have, so at least one of their members agrees -- is in agreement with the recommendations already included in the initial report and disagrees with all

recommendations from ICANN technical services that were not included in the initial report. That itself is opposed by one other Registry Stakeholder Group member. Another one had different views on each of the recommendations listed below. They supported PDT but don't expand the scope. They had concerns on the monitoring aspect where it's not currently being enforced.

Third-party certifications, they're not supportive of those, and (inaudible) been pretty difficult to implement with unclear benefits. Audits, and saying that there are situations where an audit may be necessary, that option should be available, but they said they've be not done, said to be arbitrary or disruptive. They monitored to ensure an objective outcome. Now they are in agreement with the consideration of a number of TLDs with a longer response, should not (ph) also just consider the number of TLDs but the expected quantity of registrations that'll be supported by the registry platform, so the overall numbers of domain -- the second-level domains versus the number of TLDs seems to be of more importance in that aspect. And the views in this paragraph are opposed by at least one other Registry Stakeholder Group member. So, again, a diverse response indeed.

Jeff highlights that he would like to get ICANN Org's response on this specific question, which highlights a number of recommendations. Perhaps we can reach out to them specifically for further clarifications if necessary. Does anyone feel the same about that? Steve is typing. Jeff is typing. We need -- so Jeff adds that we need to have some further guidance on this since registries can't agree. Steve states that number of the recommendations in this are (inaudible) from paper from ICANN Technical Services. Perhaps that's why they didn't respond. We could definitely reach out to them if necessary. I don't see anyone else who's jumping into this, but since this seems to be a -- oh, so Jeff is responding. I think we can maybe take this offline for further additional feedback. Seems to me it's (inaudible) a two-way conversation. Yes. It seems that we might have a conversation on the leadership level here, and we will provide any further feedback in regards to how we should consider this reaching out to ICANN further after we've done so. Well, we'll keep the full -- sorry, this full working -- this full sub-group in the loop, of course.

So, we are nine minutes from the top of the hour. A quick little observation of our next two sections, TLD rollout and contractual compliance. We'll definitely tell you that we should likely only have one more meeting covering this material. Now, I am comfortable to say that y'all have been great sticking with this this long. We really appreciate your support in helping us with this. And perhaps it might be best that we start thinking about what do we do after going through these comments. Now, I think that's a topic that can be explored next week as we take this - - yes, as we take probably will not take the full amount of time acquired

for that meeting to analyze those comments. And perhaps we can have a bit of a conversation at the working -- sorry, the leadership level to provide some suggestions, as well. A mini-vacation seems to be in the works for us, but probably not for those who are heading off to further meetings that will be held during the -- what is this, the third week of January coming up here. So, good luck and safe flights to those of you that will be attending such meetings. And we will come back after that on the 31st of January at 15 UTC for an additional 60 minutes.

Now, thank you very much for (inaudible). I do note that we have time for plenty of AOB, if necessary. Would anyone like to share a funny joke that they might have discovered this week? I had a really good one to share, that the question was--.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: --Oh, please, no. Please, no. No. No. Go and take a nap, Michael.

Michael Flemming: Oh, but it's a good one. It's a good one. It's why does Peter Pan never stop flying? It's because he never lands. Okay, I'll let you all have a good laugh at that, and thanks for joining us. We'll talk again next week. Bye-bye.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye. Thanks, everyone.

Unidentified Participant: Thanks, Michael. Thank you, Cheryl and everyone. Enjoy the rest of your day or night. This meeting's adjourned.