

ICANN Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP - Sub Group A
Thursday 08 November 2018 at 2000 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-sub-pro-pdp-sub-group-a-08nov18-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p2kvec7alh2/?proto=true>

Attendance is on the wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/6B_8BQ

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

Julie Bisland: Great. Thank you so much. Well, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Subgroup A call held on Thursday, the 8th of November, 2018. On the call today we have Ashley Roberts, Cheryl Langon-Orr, Jeff Neuman, Kristine Dorrain, Martin Sutton, Matthew Crossman, Phil Buckingham, Robin Gross, and on audio-only I have Jamie Baxter. Anyone else on audio only? I didn't see anybody. Okay. I have apologies from Jim Prendergast. And from staff we have Emily Barabas, Julie Hedlund, Steve Chan, and myself, Julie Bisland. I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for recording purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this, I will turn it back over to Jeff. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Julie. Welcome, everyone. I know there's lots of other things going on at this time, so thank you for spending your time with us. And yes, so there is an agenda. It's just not up on the top right-hand side of the screen. But essentially, we'll -- going to start looking at the comments that were in the subgroup A topics, and specifically we'll start with general comments that were received, and if we have time, then go into the comments on the overarching issues specifically on continuing subsequent procedures.

So, there is a document that we're going to follow along with, so I will ask Emily, Steve, or Julie to do two things: one, post a link to the Google doc and also to -- which I see right now is happening -- post a link to the doc on -- or post the doc on Adobe. So, if we can also get the link up there for the actual Google doc, because I think it's much easier if you are in front of a computer to follow along with that one, because the writing on this one we're displaying now is kind of small. So, Steve Chan is typing that in. So, that's our agenda. Does anybody have any questions? I'll go over the format of how these comments are structured, why there are some different colors, and the different columns and things like that, so I'll do that in a second. But, any comments on the general agenda?

Okay. So, before we dive right into the document, I want to give just a little bit of background on what we're hoping to accomplish with all of these reviews, and hoping to only really go over that today, and maybe re-send it on the mailing list again to make sure everyone's aware of it. But, hopefully we'll not have to go over it on each call. Some of you were -- I see on this list were already on a previous subgroup call, subgroup C, I think it was -- no -- yes, C, met earlier today, or yesterday for some of you.

So, essentially, these documents are provided by staff to not -- just to basically pull language, and I almost said "summarize," but it doesn't summarize -- it pulls language directly out of comments that were received relating to the topics for this specific subgroup and puts it all into a Google sheet document. Each numbered question, or each numbered area in the initial report has its own tab, and you'll also see a special tab at the beginning of this one called the General one, where there were comments pulled out of the initial report responses we got but didn't necessarily neatly fall within one of the specific headings or subjects. So, we put them in the general category.

You will also see that our role here is not to comment on whether we agree with or disagree with, or like or don't like any of the comments that are submitted. Our role here is to, in a way, tabulate the comments -- I guess that's kind of the wrong title, or wrong word. Basically, we're trying to see if there are trends with the comments that we can then use to refer to the full -- refer this to the full working group in discussing the specific recommendations as to whether we think that there is general agreement with the things that we put into the initial report, whether there are divergent views on what we put into the initial report, or even new ideas that have come up that merit additional discussion within the full working group.

So, we're not -- the role of the subgroups are not to replace the work of the full working groups in making ultimate recommendations, but really to help the full group understand where their comments came in on these various subjects. So, you'll also see a color coding within the Google doc, and just checking -- yes, it also shows up in the Adobe Connect room as well, if you're looking at that right now.

And the colors are an indication of whether something is in green, it's usually a -- means that it agrees with what the initial report said, or what the working group said in the initial report. If it's blue, it means that there's a -- really a new idea. If it is red, then it's either -- yes, red is a complete divergence from the recommendations, which thankfully there are not too many of those, and then a kind of orange-ish -- I think it's orange. Steve, correct me if I'm wrong. At least it looks orange to me -- that are not necessarily divergent, but just some concerns to keep in mind if -- so there may be an agreement with the general concept or what's in the initial report, but just some things to watch out for, or areas or parts of this that they may not agree with completely.

So, hopefully that makes sense. Hopefully everyone's able to get onto the Google doc. I know, Jamie, you're only on audio, so this may be a little bit difficult for you. But, if you -- feel free to jump in, or if you're totally lost because we're only referring to a document that is -- just let us know, stop us, and we'll try to help you and anyone else that's on the phone out.

So, does that make sense to everyone? So, in this document, as we're going along, there are essentially four main -- well, three main columns that everyone needs to pay attention to. I added a fourth for this General tab. Just on some personal comments, they're my own personal comments, I have not run that by anyone else. You may agree or disagree with them, but I just put notes in to kind of help guide discussion along, especially with the General comments. So, please don't take that as anything other than suggestions or individual comments. They're not going to be substituted for the column that's before that called the Working Group Response. Hopefully that makes sense.

And as Steve says in the chat, that these designations, whether it's agreement, new idea, concerns, et cetera, they're not mutually exclusive, so there could be agreement on a subject, but also a new idea to think about. So, it's just not like these (ph) comments have to only be one.

Okay. So, with that said, as we open the General tab, again, this is the -- sorry, maybe I should even -- I know it's not posted there. When you have a moment, but not necessarily now, there is a tab in the Google doc before this one called "The Work Plan," and that's an indication of which - - we have to put dates in there for when the meetings are, but that's the dates, or the agenda for each of the calls. So, you'll see that on the meeting number two. If you look at that one later on, you'll see that the next meeting will go on to the next area, and so on.

Okay. With all that out of the way, then let's look at the general comments. So, the first general comment came from Y-A-V-G-A-R. I'm not sure who that is or what community that person came from, but their comment was that -- it's a general comment that deals with the registration, reservation of premium names. I'm not going to go over this comment in any kind of detail. I think this is a comment where I would -- you'll see in the co-chair notes -- I would recommend that we put this comment -- we move this comment into subgroup B that deals with

reserve names at the second level, because this is really a comment on that. So, again, it's just -- again, I don't want to read all the comments because they're kind of long, but this does talk about reservations of names at the second level. Does anybody disagree with that approach?

So most of these -- as you're thinking about that, most of these in the General category are -- I have a goal of moving out of the General category into either a section that is in one of the subgroups, or moving them to a different -- as you'll see in a couple cases, some of the comments may be out of scope for us as a working group. Some of the comments may be more appropriate for the RPM group, or at least one of the comments here. And other comments we're going to move to the full working group because they are issues that we may want to consider as a full working group, and we do have a full working group on Monday. But really, we're just kind of deferring some of those issues to that particular call.

Okay. So, any questions on number one, which is really a new idea with respect to reserved names? I should also say, because this came up on the last call, a new idea does not mean that we are classifying it as a good idea or a bad idea. It's just something that was not raised in the initial report, and was not thoroughly vetted in that report.

Okay. Number two is a comment for INTA, which relates to supporting the notion of consistency, transparency and predictability, so the initial couple sentences are really general in nature, with just support for those concepts. But then, there's a sentence in there which I've highlighted in purple -- and it appears in purple on the Adobe. That's good -- which is the applicant guidebook that outlines those procedures should be unambiguous and not subject to change during the application period. This would (ph) show fairness in the process, which is resource-intensive, and the playing field must be fair and outcomes reasonably predicted, et cetera. So, this really deals with -- and I put in here 2.4.1 in our subgroup, which is -- which deals with the applicant guidebook in general. I guess in theory I could have put it in predictability, which is 2.2.2, but I thought that the specific comment on the guidebook is one that really would fit better in 2.4.1. In the tab, that's 2.4.1, dealing with the applicant guidebook. Anyone disagree with that approach?

Okay. Number three, which is on line five of the -- which you can't see, can you? Okay, so -- sorry. I'm in a Google doc where it's got line numbers and general numbers. So, this is comments, general comment number three, which is submitted by the ALAC, which is basically saying that we should develop metrics to assess the new gTLD program. Now, I thought this comment was -- it's listed as a new idea, which it is, but it's also one that we've saw, or currently see in the PCT (ph) review team report, the final report. And so, I thought that, even though it could in theory fit into 2.2.3, and that's the section that deals with the applications assessed in rounds, whether to do rounds or not, because they're sort of talking about doing an evaluation process, I think it really is a topic on its own. And I would recommend, and (inaudible) I'm just one person, so I'd

love to hear your comments, that we actually take up this issue, this comment, along with the issue, in the full working group call on Monday, because, again, this is not only responsive to this comment on the need to develop metrics and on reviewing programs, but it's also responsive to the ccTLD team. Is there any kind of agreement, disagreement with that approach? Please, Kristine.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine Dorrain. Yes, I support that. When I reviewed this, I initially thought that it's sort of duplicative of the -- I mean, the point of the CCT RDP, once you get through that doc, is just where do you need more data, where do you need more metrics. So, I think absolutely this should be lumped -- this discussion and the outcome (inaudible) whatever we decide to do with the CCT RT report, I think whatever we decide to do there will answer this question. So, I support lumping that together, whatever that looks like, from a, like, document standpoint.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Thanks, Kristina, and I completely agree. We're not saying that we have to develop metrics at this point, but we should do this as a full working group and this entire discussion. So, I am going to, as an action item, ask that Steve put this -- Steve, Emily, Julie, put this on the agenda for one of the subjects we should talk about on the full group on Monday.

Okay, not seeing any disagreement. Martin says that sounds reasonable. And Phil Buckingham is typing. I'll give a second. Okay. While Phil's typing, let's go on to the next one. So, this is number four, which was submitted by the ALAC, as well. And this one is on -- basically it's sort of deferring to the SSAC in dealing with certain aspects of the new gTLD program. And so, it's listed as a concern. I guess the ALAC is concerned that we have not been as deferential as we should be to the SSAC in certain areas.

And so, my recommendation is that this comment be moved to subgroup B, section 2.7.6, which I know that you all don't have everything memorized, but that section deals with security and stability of the program. So, there is -- and I'm going to post it real quick in the chat for those of you that just need a reminder. This spreadsheet that I just posted has a list of all the topics in one document. So, the only difference is that this document lists everything as one-point-whatever, but it's really two-point-whatever. In the initial report, we changed everything to be section two, because we had an intro in section one.

Okay. Just want to make sure I didn't actually -- then I went to two different documents. Okay, any questions with that? Again, I'm sure people have thoughts as to whether they agree with this comment or not, but we can discuss -- that will be discussed at a later point. So, the action taken here is to -- we will take this comment and move it to subgroup B, number 2.7.6.

The next one is an overall comment about fairness, transparency and accountability, and really deals with a -- from the Council of Europe. It deals with what they believe is a lack of focus on human rights and the --

probably should say rule of law. I think it says "rule of law," but the rule of law. And so, that I put in the notes that we can move this to 2.3.2 of our group, which deals with the global public interest; and 2.3.3, which deals with applicant freedom of expression, because I think this comment relates to both of those. There is a subsequent comment where they get into more details about the CPE procedure that you'll see I put in the comments to refer that to the subgroup dealing with the community process, but I think this is really an overarching kind of comment that would go best in the human rights, or the global public interest -- (inaudible), the global public interest or applicant freedom of expression comments. Kristine, please?

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine. Jeff, I don't know this stuff chapter and verse like you do, but I am seeming to recall that the application freedom of expression section primarily focused on the string selected by some sort of maybe disadvantaged applicants or others. Am I -- can you just remind me, or I don't have the book in front of me. Maybe that's what I need to do. Am I misunderstanding that? I'm just wondering if applicant freedom of expression really is the right section, or maybe you could just spend 10 seconds explaining why that might be the right section. I do agree that it should go in the global public interest section.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Kristine. You may be right. And when I wrote these notes, I just kind of -- I couldn't remember which dealt with which. So, it may -- we can look into that. Maybe it is only the global public interest section. I think when there's specifics on the community aspects, I thought that that might be the expression that -- well, we'll double-check that. I may have -- you may think I remember it as much or more than I do, but it may only be global public interest. We'll take that as an action item to see if it truly fits in both, or whether it really only fits in with the global public interest.

Okay. The next one, also from the Council of Europe, is along the same vein, although I think that one squarely fits in only with the global public interest section. And there is a -- although actually, now that I'm reading it one more time, there is a paragraph that I'm going to highlight in purple in the Google doc, which does tell me that that part needs to go into the community section. And you can't see that on Adobe, but you could see it in the Google doc. That one might actually need to go into a paragraph that deals with the concept (ph) that community's too broad and not connected with global public interest. There's no policy of prioritizing communities. So, I think that part of the comment I'm going to also note should go into the community section, subgroup C. Making a note, "should go into community section in subgroup C." Okay.

There is some things here about conflicts of interest, but it's a very kind of -- and you'll see it also in another statement. I'm not sure if conflicts of interest this here warrants a completely new discussion, or it's just a general concern for us to keep an eye out on. But certainly, where they talk about conflicts of interest of the experts (ph) as opposed to applicants, then that would be something that would go into the specific dispute properties within subgroup C.

Okay. Any questions on that before we go to number seven? And I will note that there's a lot of them, so hopefully we can move fairly quickly through some of these. Number seven also deals with transparency, but tries to provide a -- more background on community. So, it's a comment about research of the CPE panels. It's a comment about the panelists and about making sure that sufficient information regarding the -- or that applicants have sufficient information about those community process (inaudible) and the criteria. So, that one squarely fits in with subgroup C under the community applications section. Kristine, please?

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine for the transcript. I don't want to belabor every point because I know we have a long list, but I'm looking at this -- the topic of subgroup A, as I understand it, is sort of like how the guidebook is sort of structured and all of that to get everything ready to go sort of procedurally or operationally. So, why wouldn't -- the actual comment, at least in the first paragraph, it talks about giving sufficient information about time and deadlines and the completion of the process and transparency. What happens if a topic sort of straddles two subgroups? Like, I agree with you that subgroup C about community applicants might apply, but as we're thinking about how the applicant guidebook is ultimately structured, wouldn't we want to include this sort of transparency information in that as well? What are your thoughts with respect to how you want to structure maybe overlapping areas, if anyone agrees that it's overlapping?

Jeff Neuman: Sure. This is Jeff. Yes, if it does cover more than one area, it is perfectly fine to place the comment into two -- in multiple places. So, I think we have the -- so let me take a look here. It's Council of Europe. So, you're right, we didn't put any of this from the Council of Europe into the applicant guidebook. So, I agree with that. We should probably also put that into 2.4.1, at least to the extent that it relates to the transparency of the guidebook and predictability and all that kind of stuff. So yes, we can definitely move that into two different places. If it is in two different places, and I'll just make a note for ICANN staff and for us (ph) to think about, we'd need to make sure that we're clear as to which parts of those comments that this subgroup is dealing with versus what the other subgroup is dealing with. So, while we may do exactly what you did, Kristine, is relate it specifically to the applicant guidebook and just making sure all the information is upfront, the specifics could be addressed by the subgroup C. And if there are others, please point them out, because we could have easily missed them.

So, number eight deals with basically the accountability of the CTE process, although they kind of say it's the accountability of the entire program. All I put in here is that it should be in subgroup C. It actually might be in a couple different parts of subgroup C, where they deal with -- on the one hand they deal with obviously the community process. They deal with objections, and they deal with accountability mechanisms. So, I didn't limit that to a specific subsection within C, but it certainly could be within a couple different sections in C.

Looking back at the comments. Okay. The next one from ICANN org I thought was -- is very general in nature, and it was a concern expressed by ICANN that they wanted to make sure that -- a couple things. Number one is, if we don't address a specific area, meaning we the subpro group, doesn't address a specific area, and it's also I guess implicit in there is it's also not being addressed by another PDP, that they want to make sure that the -- a couple things. Number one is that they're not -- that ICANN staff has some -- it would not preclude ICANN org from suggesting implementation improvements to the areas that we don't necessarily address.

And then also -- I think this is the comment, although maybe I'm getting a little ahead of myself -- that they want to make sure that we do preserve some flexibility for ICANN org -- they don't want us to be so specific (inaudible) restricts ICANN org in implementing things in certain ways that they believe are in line with the policy. And so, I'm just trying to see if that was this comment, or a later one.

And then, I know there was a station (ph) in here -- in this comment -- well, in the ICANN org comment that's related to us being specific on which ones refer to just the new TLDs introduced after a point of time, or whether we expect things to be consensus policies applicable to existing TLDs, which for the most part we've really only been dealing with future new gTLD processes. But, since we are a PDP in theory, we could be addressing consensus policies as well.

So, my recommendation was that we take this topic and have a short discussion about it with the full working group, because it doesn't really necessarily fit with any individual section, and it's more over-arching comments about the entire report and future of final reports. Any thoughts, questions on that one?

Okay. Follow that up with several comments from Christopher Wilkinson. These were -- some of these were a little bit tough in the sense of they either were a little critical of the process we followed in coming up with this initial report, or they were critical of the GNSO having this within their remit. Some of this I put in that it's probably out of scope for this working group, so, like number 10, it's hard to see how that comment, while not trying to take away anything from the comment, it's hard to see how that comment is within our scope. So, it's one of those where I put in that I think we should declare it as a subgroup to be out of scope. This one deals with the -- basically the GNSO's sole ownership of this issue when it comes to developing policy under the bylaws. It's not really something that this working group can do anything about, even if we wanted to. That, as Kristine says, yes, out of scope.

Okay. Number 11 is dealing with -- again, this is kind of a criticism of the work track approach. So, it gives us things to think about, but I don't -- there's no action for us to take regarding it. It's just pinning (ph) a

preference of how this commenter would have liked to see things work. As such, that's not really something I think we should pick up. Kristine?

Kristine Dorrain: Hi, this is Kristine. I just -- I'm remembering that a couple of years ago I was involved in a PDP where we went through the report of public comments, or created the report of public comments, and there was the comment -- a column for PDP comment, or PDP response. And it was, "Noted, thanks." I mean, I think for some of these, it's like, yep, thanks for your opinion, Gary (ph). You know that sometimes there's no response needed. It's just we heard you. We read it. Thanks a lot. I'm not sure if that's what we're doing here, but I think we don't want anybody to think that we didn't see their comment, so I think noted "Thanks" might be something -- a fair point. I'm not sure. Maybe that was something you were already planning on doing. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, Kristine. I think that is the plan, is to basically show people that we read it, but that there's no further action to be taken with respect to this comment. I would also put that into the next comment as well, which is on geo names. It's really a -- it's really just a caution, I guess, from Christopher Wilkinson about geographic names and how that's being handled, and he doesn't like the fact that it's a subgroup within the overall GNSO PDP. Which again is, as you said, "Thanks, noted," is fine. And Michelle said we can say it's out of scope for our work, which is fine as well.

Okay, so now something -- a comment that I think is within scope, several comments from Google. The first one from Google, line number 13, deals with cross-ownership -- a cross-ownership discussion. And that one would fit within subgroup C, section 2.10, that deals with registry/registrar separation and -- yes, registry/registrar separation and non-discrimination -- or a standardization, I should say. So, it fits in with that.

Okay. Then, we have comment from Google that is -- again, it's pretty general. We probably would need to split some of the bullet points into different subsections because, although it is very introductory in general, it does (inaudible) about improving predictability, assuring dispute resolutions are fair, preserving the openness of (inaudible) round and fostering innovation. So, those sort of relate to different areas. I just didn't know necessarily which areas to put them in at this point.

Okay. The next comment from Google is on predictability, but it really deals with the bulk of number 16 -- sorry, 15 -- deals with the preapproval process for technical -- second technical providers, which is actually -- we called it the -- sorry, originally it was called the accreditation program, but even though we're not using that term, the section is still entitled -- 2.2.3 is still entitled "Accreditation Program." So, that's the first paragraph in blue.

The second paragraph in blue deals more with -- did not put that in there, but it's -- oh, yes, sorry, it's 2.2.3, which deals with the application (inaudible) rounds. This one is much more in favor of a continuous first-

come, first-serve process. So that would be -- this comment would be moved to 2.2.3.

Okay. Number 16 is also from Google, and it is a suggestion. A little tough to actually figure out, because I don't know what the dot span (ph) trademarks are. But it basically says, "We believe that the rights to section mechanisms (ph) designed for 2012 and generally struck the right balance. However, we encountered minor issues related to inability to consider dot span (ph) trademarks." Does anybody know what that refers to? Kristine?

Kristine Dorrain: This is Kristine. And given my history with UDRP, I am going to surmise - I don't know the answer to this -- but it's a word that is sort of probably maybe a trademark that's bifurcated and ends up on both sides. So, let's say that someone registers a gTLD, that would be (ph) gTLD ZON, and someone registers AMA. So, AMA.ZON would not show up in anyone's sort of (ph) trademark matches, and -- but that would obviously violate Amazon's trademark. Does that make sense?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, that does make sense now. And since, Kristine, you're on -- I know you pay attention, as well, to the RPM group, do you think this is something that we should be referring to them?

Kristine Dorrain: Yes, this is Kristine. Yes, I mean, I think that's probably the right answer. Whether or not we'll actually be able to resolve it is a different matter entirely. But yes, I definitely think it should be flagged. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, yes. Thanks, Kristine. I understand your comment, and I think this is so -- after this call, or maybe after we go through some other items, I'm not sure if there's any others in here that we think may need to go to the RPM group, but certainly this one seems like they should be referred to Brian Beckham, Kathy Kleiman, and Phil Corwin to see if this is something they should take up. Does anybody disagree with that approach?

Okay. Support for openness to the application process, I put this as one that relates to 2.2.4 because the comment is really about open competition, and that categories for 2012 rounds were appropriate, and no other categories should be created. So, that's where, if I were to put this comment into one group, I would put it in with 2.2.4 of our group.

Okay. And then, number 18 is -- actually it has a number of different components. So, I actually put four different things in this one. There was a comment on closed (ph) generics that should actually go to the closed (ph) generic -- to the group going these closed generics. There's a registrar requirement section, which I think should be moved to the (inaudible) registry/registrar standardization/vertical integration. The next comment is on fixed annual registration terms and billing cycles, and allowing registries with discretion to set registration terms and billing cycles in increments other than a year, which I think -- I put three stars

next to it, which again I think could be in the registry/registrar standardization, which also gives vertical integration.

Okay. Number 19, so we're moving along here. 19 deals with -- I put "Not applicable" on this one. It comes from the public interest community. The reason it says "Not applicable," it's not because I don't appreciate the comment. It's just about they were not happy with us calling this an initial report. So, this is one of those that's going to be, "Thank you, it's noted." Pretty much we'll move on.

And then, the one after that is also I think from this public interest community, but it goes into some more specifics. And so, I've numbered each of the ones on the side as to where I think it should go. The first comment is about closed generics, and that obviously should go to the closed generics group, or the group doing these closed generics. There's a -- allowing self-defined and self-imposed content and copyright rules being at the registry's sole discretion. And so, those I think are the main points. You'll see some other ones either go into global public interest or to the general comment section.

So, going to the chat, Kristine's saying that the document in Adobe is upside-down. I am seeing it right-side up, but maybe I'm only looking at the first page. Hold on. You are right, it is upside-down. First page is right, but the rest of it's upside-down. Thanks, Kristine.

Okay. The next comment, also from the public interest community, which is not -- should not be confused with public interest registry, two very different things. It deals with the -- basically an overview of concerns that they have with closed generics. I (inaudible) this one. Never mind. Hold on. Let me go to the next one, sorry. This one deals with conflict, and participants in the subpro group having a financial stake in the outcomes, as number 21. And they think that there should be more transparency and a special obligation of impartiality amongst those that are writing the rules. The only thing I could think of at this point was kind of a "Thank you" or "Noted," but not much we can do at this point for any of that. I don't think we're going to put in a conflict of interest policy, because I think it pretty much is what it is (ph).

The next comment, 22, talks about the concern of conflicts again with subsequent procedures members. The only thing we can do here is to really say thank you, it's noted, but then also -- and I talked with ICANN staff about doing this anyway -- just as the first of the year approaches, we basically set (ph) everyone and remind everyone that they should be updating their statements of interest, and hopefully providing that reminder should get this (inaudible) change any outdated conflict so that this comment could be achieved, that -- sorry, that -- yes, I just lost my train of thought. There you go. I was thinking of a next thing to say, and - - but I think this one's a general concern.

And if we make sure people are up to date with their statements of interest, and at least while we can't solve the conflict of interest problem

completely because of the rules that allow participation, at least as the statements of interest are all up to date, then we know people's conflicts, going in.

Okay. I'll issue out a call, or we'll issue out a call, Cheryl and I, towards the end of the year to have everyone update their statements of interest by the beginning of next year.

Okay, next one talks about not wanting new gTLDs -- well, I shouldn't say not wanting, sorry. I'm reading this backwards -- noting support for new gTLDs, and then I just basically said this fits in with really 2.2.1, which is continuing subsequent procedures. The next one -- I'm looking at time here -- is on the PDP moving too quickly without completing the dependent (ph) activities. I think this one, although it talks about the SSAC in certain areas, I think -- and it is from the SSAC, so it's not really a surprise -- I'm actually proposing to move this to the full group call, as well, because I think this one should be discussed with the full group to make sure that we do note all of the dependent activities in our final report so that we don't miss any of them. Does anyone disagree with that approach?

The SSAC then goes on in number 25 to say that more research is needed on domain (inaudible). My item -- or my thing there is basically all they're saying -- actually, instead of this (ph), I labeled them general concerns. I should probably have put them in the securities section, as well, just to make sure that the -- that section says subgroup D, I think, and Steve, correct me if I'm wrong. We should make sure that these are all in the subgroup B, or at least -- sorry, number 25 should be in subgroup B, 27 is just a general concern as how they're -- yes, number 25 should be in subgroup B. 26 is from the NCSG. They don't -- this is a general concern that they don't consider this a true initial report. 27, they talk as Christopher Wilkinson, very similar, talks about didn't like the approach that we took for the initial report, and then also (inaudible) 28. It has some additional comments on the approach. So, I would put all these in kind of a general concern category saying "Thank you and noted," because there's really not much we can do about the (inaudible).

So, we are on to our last couple here, so thank you for hanging with me. 29 deals with how to improve competition in the gTLD space. Christopher questions whether true competition's been achieved. My only comment on this is that I think this was addressed by the CCT review team filed a report, and it's not something I think we need to address. There is a comment in here about RFPs and a -- but I think, again, it's really a general comment that is addressed in the CCT review team report. Does anyone disagree with that? So, there's no action to take.

Okay. And then, there's a comment in here from Christopher, number 30, about the jurisdictional and tax implications of when a registry is incorporated. And I think, again, that's pretty much out of scope, or not pretty much. It's out of scope from this group. There is a point in here about Work Track 5, and I know that they're talking about these issues

already. So, I think it's out of scope for this group. Not seeing any disagreement with that. And then, finally, recommendation 17. Neil (ph) says ICANN should collect data and publicize the chain of parties responsible for gTLD domain name registration. This one, along with the metrics one, I think are new ideas that should be discussed at the full working group level. So, I'm going to have -- unless anyone disagrees here, I think the action item here is to put that on the agenda for the full working group for Monday. I think it relates well to the metrics comment from the ALAC. Thoughts, concerns, questions?

Okay. Everyone's quiet. That's fine. I know everyone's tired. I appreciate everyone staying on the call. For the next call, I think we can cover both 2.2.1 and then start 2.2.2, so 2.2.1 is on whether to continue subsequent procedures, which you'll see from the comments are pretty much all aligned (ph), so that should be fairly quick, but predictability is a tougher subject then, so we'll definitely need at least most of next time and the time after.

Excuse me. Any comments or questions? Thank you, everyone, for hanging in there. We have a full group call on Monday, and we do have another subgroup call next week. Robin will lead that one. So, thank you, everyone, and talk to you next week. Have a good weekend.

Julie Bisland: Thank you, Jeff. Thanks, everyone. Ashley, you can stop the recording. Everyone have a good rest of your day.