

**ICANN  
Transcription  
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP-Sub Group A  
Thursday, 13 December 2018 at 15:00 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/gnso-new-gtld-sub-pro-pdp-sub-group-a-13dec18-en.mp3> [audio.icann.org]

Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p4xy0vmjnc/>

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/gAbuBQ>

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

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You're perilously close to our self-imposed, but I think still important, quorum. In my case, because decisions are not being made, as Kristine pointed out, I would actually run with it today at this time. I think (inaudible) remember the time of year, the number of other calls going on in people's lives. All of these things take its toll. But rather than miss out on any progress, and you've got an opportunity to do some more progress today, I think you should just run with the group you've got at the moment. Jim will be joining eventually. He sent a -- "he's delayed" message. Someone else may also join. And at least, yes, get a little bit further through. I guess my hesitation at taking it to an e-mail is that I doubt you'll get even the number of people you've got here interacting that just -- maybe a miracle will happen. But, a Doodle poll-style thing may, in fact, work, but rather than not work today, I think I'd press on at this point, because you're not far off. Maybe someone else will join, and then you'd be on the level anyway. So, let's go for it.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Cheryl. So, have we -- did we get the -- I don't think we got the recording started, right?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, just go over it now. We're ready to roll now.

Unidentified Participant: It's started. Thanks, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, cool. Welcome, everyone. It is December 13th, 2018. This is the regularly scheduled call for Subgroup A, and normally we would say that we're not taking attendance due to the overwhelming attendance in Adobe, but so far, I'll go over the people that are in the Adobe room, and also only on audio that I know of. We have myself, Jeff Neuman, and Robin Gross, the two co-leads of Subgroup A. We have Cheryl Langdon-Orr. We have Michael, and I hope I pronounce it right, Casadevall. And on the phone we have Kristine Dorrain and Kathy Kleiman, I believe, yes, on audio-only. So, is there anyone--?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Jeff, hi, it's -- yes, Jeff, it's Anne Aikman-Scalese. I'm only on the phone as well, and I'm going to have to cut in and out because I'm at the doctor's office. Sorry.

Jeff Neuman: Sure thing. Thanks, Anne. And then, from ICANN staff, we have Steve Chan, Julie Hedlund, Julie Bisland, and Emily Barabas. So, great. Okay. We got started a little bit late today because we were waiting for a quorum, and it seems like we have just hit a quorum at this point. The one thing that I do want to get on the record, some discussion prior to us starting the recording, about whether we could kind of view (ph) the root cause of why we're having this low attendance for these calls and just barely making quorum, and some believe that that may be because of, during this phase, we're really just going through the comments and making sure that we understand them and that we're just documenting them in a correct way to whether they agree (inaudible) express concerns with the original working group recommendations. We're going to carry forward with this call. We may send out some emails in the next several days of seeing if there's a better way, or how to encourage others to participate.

On the schedule today is an agenda, will be to go over -- continue in the public comments from 2.2.2.2, or continue from that, from section E1, and then hopefully get on to 2.2.3 and any other business after that. That's why I have first, is there any (inaudible) got anything to review with their statement of work? (Inaudible) -- or statement of interest? My head's at something else -- statement of interest, any changes?

Kathy Kleiman: Hi, Jeff, this is Kathy on audio. I don't have an update to SOI. I did have a comment to make whenever it's appropriate on some of the things you just said and some of the things we said before the tapes start.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Let me just finish up, and then I'll get back to you. So, Michael, is this a comment for the statement of interest, or a comment (inaudible)?

Michael Casadevall: I have an SOI change. I'm part of the non-commercial stakeholder's group reviewing comments on Work Track 5. I'm not sure if it's relevant to this work, but I figure I'd mention it. I'll update the Wiki after this call. I just -- you just made me remember it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Michael. Yes, that's relevant, and thank you for bringing that up. So, just before we get into some of the substance (ph) for the call, let me turn it over to Kathy, that's got a comment on the intro and also some color to add from the conversation we had just before we started the recording.

Kathy Kleiman: Great. Thanks, Jeff, and yes, it's hard. It's hard in this season. Everyone has, in addition to other work, all their conflicting obligations. So, I know it's rough (ph). I just wanted to make sure, and I think the answer's yes, but that if anything changes regarding the quorum process, that that's going out to the list, just so people know that maybe these sub-teams will be going forward, these subgroups will be going forward without quorums.

I would also note that it'd probably good idea on different calls, if they do take place without a quorum, to note that very clearly at the front of the notes that are taking place so that people know, so that it just becomes a matter of the record. That was it. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, Kathy, both good comments, good suggestions. So, we'll note -- well, we'll note on our attendance, and note I think that we have quorum for this call. But also for future calls, if we were to change anything, going forward, they would obviously go out to the full list as kind of suggestions and feedback. And then, we would -- depending on what we got back, we'd move forward after that. So, thank you, Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Thanks, Jeff, (inaudible).

Jeff Neuman:

Okay. Thanks, Kathy. Let's go -- if you look, I think they have -- they're both the same point (ph). So, both Robin and Cheryl have posted the link to the Google Doc for what we're talking about today, or for all of the Subgroup A, I should say. And it's probably easier to read in this -- the Adobe, but of course we're on Adobe, as well.

So, any other questions or comments before we get into jumping into this? Steve is saying on the chat not to discourage disclosure of attendance (inaudible), but I think it's worth noting that quorum for working group calls is not an official thing in the operating procedure. Yes, thanks, Steve, that is right. There is -- this is kind of an informal guideline. I'm not even sure -- I can't even tell you why that started. Wasn't with this group, but I think it's just one of those informal things that we -- actually, I think, if I remember correctly, I think Aubrey (ph) was the first one that I remember bringing it up. And it may have even been -- I couldn't tell you whether it was this group or another one, but it is part of a self-imposed, as Cheryl said, limit. But certainly, we should document attendance, and if we are going to change anything, going forward, whether that's a quorum rule or doing things on e-mail. We will definitely be upfront on the list to make sure that everything is known (ph).

Okay. All that said, let's go to 2.2.2.e.1, right? Is that correct? Oh, did I miss a two in there? 2.2.2.e.1, so -- and this is the question dealing with -- well, maybe let me go to the -- overall, the subject is the clarity of application process, so all of this fits in that overall topic. But this particular section is -- really asks the question of whether ICANN has as an organization is capable of scaling to handle the application volume, and if not, what has to happen in order for ICANN to scale? What's key here is we're talking about ICANN organization (ph), not necessarily the community. That's what the question's asking about. Doesn't mean that others didn't respond in the comment section about community, but this question was, in general, asking about that.

So, we've got comments from Neustar. We've got comments from ICANN, registrar, business constituency, ALAC, brand registry group, the (inaudible), so pretty diverse set of -- or a diverse group of commenters. And essentially, if we go through Neustar and ICANN, Neustar believes that ICANN does have the resources to scale regardless of the number of applications, and it's basically saying that (inaudible) near GAC (ph). That's why their view that there may be a higher volume of applications I guess with the message that, in the future, if there are not such long gaps, then it may not be the case that rounds will be -- or that ICANN would need to necessarily scale up high (ph). ICANN organization agrees with the concept or with the notion that it does have the ability to scale, that they probably could exceed the original guidance in the first -- sorry, 2012 round, which was essentially 500. They had done (inaudible) applications within five months. They think that they can do more than that. And depending on the policy recommendations adopted, they would likely be able to exceed the processing volumes.

But, some concerns, and the concerns are really about making sure that there's an adequate time period between when the applicant guidebook is finalized and the opening of the application window to make sure that there's enough time for operational planning, readiness, and implementation to ensure smooth process for applicants. So, it's not disagreeing. It's just kind of putting that caution flag up, saying that they need some to make sure that there's enough time. Well, what that time is, they didn't exactly say, but certainly, as we go through the implementation, with the Implementation Review Team, I'm sure that ICANN org will be providing additional input as to that specific timeline.

Just waiting to see if there are any comments on that part, final flip (ph). So, if anyone sees that I'm missing anything from the chat, just let me know. I'm trying to switch between my Google sheets and the Adobe.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Michael's hand's up. Michael's hand's up.

- Jeff Neuman: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay, hands up. Good. So, please go ahead. Oh, I'm sorry, you said (inaudible). Sorry.
- Michael Casadevall: No, no, I have a hand up.
- Jeff Neuman: Now I see him. Yes, thank you, Michael.
- Michael Casadevall: So, looking at the comments, I have -- I think it can be broken down to two things, is that the biggest problem, and this is pretty well outlined with the NCSG group as well as the - - what was the other one -- the business constituency is that, while their support for creating a team to basically review the applications and allow ICANN to scale, the problem is what represents that team. The NCSG comment, it specifically calls out the fact that most standing Implementation Review Teams are pretty small. So, I think this could be summarized as a lot of agreement for the idea, but an IRT may not be the correct way to handle it. That's my takeaway from reading all the concerns in a short takeaway. I think the general way that it's been written by ICANN staff makes sense. It also needs to be clear that the IRT cannot bypass. Again, this is directly connected to the NCSG comment, as well as the business constituency. The IRT does not operate outside the guidelines of the PDP working group. So, I hope that -- that's my takeaway reading from these comments. That's the trend I see.
- Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, Michael. I just -- want to just clarify something, because -- and this does get confusing. There's really two types of IRTs that we're talking about in -- or have been talking about in connection with this. The first type of IRT is the GNSO mandated IRT, which is one I don't believe the NCSG comments related to, but someone can correct me if I'm wrong. This is the IRT that normally is formed by the GNSO's representative of all of the stakeholder groups and in the GNSO operating procedures. But I'm not sure -- again, and someone can correct me (inaudible), but the -- I believe the comments from the NCSG were about the addition of a standing IRT after the (inaudible) one for issues that came up after the launch of the program.
- So, I think, Michael, you're correct to note that the NCSG had comments in there about the (inaudible) of an IRT, but I think it was a connection with the latter one, the standing IRT as opposed to the first one, which is GNSO, which was -- is a GNSO mandated one. We can ask for clarification. I see that you put that in the chat.
- Kathy Kleiman: Jeff? Hey, Jeff, can I join the queue? This is Kathy.
- Jeff Neuman: Sure. Yes, please, Kathy. Yes.
- Kathy Kleiman: Okay. I think Michael's right. I think it's concern about both. And I'm not sure the nuance of a regular IRT versus a standing IRT as a different (ph) group that goes forward. It's fully understood by the community. So, I think it would be easier and more accurate to apply the NCSG comments, as Michael did, across the board.
- And IRTs very rarely are representative of all stakeholder groups. They're mostly the people -- if they do their job properly, they're just technical. They're largely technical details, and that's largely the communities that would work closely with technical details. But again, this differentiation of IRT 1 versus IRT 2 may not be fully understood by the community, and where one starts and whether they flow into another. So, I think Michael's right, so if you could please apply the concerns of NCSG across the board, I think you'll have a more accurate representation. Thanks.
- Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, Kathy. So, we can certainly, and we should ask for the clarification. I will note, as one of the co-Chairs, and Cheryl can weigh in as well, and of course Robin, but

as an overall co-Chair of this group, I think the first type of IRT, that's really beyond our scope, right? That is a general GNSO issue that applies to every single PDP. And so, I think at this point, certainly we'll want the NCSG to clarify. But if there are overall concerns of IRT in general as is reflected in the operating guidelines, or the operate (inaudible), then what we can do, Cheryl and I, is (inaudible) the GNSO as a whole, and even forward on the comments from the NCSG. But with respect to this particular subsequent procedures, which I think (inaudible)--.

Kathy Kleiman: --Okay, Jeff, a follow-up question whenever it's appropriate.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Yes, so let me just finish that for the record, finish (inaudible) on the record, and then I'll follow up. So, for the record, my proposal to take those concerns from the NCSG with respect to GNSO-mandated IRT, and I'm sorry that they carry the same name, because that's adding to the confusion. But, for the GNSO policy development process, IRTs that are in the operating procedures, we will forward the NCSG comments on and say that this is something that the Council may want to take up. We won't take that up (inaudible)--.

Kathy Kleiman: --No, I disagree. Okay--.

Jeff Neuman: --Let me finish, right (ph)? Let me finish, and then I promise (inaudible). And then, the second type of standing IRT to (inaudible) with this group has put out an initial report. Certainly the NCSG comments are certainly to be considered there. So, Kathy, please?

Kathy Kleiman: Yes. I wouldn't take anything to the GNSO Council now, and I think it would be inappropriate to do it. These are comments that were made to the SubPro, and what you're hearing is the confusion. And let me add to that confusion. Which IRT were you talking about starting earlier? The last time we went to the GNSO Council -- and sorry about the background noise. I'm walking. So, which IRT were we talking about in Barcelona to start earlier? What you've got is a fundamental confusion about IRTs. And so, A, I think you might want to come up with some different names; B, clarify to the community which IRTs we're talking about when; and then, C, let those who commented then clarify, if necessarily, which they're applying to.

But there's a confusion. We're hearing it echoed. And it may be very clear for you, Jeff, since you helped write this, but it's not clear for us. So, I wouldn't take anybody's comment outside yet, but note that there's confusion and concern, and maybe the same words being used in fundamentally different ways with the community not knowing where A ends and B starts. So, I think all of that should actually be reflected at this point in time in these documents to the working group, because I think it's really important that everybody understand exactly the issues that we're talking about now. And I assure you they're very unclear, and very important. So, thanks, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, Kathy, fair -- all fair points. So, agree with you that, because it's sharing the same name, that it's confusing. So, it's an item (ph) to come up with a different name or term for the thing that this working group, or the working group, had recommended in its initial report as opposed to the Implementation Review Team that is GNSO mandated in a consensus policy implementation framework document. So, I will -- I agree with you, Kathy. I'm not disagreeing at all. So, maybe Steve's got clarification.

The last thing I would just say before I give the (inaudible) back to Michael is that, see, the initial report does define, at least tries to define, a moment in time when the new standing panel, which I'll refer to as now the standing panel as opposed to an implementation team, would be formed. So, let me go to Steve, and then I'll go to Michael, please.

- Steve Chan: Thanks, Jeff, this is Steve. So, actually, just to address that directly then I guess, one of the things that -- we've noted the confusion about how the predictability framework, as well as the standing panel, I guess as we might be calling it for now, how those are represented and understood. And I think one of the things we thought about that might be helpful is to try to put a graphic together to try to better highlight where those demarcation lines are. Because I think the point at which they switch from a standard regular GNSO IRT to what is being proposed by this subgroup is fairly distinct, but I think drawing a picture and making it clear for folks is going to be helpful.
- But actually why I raised my hand is actually I -- from a staff side, we got a little bit lost in this conversation in how it's connected. So, the IRT, or even the standing IRT, for us, we're happy, of course, to bring comments into different sections if it's applicable. And we count on the subgroup members of -- the members to help us apply comments where applicable. But, for this one, we're a little bit lost in how IRT or standing IRT, or standing panel, is connected to the ICANN org ability to scale. So, if you can help us understand how they're connected, that'd be great. And I will be happy to (inaudible)--.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: --They need to help me understand that, too, because I'm sitting here going, okay, I know it's 2:30 in the morning, Cheryl, but what earthly relevance does this, albeit valuable comments and conversation, have to do with the ability to scale? I have re-read the comments in all this time, and I still can't find the relevance. So, not that it's irrelevant in general, but the relevance to 2.2.2.2.e.1 escapes me. Anyway, maybe I'll live and learn.
- Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Steve and Cheryl. It does not directly relate to the very item that we're talking about, but it is an area of confusion left over from the last call. So, let's -- I don't think there's anything to fill in over here for this comment, but I think it's a more general action item that we certainly should be taking care of. So, I'll give the floor to Michael for a minute or two, and then we'll go to the -- we'll go to the next comments. So, Michael, please?
- Michael Casadevall: So, the relevance to scalability that I see, and this is what I took away primarily from the NCSG comment, is that certain stakeholder representatives may simply not have the manpower available to contribute to said standing power. And they're concerned that, if the number of applications go up, it may simply overwhelm the subgroup constituencies to be able to keep up with them on the standing panel. That's how I read the NCSG comment, and the creation of the -- well, what we now refer to as the standing panel.
- I also would recommend that we call it something a little bit more specific than standing panel, like new gTDL (sic - gTLD) review standing panel or something, just to make it very clear what it is. And some of the questions may need to be rephrased or re-asked with the re-word, because this is not the first time we've had confusion with the IRT issue. This came up in Subpro Group B, if I remember correctly.
- Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Michael. We'll come up with -- we'll try to come up with a term that's -- I think a new term plus the graphic, as Steve talked about, will help us understand and maybe get (inaudible) in the right place when we think about the timeline. And this will come up again, and I'm trying to remember whether -- I think it is this group when we talk about things like a communication period and everything else. So, let's -- we'll take that action item away, then we'll--.
- Kathy Kleiman: --Kathy in the queue, just to agree. I don't want to interrupt. Go ahead, Jeff.
- Jeff Neuman: Well, I was just about to go on to the next comment, so Kathy, just one last comment on this, and then let's go ahead with the next comment.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay, yes. For the infographic that Steve's talking about, it would be really interesting also to see what happened, a little more detail about what happens when the Standing Committee is created after the IRT, whether -- in terms of who constitutes it, whether that's new period opening up for people to join, whether the old IRT automatically folds in. I think there's confusion on this, as well. And I just wanted to tell everybody, I have to go to a computer science and public policy class that I sit in on, much to my amusement, and so I'm leaving the call, but thank you very much for considering my comments.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, Kathy, and have fun at the class. Okay. Let's move on then to the next comment, which came from -- make sure I got my place right here -- the business constituency. So, the BC1 expressed concerns as to whether -- although the previous comments didn't express ICANN's ability to scale, the BCC does think, if I'm interpreting their comment, there may be a point at which ICANN may not be able to scale. I think they draw (ph) at 10,000 number. So, I think if there's -- I mean, I can kind of glean as a clarifying question. It's maybe a question back to the ICANN organization to say, right, you do say that you can pretty much scale to anything. Do you really mean anything, or is there some sort of overall remix is kind of the way I'm interpreting? If I don't interpret that as a disagreement with ICANN's ability to scale, but I think the BCC is probably pointing out that there is -- there may be, at least in their mind, a point at which -- or above which they may not act. So, we can go back to ICANN org with a question on that.

Let's see, looking at the comments. Okay. Looking at the registrars next, the registrars state that they don't believe that ICANN, as it's structured currently, can efficiently handle a new application round, be it (ph) that a careful design, along with maybe a restructuring of ICANN staff, appear to be necessary, then, once restructured, would remain open all the time. And so, looking at -- I'm looking at the (inaudible). I'm not seeing anyone from the registrars. I am somewhat familiar with the registrar comments, and I do know that from the registrar stakeholder group (inaudible), when they were putting these comments together, they were making a reference to the fact that there no longer is a group (ph) focused on (inaudible) new gTLDs within ICANN, and that group of people have been really assigned to different areas. And so, one of the things that (inaudible) comments was the fact that there was no separate group. Perhaps relaying that to ICANN Org and maybe asking them about what -- actually, I'm trying to think of a best way to ask that question with ICANN Org, but it's essentially -- it's more of an implementation question of ICANN Org is saying it can, and I guess just reaffirming with ICANN Org that it will structure -- it may structure itself a little bit differently when the application process starts and try to figure out an effective way to ask ICANN that. I'm not sure that covers it.

Any thoughts from anyone else in the group? Steve Chan is typing. I'll wait a second.

Steve Chan: Hey, Jeff, this is Steve. I'll speak if you don't mind. I expect it'd be faster.

Jeff Neuman: Much better, thanks.

Steve Chan: Thanks. I was just going to say that I think ICANN Org has consistently said something to the effect that they need -- I guess the closer to final set of recommendations from this group to be able to really do a fulsome assessment of their operational ability to scale. So, I think if we were asked to ask them that question now, they'd probably come back with something similar, that they need closer to final recommendations before they're able to give this a realistic estimate. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, Steve. That does make sense, and that's why I was kind of grappling with how to even ask that question at this point. We can note it as a concern. And after I said

it and after you kind of responded, I was kind of left (inaudible) sort of the same thing, a bit -- it's like a chicken-and-egg problem, and until you have the -- ICANN Org I don't think could be any more specific other than a commitment to meet whatever their demands are.

Michael, you had your hand raised, but you dropped it. Is that -- I just wanted to make sure it's not my Adobe that's acting up. Okay, Michael, please?

Unidentified Participant: Hey, Michael, I see you--.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: --We're not hearing you, Michael. Can you adjust your microphone and check?

Michael Casadevall: Sorry, hardware mic switch. Can you hear me now?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes indeed, (inaudible).

Michael Casadevall: Okay. I was looking at this, and I'm sort of seeing this as another round of confusion with the term IRT, because it talks both about an IRT being created and the standing IRT. And it doesn't talk -- it doesn't clarify. So, I suspect this comment, once we create that infographic and finalize the term for the standing panel, I think we should re-ask this question of the registry stakeholder group, skipping -- I also would think that would be true for some of the other comments here, but I'll get to those when we get to them.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, Michael, this is Jeff. I'm just trying to follow. I don't -- the comments were (inaudible) this from the registrars, and I don't see any mention there of an implementation group. Are you maybe looking at a different comment?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What line are you looking at, Michael, in the document? Give us a line. Is it line 18?

Michael Casadevall: I'm at line 18.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Michael Casadevall: Line 18 on page 2.2.2. Am I in the wrong place?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You are, and I'm looking there, too. Where is it talking about standing panel?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, Michael, we're on -- we're in the tab number 2.2.2.2, so four twos. We're on line 18, but we're in that tab. You might be on a different tab.

Michael Casadevall: I'm on the wrong tab. I retract my comments. I'm sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That helps solve a lot of the confusion in this poll. Thanks, Michael, because I was really going to wonder whether you were just going to have this sort of dog-on-a-bone attitude on one comment from your constituency. And it relieves me that that isn't the case, because I was getting concerned about one group trying to make over-arching priority over the other group comments that we've received. I already was charting (ph) to staff my deep concern, so you'll save me a chair making a complaint and having this discussion, which would be a very serious one, I can assure you, with the rest of the leadership team. I'm greatly relieved to have you on the right tab now.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Cheryl. Let me jump to the next comment, which was from the ALAC, which ALAC has suggested that ICANN should conduct a study on scalability, where it says, "The ALAC believes that ICANN Org needs to conduct a study regarding its scalability to handle the likely higher influx of applications for new gTLDs. We'll note that comment. I think with the ICANN organization affirmatively stating that it can scale, I

think with the root scaling studies and things that we have there, and the results, I'm not sure that, at this point, other than noting this comment, I'm not sure that we need to pass anything through to the ICANN Org, but let me ask -- sorry, Cheryl, I think you're the only one on the call, if I'm not mistaken, from the ALAC. Am I missing something here? And if you don't know, that's fine.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not wishing to speak on behalf of ALAC, but again, I notice this is not a concern. It is more a modification, a suggestion, an additional idea. And I think we've got a parking lot for additional ideas, and that's exactly where this, along with many others, should go.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Cheryl. Actually, that's a better way of stating it, so thank you for that. Cool. All right. Let's go on to comment on line 20, brand registry group. This was support for ICANN Org to handle application volume if smaller, distinct application rounds were opened. So, this is a new idea. It's not disagreeing, necessarily, that ICANN couldn't handle the scale, but it basically talked about a couple things. One is that clearer instructions for an applicant, for the application, with improved, streamlined processes could help ICANN Org to scale up. I think that's in line with -- I think that's in line with that. I also (ph) -- then it says if smaller, distinct application rounds were opened for specific categories in parallel to ongoing policy work, this would alleviate the pressure of a single open round in two or three years' time and help create a manageable and scalable process.

I'm going to take this comment, and I'm going to push it into the 2.2.3, and potentially 2.2.4, because it's really talking about creating a category and really -- actually, I'm going to keep it in 2.2.4 instead of 2.2.3, but in 2.2.4, it's talking about categories and the different rights, and obligations and other things that would apply if we were to create different types of categories and how to treat different ones. Although there is a comment that it says that this would help scale, and so then, that was, it's got to related to scalability. I think it's really dependent on whether this group makes a decision on whether to treat brands in this respect differently as opposed to making an affirmative suggestion particularly (ph) holding that ICANN is going to be able to scale is by doing this.

Let me look at the group here and see if I'm misjudging that, but the way I read it, and read it a couple times, it seems to be in line with that. (Inaudible) agrees. Any disagreement with that? Okay.

Next comment is from the registry stakeholder group. So, the registry stakeholder group believes that there are certain modifications that could improve the scalability. This again is -- in some respects it's a new idea. In some respects, it's actually supporting some of the recommendations that are (inaudible). So, the registry believes that an RFP pre-approval program will help with scalability. And while I would really put that in as just support for the applicant RFP pre-approval program, and I guess one of the benefits of their support of that of that is that it would help the scalability. The minor tweaks to technical evaluation, again, this is not necessarily -- it's not really a new idea, because what they're saying is that, if we take the suggestions that they make to the technical evaluation, that that will help the scalability. In fact, I think all five of these, if I'm counting right, aren't really -- they're not new ideas.

I think what the registry stakeholder group is saying is that, if we take some of the changes that are already recommended by the initial report and others that may be registry recommendations later on here, that they believe that all of those taken together will help the scalability. So, I'm actually going to not -- I'm going to recommend, and please, those from the registry stakeholder group, if I'm misreading it, but I'm going to actually put this act in green as opposed to in blue, saying that there are agreement that ICANN has the ability to scale with a sort of (inaudible) -- maybe in the -- well, I guess

it's not really a concern. Try to figure out the best way to (inaudible) -- as opposed to any concerns or new ideas. But Kristine is typing. So, we just--.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: --You've got Jim's hand up, as well.

Jeff Neuman: Ah, thank you, definitely. Thank you. My Adobe's been incredibly slow, and I see Jim, and then I see Kristine. Jim first, then Kristine.

Yes, thanks, everybody. Apologies for being late, just had a conflicting call. Jeff, I think in this shorthand version here, I think it's fine to make the change you're suggesting. But as you dive into the details of what some of these bullet points entail, just particularly adjustments to the system testing, preapproval of registry services and the overall financial evaluation, there may be some new ideas in there. So, I didn't hold the pen on this particular section, but I think there's -- this is shorthand for a big basket of issues and concerns and ideas on how to improve this part. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Jim. Kristine, please?

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine Dorrain, Amazon Registry. Yes, so this section is a shorthand list of the various other comments we've made throughout, which may or may not relate to the subgroup A. It may relate across subgroup B or subgroup C, as well. But these were five comments that the registry stakeholder group made that we just felt like we didn't want to reiterate here. We wanted to direct the working group to know that we have actually made comments that would improve scalability, but overall, tis is an agreement concept, the registry stakeholder group. And we (inaudible) doing the drafting did believe, as Jim pointed out, that we generally think ICANN can scale, but also s please see the rest of our comments. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Kristine. And I think as we talk about -- and Steve as well -- as we -- and by we, I mean the entire group or whatever subgroup it's related to. As we talk about those areas, one of the benefits we should hopefully remember, all of us hopefully can remember, is -- for those different recommendations is oh, and by the way, the registries (inaudible) this way. We think that'll help with scalability. Don't know how we're -- jot that down, and we can try to make a note for ourselves in here. But if everyone can kind of remember to do that when we get specifics, that one of the benefits, as you've noted in this saying, in this 2.2.2.2.e.1, is that adoption of this will help the scalability.

Okay. Let's see. Just going through the chat. Am I missing any in the chat? Let me know, because mine's slow. Michael has said may I make a recommendation for comments we've covered as a group, we background color them or make them visually distinct. It should help prevent (inaudible). All right. We'll see if we can maybe do kind of a marker of at least where we left off or something to help us. And Phil is agreeing with -- or agrees with Jim's comment about revamping the (inaudible). Cheryl is the new idea parking lot is becoming very crowded. Not that I'm complaining. I'm more for driving continuous improvement to prospect synergies (ph).

So, Cheryl, I don't think that -- if that's a comment for what I said, but it's not a new idea. It is (inaudible)--.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: --No, it was a comment on the points Kristine was making regarding the desirability of having the new ideas reiterated with their relevant scalability. And I was saying, well, that's more for the parking lot, and that's a great thing. And then, I'm going to take the metaphor even further, because I like Robin's concept of public transport. And I now have a mental image of a continuous improvement train, which makes me even happier. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks. And again, I was also -- because my Adobe's behind -- the last comment I see is from Michael saying -- oh, now I see where Kristine is saying happy (inaudible) mentioned. Okay, never mind. And by (inaudible) of them being public (ph) transportation (inaudible), there were comments that I might be missing.

Okay, (inaudible) seeing any, and again, I apologize for my slow Internet catching up with the comments. So, then we've got 2.2.2 in the clarity of application process, where we had some comments that were received we thought fit within this kind of section, but not necessarily within a specific subcategory of this one. And so, the first one is on -- is from -- sorry, not on, it's from -- well, maybe there's only one, going back and forth. There's a bunch of comments on here from Christopher Wilkinson related to transparency concerns. The concerns were the lack of readily accessible information. I'm assuming that's from the last round -- no, I'm sorry, that's from -- lack of information from the staff on the community (ph) costs. There's (inaudible), not sufficiently coherent to interpretation of the selection criteria. There's a lot of professional background of panelists, their affiliation, transparency concerns from Christopher.

And then, the new ideas, which I don't think necessarily all of them are new, but some of them are. And there are some things about -- discussion in there about a clear, concise, precise timeframe, so I think that's not really a new idea. That's an expression of -- and what I think a number of people support. Number two is providing interested parties with an estimation of fees and costs, which I think also is kind of a minor (ph) to transparency. More transparency around the qualifications of evaluators and panelists. Ensuring that procedures, requirements, and scoring rules are precise. I don't think any of these are really new, even though they're all in the blue at this point. I'm just trying to skim through and see if there's something really truly new here. Exactly. Mike's being clear, and clear that it's a plain rationale (ph). This is actually in the bylaws (inaudible).

Is there any one that anyone's seen in here that's really new? There is concern that Christopher has, that's basically saying that this section, and a lot of sections, rely on the notion of everything being -- all application types being treated equally, and I don't think that that's -- and so what he's -- Christopher's saying is that that may not be a fair assumption. Does anyone have any questions or thoughts on Christopher's comments? Okay. Not seeing any, although let me just give another second in case my Adobe is slow.

Okay. I see that Jamie is now on audio only, so welcome, Jamie. Can I ask, for the record, Jamie?

Jamie Baxter: Yes, I'm here, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Oh, okay, Jamie Baxter. Thank you, Jamie. Great. I recognize the voice. Okay. So, it's Jamie Baxter. Thank you. Great. Welcome.

Okay. We're now on 2.2.3, and I forgot what Robin and I decided as to which one. I'm happy to continue, but I don't know if, Robin, you had your heart on it. And I'm trying to remember what we decided.

Robin Gross: I don't think we did decide.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Robin Gross: I'm not sure we (inaudible).

Jeff Neuman: Well, I'll tell you what. I will start it on this call, and then you can pick it up and then go with different TLD types for the next. How about that?

Robin Gross: Sounds good.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. All right. Applications assessed in the rounds, which means this area generated any comments, and so let's start going through it. The first part of it was the general -- we'll go in the general comments, which there was from the ALAC general opposition to do first-come, first-serve (ph) right away. I really think it's actually agreement, because I believe the initial report had that in there as well, that the group had recommended not starting with a first-come, first serve. So, this one might go a little bit deeper as you read the comments as far as dealing with first-come, first-serve later on. But at least with not doing first-come, first-serve initially, I believe that that is agreeing with what the initial report has in it. So, I'd like to put part of that that we agree (ph) at least, with the initial report's recommendation. Does anyone oppose that? Again, we'll read the rest of the comments, but I believe the initial report did recommend that the very first part of it not being first-come, first-serve. Jim, please?

Jim Prendergast: Hey, Jeff. I don't know -- and I'm looking towards Cheryl or anybody else from ALAC on the call, but I think you've got to read the comments as a whole instead of splitting it apart, because to me it reads as though they still have a concern in the rounds -- within a round, which presumably would be the next opening about a first-come, first-serve approach in there. Maybe I'm misreading it, but that's how I viewed it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Jim, Cheryl here. That resonates with what I heard the ALAC coming to consensus on during their review process. But if we are in any doubt, we can always ask the lower-case L liaison to clarify it with them. The policy group meets weekly, so it's not going to be much of a delay to get a response from them.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, Jim, and thanks, Cheryl. So, we should definitely follow up with them. I can (ph) follow up with them on is -- because at the end of the day, what we're trying to do is try to make a recommendation ready for the full group. We'll read this whole comment. I think you're right, Jim, in the fact that -- but I'm trying to pull out elements and pull it apart, as well, to see what parts of the section that agrees with the initial report and what part it doesn't.

So, let's just go over the full comment. The full comment says that, regardless of whether we do things in a round or on a first-come, first-serve basis, applications must continue to be batched, and to allow for not only fair competition in string selection, but also facilitate a manageable review by various stakeholders. And it lists the stakeholders, the different types of -- well, the stakeholders and different types of processes, whether it's early warning, objections, et cetera, and also for resolution procedures and CPEs and things like that. In any case, ALAC strongly advocates against the immediate commencement of a permanent first-come, first-serve basis.

The way I would interpret this is, if I could pull it apart into different sub-parts, number one, no first-come, first-serve right away, which is in agreement with the initial report, because that's what the initial report said. Number two is, when the initial report is talking about options, they are making the assertion that there's a next round after that, or whatever happens after that, they still would have first-come, first-serve (inaudible) because of these factors that they mention. And so, I think that second part is where -- so this is an interesting one. Let me throw this out for the group.

So, the initial report put forth options. It didn't really -- it said for the first or the next, quote, "Application window," it should be in a round. And I think that's what the initial report said. And it said, for the next application window, there are (inaudible), and so it's that second part where it is the ALAC selecting one of those options, not necessarily as a concern, but it is selecting option, or not option, whatever number that was. So, maybe

it's just me going -- it's not me. It's (inaudible) the leadership team as it's re-color-coding it to say that agreement with the first part of the initial report, which says that the first one should be a round, and then the ALAC would select not option whatever was associated with first-come, first-serve.

Then, let's take that, and we'll pass that on in the questions. There's also a comment developed from Steve (ph) as to why the ALAC has two comments. I think the answer to that -- Michael and Steve, you can jump in, and you're going to jump in anyway -- is because these didn't -- what we did is we pulled out general comments from ALAC and from others, but it just happened to be ALAC in this example, where it didn't easily fall (ph) within one of the subcategories, so there were (inaudible) comments in this part that didn't neatly fit into one of the sub-questions. So, we pulled it out in general, so that's why there's two comments. Steve, please?

Steve Chan: Thanks, Jeff. This is Steve Chan from staff. So, actually, I think you mostly have that right. So, the ALAC comments here were made -- they were actually indeed general comments made to this section, to 2.2.3. So, I think the way that it was phrased is that it's applied to the entire section, and so at that point, they were grouped as either general or other comments. But I think the point you're making is that a lot of these comments in here, or I guess a lot of the subsections in parts of the comment actually apply to the questions or recommendations that the working group made.

So, in that regard, what I think we could probably do is just copy and apply the relevant -- or the comment to the relevant section. So, for instance, line one could probably go towards recommendation -- preliminary recommendation one, and then highlight the part that's actually already highlighted, that the ALAC strongly advocates against the immediate commencement of a permanent first-come, first-serve process.

So, I guess that would be the staff suggestion, was that rather than re-color-coding this, we just probably apply the comment to the relevant sections of this section. I didn't mean to use "section" twice, but hopefully that makes sense. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Steve. That does make sense. And yes, let me ask -- I don't know if Cheryl's back yet. I know Cheryl had to step away, and I don't see anyone else from the ALAC. Cheryl, are you back yet?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm not -- I've never not been with you. It's just I'm only on audio, just for a little while. I'll be back at the computer shortly. But yes, what did you want me to ask? What did you want to ask me?

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So, I think, since these recommendations, we initially labeled some of the ALAC comments, because they were in the general section, as expressing concerns. But when you take a look at least at this first one, we actually think we should put it in with the section of the report that actually discussed that part and (inaudible) within the section.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. What I heard Steve say was "replicate" that into the other sections it applies to. It was an over-arching, in-general comment. Obviously, you can also double-check that with Kristine -- sorry, with Justine, Justine Chu, who's officially now the lower-case-1 liaison from the ALAC and at-large for this. So -- but that certainly seems more than reasonable to me.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Thanks. So, again -- so we will take -- we will replicate these comments into the particular sections. To the extent that we keep any of this also in the general section, I'm going to ask that the color-coding be removed, because I don't think their concerns with the initial report recommendations. They may be concerns in general, but they're not concerns about the initial report recommendation. So, hope that makes sense.

- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Jeff, Cheryl here. Just this is an opportune moment to bring up something that I was going to bring up on the leadership team synchronization call anyway, saves me doing that. We had in last weeks' sessions of calls -- I don't know, it was call B. We had the Council of Europe make an intervention, and they were deeply concerned that their quite general over-arching comments were replicated into a section that they thought it had relevance to. And we did point out that they were not -- they're about transparency and accountability. And we pointed out that they really belonged in over-arching, or overall concerns, or over-arching comments.
- And therefore, we'd bring it to -- leave it in our general section in B, but also bring it to the attention of Group A, where we thought this over-arching things would also be highlighted. So, if we can just have an AI for staff to -- while they're replicating things, also grab the missive from the Council of Europe and make sure it slots in, even if it's got its own tab. Since we made that commitment to bring it up to this group, I'll bring it up now. Thank you.
- Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Cheryl. So, you're talking about in the general tab in front of -- so in front of 2.2.1--.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: --That is correct--.
- Jeff Neuman: --Or whatever it starts.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct, yes.
- Jeff Neuman: Got you.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, in the tab that you initially worked with. But because it is over-arching, it needs to be replicated there, valid point made, and there's an action items we need to follow on. That's all. Thank you. One you didn't know about, so I figured I should probably share it.
- Jeff Neuman: Okay. Yes, thank you for pointing that out. So, we will remove that. As you said, AI, and for the record, that means Action Item, for anyone that didn't get that. So, we will do that.
- Okay. The next comment is also a general comment from the -- sorry, let me just go back to my Google doc. Okay. So, the next comment was--.
- Anne Aikman-Scalese: --Jeff, sorry, it's Anne. Could I -- I'm sorry, I'm just on the phone, but could I just ask a question about Cheryl's comments there?
- Jeff Neuman: Sure, with the slight caution that it's not always given to (inaudible), but please do ask the question.
- Anne Aikman-Scalese: No, I'm not -- no, that was exactly my question. Was the comment just to the effect that Council of Europe wanted to make sure that its comment showed up on both places? Was it merely a procedural comment, then, or what? I wasn't real clear on this.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So, I'll stop talking shorthand then, because I didn't want to take the valuable time of today's committee, and I'll give you a slightly longer version.
- Council of Europe's concern was that their over-arching comments on transparency and accountability were not being replicated where they felt relevant in a number of places in group B, right? It wasn't relevant other than in an over-arching way, right? It was an

over-arching comment, and the over-arching, or general comments were handled not in group B, which is where this conversation happened, but rather in group A.

I undertook, as one of the PDP overall coaches, to say thank you for highlighting your concern that your comments aren't being recognized or resonating in all the right places, and that we will make sure group A understands that they have an additional over-arching or general comment, in other words your first tab that you've all dealt with in group A where it also belongs. Is that okay?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: (Inaudible), yes. Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And so, it's a process. It's a process AI, but it's one that has to have the loop closed on it.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. Okay, thanks. Thank you. I just wasn't clear. Thanks very much, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, it was me covering up being clear, seeing as I'm doing other things right now. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Anne and Cheryl. This next one, too, I'm not sure I'm going to go through, read word-for-word, because again, I'm not sure it should really be labeled as concern to the initial -- generally when we label something of concern, it's not concerns in general with the program. It's concerns about what the initial report has recommended. These -- this is an over-arching comment (inaudible) back on basically saying, regardless of whether you do rounds or first-come, first-serve or anything else, they want to see all of these things. And these things that list really relate to a number of different sections that probably each belong, and I'm sure they're in there anyway, but we can double-check, in the specific section that deals with it.

So, like the first one is on the guidebook being -- accurately reflecting everything. The second one -- and I'm talking very much shorthand, I know -- the second one is to make sure that there are -- there's a mechanism for course corrections. The third one is that prioritization for community TLDs. So, each of these are substantive recommendations that aren't really related to the content of round at all, but are basically saying, look, whatever we do, however we introduce applications or review them or whatever, they just want to overall make sure that these issues are addressed. And so, we will take it as an action item to make sure that these items are all addressed in the substantive sections, which I'm sure that we've already done that, but we will double-check.

So, again, we're not ignoring these comments by any means, but they don't really relate to assessing things in rounds. Any thoughts or comments? Okay. So, that will take us to the comment from -- going too quick -- ICANN Org, which basically states that it'll be helpful to understand how the PDP working group envisions the bylaws mandated Competition, Consumer Trust and Choice Review fits in with these questions. So, at this point, I think -- wait, did I skip one? Sorry, I'm just looking back. No, I didn't, but for some reason it's numbered four, and the previous one was number two. Sorry about that. Think this is just a statement. I understand there's sort of a question here, but I think we addressed consumer choice, competition and trust in a different area.

Steve, do you think I'm misreading that at all? I think it's just--.

Steve Chan: --Thanks, Jeff, this is Steve. So, I think I'm not -- actually not entirely sure what they're referencing, so it might actually be worth asking them which part of the ccTRT report and/or recommendations they're referring to that would apply to this section. And I just honestly can't think off the top of my head where that connection is precisely. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman:

Okay. Let's -- thanks, Steve. Let's ask that question. Okay. Let's then move on to -- I know -- let's see, just looking at time. It's a fairly big section, but I think we can do it. I have faith.

Okay, 2.2.3.c.1, starting on line seven, is -- it basically is where we set (inaudible) recommendation that the first -- I'm sorry, the next introduction be in the form of a round, and then with subsequent introductions, although the working group does not have any (inaudible) on any proposal, let's remember the initial report stated that, whatever method is chosen, that the method is known prior to the launch of the next round, or next application window, either. What's said in the guidebook is either a late-term (ph), something like introduction will take place; or B, a set of criteria that must occur as a contingency, I guess, before the opening of the next application window. So, just to provide an example, but not -- as this wasn't a recommendation but just an illustration, let's say that the next round, or the next round launch, and the guidebook could contain something like the subsequent introduction, so not the next round but the (inaudible) would occur either on January 1, 2023, or it could say something like nine months following the date (inaudible) applications from the last round have completed initial evaluation. Again, that was just an illustrative example, so I ask everyone not to focus on the substance of that recommendation, but really just an illustration.

So, with that, the business constituency supported their preliminary recommendation of the initial report, and also supported the notion of continuing in the future with rounds. The FairWinds Partners supported the notion -- or sorry, business constituency also said that that would help for underserved countries. That's important part of their comment. The FairWinds Partners supported the certain date or set of criteria approach. I don't think it opted for which one of the two, but it said either one would be -- they would agree with. And they want to emphasize the importance of clarifying the parameters before the next round actually begins.

The next comment comes from Valideus, to support (ph) rounds on an ongoing basis with defined criteria as opposed to a date certain. That provides a more workable means for the community to monitor applications. So, it's not just better for applicants, but also for the community. (Inaudible) comments, (inaudible), objections, et cetera. And they also agree that, prior to the launch, it should be made clear, just so others know, that there's sort of predictability as to when the next application window will be.

Comments for the registries are also kind of in line with that, agrees with the set of criteria or a date certain, but does also have the concept in there, which is new in the sense it wasn't in the recommendation, but they think it also needs to be volume-based. So, in the ideal world, they'd like to see that schedule, but they recognize that, if there's an extraordinary amount of volume in that first window, then there may need to be some process to be able to extend the time period before which it would start (inaudible) subsequent round. And they provide an example. So, for example, the guidebook could say that it will start in Q1 of the following year unless there's more than 10,000 applications. Then, in such event, the subsequent round will begin Q1 of the second year following the then-current round.

Any questions on those? Okay. I know I'm going a little bit quick, but these are mostly in agreement. ICANN Org has a concern -- well, it's listed right now as concern. It's basically a feedback on certain options. They want to have a predictable process, and so a time window would allow ICANN Org to better plan, so they like the time window, and also would provide applicants with more certainty. However, if the aim is to eventually get an ongoing process using criteria event (ph) provided -- or sorry, using the criteria or event, like a completion of 50% of the applications, could allow the program to accomplish it. And so, it's conceivable that if the volumes do peak (ph) over time, then in

theory you could shorten up the time between rounds, or even go to an ongoing application process.

So, that's the essence of the ICANN Org. Again, I'm not sure if necessarily appropriate labeled the concerns. I think it's more of -- yes, I'm just trying to go through this again, and then I'll -- we'll probably stop after here. I'm not sure if concerns with the initial evaluation report. I think it's more a support of the criteria-based approach or the date approach, but points out that if a criteria-based approach is used, then that might be better from a perspective of having an ongoing predictable process. Steve or anyone, do you agree or disagree with the way I've kind of interpreted that?

Steve Chan: Hi, Jeff, this is Steve. This is just a general comment about the ICANN Org ones. And I think you said this a few times, but the way that they assessment tool for public comments is configured. It's not always fit for purpose, I guess is a way to put it. So, in that regard, we've labeled most of the ICANN Org comments as concerns. It's really more like feedback and additional considerations for deliberations. But I get your point that maybe the categorization isn't quite right, but we weren't really sure which is a better one. So, this just seemed to fit most appropriately. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We almost need another color for -- sorry, Cheryl for the record -- proposed modifications, or points to consider, agreements but points to consider sort of thing, but we can look at that, but not right now.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. And if people could indulge me -- actually, you know what? This is a good place to stop. I don't want us to skip the BRG comment. So, if I could ask, actually, Steve to -- or Emily to reverse the comments, to make sure that we cover the BRG, you could put the ICANN one above the BRG just so we can make sure that we don't forget the BRG one to start with on the next call. That would be helpful.

So, again, thank you, everyone, for coming, and know that initiatives (inaudible) is a close call to whether there is a quorum, but I think we got through a bunch of materials, and I look forward to talking to everyone next week. Any last comments or any other business that we should cover?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Jim Prendergast: Thanks all.

Unidentified Participant: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

Jeff Neuman: All right, (inaudible) next call says December 20th at 1600 (ph) UTC. Thank you, everyone.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

Unidentified Participant: Thanks, everyone, for joining. Today's meeting is adjourned. You can disconnect your lines, and have a good rest of your day.