ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP - Sub Group A
Thursday, 28 February 2019 at 20:00 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-sub-group-a-28feb19-en.mp3 [audio.icann.org]

Adobe Connect Recording: https://participate.icann.org/p6q3r9j8aqo/

Attendance is on wiki agenda page: https://community.icann.org/x/iJsWBg

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

Operator: Recording is started.

Julie: Thank you. All right. Well, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Sub Group A call held on Thursday, the 28th of February, 2019. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect Room. If you're only on the audio bridge at this time, could you please let yourself be known now? And I just want to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

                     With this, I'll turn it over to Jeff Neuman. Please begin.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you, Julie. Welcome, everyone. I think this will be the last call of Sub Group A because I think we can easily get through the last tab today. So that's a good thing. And I see the clapping there.

                     We will, as usual, just go over, see if there's any changes to statements of interest and then finish up on the last tab, the Systems tab on the public comments, and then talk about some next steps. So is there anyone -- any questions on what we're going to cover today?

Not seeing any questions. Let me initiate a call; are there any changes to statements of work?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Hi, it's Anne Aikman-Scalese. I'm on the phone only.

Jeff Neuman: Cool. Okay, thanks, Anne. All right, I will take it that there are no changes to statements of interest.

So I'm just going to ask for Steve or Julie to put the link of the -- or you may have already done that -- or put the link of the Google doc up on the chat so that if you are like me and can't really see very well the Adobe document, you can then go into the Google Docs. So Steve has put it up. Thanks, Steve.

I'm going to be using that one as well so I'm going to go back and forth. If I miss anyone that's in the queue, if someone could just interrupt, but I'm going to try to keep my eye on both at the same time.

So with that, this last tab deals with the -- a discussion we had on -- a subject on the systems that ICANN uses for submission of the application, handling questions and support, and there's also a question in there about the terms of use and things like that. So this is a fairly non-controversial area. In fact, almost every single recommendation that we made in the initial report has mostly agreements with a couple towards the end that either have some new ideas or a basic concern that ICANN Org has, which is that the more complicated we make the system, or I should say the more we try to make the system more user-friendly, the more complex the system is going to be and the more it will cost. So you'll see that come up a number of times.

And the other common factor with all of these is that my guess is that the full working group will include most of these items not as policy recommendations, but as more implementation guidance for the Implementation Review team to take to the next step. Not much in the way of policy here except, perhaps, maybe the question on terms of use.

So with all that preamble, the first recommendation, not very controversial, says that there should be -- that ICANN Organization should ensure that there is enough time provided for development and testing of the system before it's deployed. Here, referring really to the application system. Everyone agreed that filed comments on this and that was the Brand Registry, the Business Constituency, Neustar, FairWinds and LEMARIT or LAMERIT. Sorry, I don't know if I'm saying that right. Every time someone corrects me and I always forget. So they have all agreed. There is just a note from Neustar in addition to just agreement that says that testing and development periods should be defined and limited to ensure there's no undue delay caused by overly long testing and development windows.

Related to that, testing is now on Line 9, to 2.4.3.c.2, which talks about robust quality assurance, user interface and penetration testing to make sure the system is stable and secure and that information is kept confidential. Many people remember some of the difficulties we had in the 2012 round, around the systems. There were a couple of security issues that hopefully could have been worked out before with a proper quality assurance testing. No surprise that everyone seems to agree with this recommendation including the BRG, the Business Constituency, Neustar, FairWinds and LEMARIT. And I think Neustar, it's the same comment; just to make sure that there's no undue delay in the development cycles and that the testing period is limited.

The third one, third recommendation, starting on Line 15, is that the system should be useable and integrated ideally with a single logon. Not controversial at all. I think this was definitely an issue for a lot of applicants that applied for more than one application or applicants that supported multiple applications. And everyone agreed with the recommendation; Brand Registry Group, the Business Constituency, Neustar, FairWinds and LEMARIT, again with the note that as long as this doesn't cause an undue delay, they support this recommendation. LEMARIT also says that applications could be bundled in the systems, could work with a single login, but multiple TLDs under the same account. I think that's the point.

The next recommendation, which has all agreement and a couple new ideas, starting on Line 21, is once the system is in use, that ICANN should be transparent about any changes that may impact the applicants or the process and if there's a security breach, they should notify all impacted parties. No surprise that pretty much everybody agreed with this. There's a couple of new ideas that are in here, but before we get to that, the BRG supports, basically saying that they should follow best practices and industry standards. The BC, LEMARIT, Neustar agree, subject to the Neustar comment on avoiding undue delay. FairWinds supports the recommendation, especially transparency, and in the event of a breach, ICANN must communicate the matter in a transparent manner -- or must, yes, communicate the matter in a transparent manner as soon as they become aware.

So ICANN notes -- I'm sorry the Registry Stakeholder Group notes that identifying impacted parties can be a long task and that may prevent immediate disclosure so therefore the Registry suggests that we modify the phrase at the end to "notify all possibly impacted parties." So we should make sure we cover that in the full group. And then ICANN Org, they do have a policy already, and the link is there of their cybersecurity policy, and so they're just making a comment that they have a policy that deals with this and disclosure requirements and we can all go and read

that link and see if that meets the requirement -- or see if we're satisfied with those requirements.

I'll also note, just a side note, that ICANN did create new terms and conditions surrounding their, what they call the Naming Services Portal, which, for those of you that may not be familiar, registries do pretty much all of their interaction now with ICANN through this Registry Naming Services Portal. And that portal does have new terms and conditions -- well, I'm saying new; I guess it's probably about a year old now -- that were negotiated that do have some language on making sure ICANN commits to following its security policies and this is one of them. So that might be just worth noting as we look at these comments as a full group.

Any questions so far? All right. We have a pretty quiet group. Let me check the -- okay, nothing in the chat. Sorry, just wanted to make sure I was covering that as well.

Okay, so we're now on the Line 29 that the ICANN organization should offer prospective system users with the opportunity to beta test while ensuring no unfair advantages are created with who tests the tools. And it could do this by doing what a lot of registries do with registrars today, which is setting up an operational testing environment -- sorry, an evaluation environment. BRG and the Business Constituency support. Those are the only two comments. Again, it's pretty non-controversial. There are no comments from ICANN Org on this particular recommendation so I am assuming that that is a not too burdensome recommendation.

2.4.3.c.6, Line 32. This relates to certainly other topics we've talked about in our sub group, but also Sub Group B or C, I'm trying to remember which one the legal agreements are in. But any agreements, terms of use for systems access, including ones that need to be clicked through, should be finalized in advance and included in the guidebook with goal of minimizing obstacles and/or legal burdens on applicants. I'll note that this was not the case in the 2012 round. There was a terms of use of filing your application, but I believe when you signed up to use the application system, you actually had a different terms of use and that caused a lot of consternation. So no surprise here that all of the - that the BRG, Business Constituency, Neustar, FairWinds and LEMARIT all agree with this recommendation. And subject, of course, with Neustar's comment of not introducing undue delay. And FairWinds just adds to the rationale of just making sure applicants can review those before they make a decision to apply.

All right. 2.4.3.c.7, again this is implementation guidance. Applicants should be able to enter non-ASCII characters in certain fields. This was not allowed in the last application system. And no surprise that the Registry -- sorry, that the Brand Registry Group, Neustar, LEMARIT

support this. Business Constituency just says that certain fields should be clearly indicated in the guidebook to avoid confusion during the application process. So I would list that as agreement with this new idea. Make sure that really everyone supports the notion of allowing non-ASCII characters. So if we can make that kind of agreement/new idea.

Okay, the next topic is starting on Line 43. Applicants should be able to access live real-time support using tools such as a phone help line or online address technical system, I guess -- or sorry, online chat to address technical system issues. Again, the Brand Registry Group, Business Constituency, Neustar, FairWinds, LEMARIT all support. I actually found this part a little bit interesting because in a number of other areas, ICANN Org did express a concern about introducing -- that the more requirements we have could introduce complexity into the system, but this one did not have that. So my assumption is that there's no concern from ICANN Org on this recommendation.

And, Steve and Julie, when I'm making assumptions, maybe we should just double check that later on -- actually, starting in this next topic where ICANN does start to put in their concerns about added complexity and cost that it didn't apply to those other recommendations, but just the ones that they specifically indicated there was a concern. I hope that makes sense. Because otherwise, the assumption is going to be that they're not concerned about it. As Martin says, "That may be a big assumption." Right? Thanks, Martin. I agree. But that's why I'm going to just ask for Steve and Julie to just double check with ICANN, with Trang and ICANN staff.

I'm seeing some typing going on. Right. So, Martin, right. They may feel that their other comments should be applied. So that's why I'm asking Steve and, again, Julie to just double check which ones that it applies. And Steve is checking the comment himself to make sure it just wasn't missed by our summary. Okay.

So moving on to number 49. A single applicant should be able to submit and access multiple applications without duplicative data entry and multiple logins. So we sort of addressed the multiple logins on the last -- a previous question. But this is going down another level, which is basically saying that someone should be able to enter in data once and then have a choice to populate different applications with that same data so you didn't have to keep going in and keep doing it even if you had one single login. BRG, Business, Neustar, LEMARIT all support. Again Neustar's caveat that they would really support -- only support this if it doesn't introduce delay.

And this is where we start getting ICANN's comments of saying that they understand the recommendations and they understand that we're trying to make the system more user-friendly, but they're just flagging for us that

these recommendations would result in added complexity, cost and time to implement. So that's something that, as a full group, we may want to discuss and say -- maybe make some of these things optional or just keep them as implementation guidance subject to commercial feasibility, reasonableness, things like that. There are things we can do in the final report that would indicate that these are things we want, maybe have our top list or prioritized list of things we feel like we have to have and then a list of items that are nice to have, but only if there's enough time, resources, et cetera to get those.

Steve, just going back, Steve is saying that c.8 was not mentioned in the ICANN Org comments. Okay.

Okay, we are now on Line 55, again an implementation guidance. Applicants should be able to receive automated confirmation emails from the systems. Which is pretty basic of most systems. BRG, Business Constituency, Neustar and LEMARIT all support. There's no comment here from ICANN Org about adding complexity so again, we'll make the assumption that where they do not comment and we can verify that they didn't comment, that we're good with those recommendations.

Line 60, implementation guidance again. Applicants should be able to receive automated application fee-related invoices. So invoicing was not something that was in the original custom application module. But I think given the fact that everyone is agreeing and given the fact that ICANN Org has not filed its standard complexity concern that this should probably be something that is reasonable.

Just looking at the chat. Okay.

2.4.3.c.12, Line 65. Applicants should be able to view changes that have been made to an application in the application systems; sort of like, I guess, a redline. BRG supports, but notes, importantly it's not a priority. So again, if we do, as a full group, list our recommendations in priority order or in some priority order for ICANN, BRG is saying that this is not one that would be on the top of the list. BC agrees with the recommendation. Neustar again agrees with the caveat of not having long testing and development windows and not introducing delay. LEMARIT agrees. And ICANN puts in their standard caveat of they understand the recommendation, but this is going to result in increased complexity, cost and time to implement.

The next one is starting on Line 71. Applicants should be able to upload application documents in the application system. This was not the easiest thing to do in the 2012 round. So this is a lot of applicants had some difficulties with this process. But it seems like no one disagrees. BRG, Business, Neustar, FairWinds and LEMARIT, again subject to the same

Neustar caveat and the BRG says this, too, is not a large priority or not a high priority.

Next recommendation is starting on Line 77, c.14. This is applicant should be update information documentation in multiple fields without having to copy and paste information into the relevant fields. Again, pretty widely supported. BRG indicates, however, this is not a priority. Neustar, same caveat that it shouldn't introduce delay. FairWinds supports the notion of making things more user-friendly and be up-to-date and lower the chance of errors. ICANN's standard same concern that this is a feature that may introduce increased complexity, costs and time to implement.

Just double check chat here. Steve is saying that, "I think perhaps why ICANN Org did not tag c.8 is because phone chat assistance is for technical system issues not substantive questions about the criteria, for instance." I got you, okay. Such an important distinction; that this is really just for the technical issues and not online chat for communications between prospective applicants or applicants and ICANN. That is something we actually discussed yesterday -- or last week in the Communications tab.

All right, c.15, starting on Line 84, is a recommendation or guidance that they should be able -- applicants should be able to specify additional contacts to receive communication about the application and/or be able to give -- specify levels of access to different people with these additional points of contact. The system should provide a means of portfolio applicants to provide answers to questions and then have them disseminate it across all applications being supported. BRG supports and does not indicate that this is -- in fact, specifically states, "This is not a priority." And so if this were to cause any delay, this would not be on the list.

Business Constituency disagrees with this, which is interesting. They say for this one that, "Disseminating one answer across multiple applications could result in unintentional or unknown mistakes and may increase chances of errors in the application. Each application should be treated independently." So I'm not sure this is -- that this recommendation is on how applications are treated. It's just populating different applications when you make the change once.

Perhaps, this is worth going to the Business Constituency and just getting some clarity that we're not talking about how they're treated in the system, but we're just talking about dissemination. So they are concerned that there may be an increased chance of errors, but if we could provide some kind of comfort that it would not result in errors, would this actually be support for the proposal.

Okay, let's see. I'm just looking at comments. Michelle says, "Yes, we need to understand the specifics of their concerns here."

Oh, it sounds like someone is in the queue. Kathy, please.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes. Thanks. Hi, Jeff. Hi, everyone. So I have a question for you. When you speak about going to the Business Constituency to get input, is that an actual action item? Because I thought that it happened previously in conversations that I've been part of and I don't recall any specific action item that hit the non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, for example; a request from the sub team or from the working group to non-Commercial. So if it did happen, I'd love to know.

And second, so what's the communication now with the Business Constituency? Who gets it? And what's the timeframe for response? That kind of thing. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Sure, Kathy. That's a good question. So a couple different ways that we're dealing with this. One is that before -- again, I think this is before you joined these groups, but we started out the process asking for lower-case "l" liaisons, not official liaisons, but people in the group that we could look to that would take on these action items on behalf of their group to just see if their group can provide some clarity. So that is one way that we're hoping to get information.

And I'll note that -- I'll give a good example of someone that's done a great job. Justine, on behalf of the ALAC, has gone back anytime we've said that we need some clarity in a call and, on her own initiative, has really gotten back to us several times. I note that Donna has done that as well on behalf of the Registries.

And so when we -- we're hoping that the people that were appointed, again, the lower-case "l" liaisons are doing this, but we'll also have this in the summary document to make sure that when we get to that topic with the full group, or as we're preparing for that topic, that we issue a reminder that we're seeking clarity on certain issues. There have been other ones where it doesn't involve necessarily a stakeholder group, but may be clarity from ICANN staff where either policy staff or myself or Cheryl have been, after meetings as action items, reaching out to the applicable parties.

So we think the small "l" liaisons for this group is for the non-Commercials is Robin. So I'm -- so Robin should be going back to the non-Commercials and seeing where we say we need clarity, trying to get that input.

Kathy Kleiman: Great, Jeff. Just may I follow up?

Jeff Neuman: Sure.

Kathy Kleiman: So I was thinking as you were going through the explanation, which I really appreciate, that it probably was Robin. So can I ask a question? Robin, have you been able to raise the questions and get the answers that you need from non-Commercial?

Robin Gross: I'm not sure which specific questions you're talking about, but I'm more than happy to. So yes, I mean, absolutely. I wasn't actually entirely sure that I was the liaison. So this is -- okay, I'm happy to be. But whatever it is that you need me to do in terms of reaching out to NCSG on these, I'm happy to do.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Let's take this offline and we'll just -- we can go back and with Robin review all of the previous meetings, at least for Sub Group A, and see where there are areas where we sought non-Commercial clarities -- or non-Commercial Group clarities.

Kathy Kleiman: Each sub group has its own liaison, small "l"?

Jeff Neuman: No, not necessarily. That was up to the constituency or stakeholder group. If it wanted to appoint multiple ones, it could have. If it wanted to appoint one, it could have as well. So --

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. I think there has been a breakdown of communication across all of the sub teams. And please feel free. I've had real trouble with offline communication and getting any responses back. So please feel free to cc me on this so that I can -- I'd love to see the loop closed on this. Because if there is -- I know there's input that you were seeking from non-Commercial and I don't think it's been formally or informally requested. So if you could cc me I'd appreciate it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Kathy Kleiman: Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. When I said offline, this may be a kind of a unique thing with one or two stakeholder groups. So yes, we'll do that.

            Okay, back to the document. We are on 15. Yes, so we were going through 15 and we had asked for clarification from the Business Constituency. I don't know if we got to the last two comments where the BC -- I'm sorry, where ICANN Org states again this providing different access levels and other things like that would increase complexity and cost. But they understand the recommendation. And the BCCs have a

second comment -- well, actually is that just repeat? So Lines 86 and 90, are those just repeats of the same thing? Or am I missing something?

Steve Chan: Jeff, this is Steve. They're indeed duplicates. I think it was just an artifact from re-sorting the comments.

And actually, while I'm already speaking, at least from the staff's reading, it seems that the BC comment is pretty unambiguous, at least from our reading. It seems that they're reacting to the last sentence of the implementation guidance or of c.15, and it seems that they oppose it. So at least from our understanding, or I guess our reading, it doesn't seem that it's ambiguous. But maybe we're just reading it differently than all of you. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I think -- well, I mean they're opposing it because of the fact that it may result in unknown mistakes and increase the chances of errors. And I guess the question, though, for them, the clarity would be if there was a way -- they're making assumptions that disseminating information would result in that. But if they had been given some comfort that it wouldn't result in that, is it something they would really oppose, right? I mean is this really something that the BC -- let's say the working group, as the comments came in, considers, "You know what? This is a really good idea." Is this really something the BC would oppose being the only one that's really opposing it? Or is it something -- is it more of a concern that if the system can do this without resulting in errors, again is it just a concern? Or is it that they just really are sticking to their guns and this is a terrible recommendation? I hope that makes a little bit of sense. And they may come back, Steve, and say, "It's unambiguous and that's it. It is what it is." But I'm trying to think ahead as to areas that where we can try to come in and compromise and come up with a consensus position if possible. That may not be possible, but we should try.

Okay 2.4.3.c.16. Systems should provide clearly defined contacts with the ICANN organization for particular types of questions. I don't see any wholehearted disagreement with this recommendation. There is certainly approval from BRG, at least in principle, although not a priority. From Neustar, again same caveat that as long as it doesn't cause delay. LEMARIT agrees. The BC is saying that all questions should be routed through central system which can use the questions being asked to update the knowledge database and keep track of the efficiency and effectiveness with which the questions are answered.
So that's not -- it's not supporting the recommendation. It's not really opposing it. It's just a different way to deal with it. ICANN Org assumes that this question is in reference to the Global Support Center resources. If this is correct, it should be noted that the Global Support Center is a department that represents the contact point for the organization.

So again, I think -- I'm trying to figure out whether this is opposition to the comment or it's just a new idea. Because both what the BC and ICANN, I think, are saying is that -- I mean maybe you have different people within ICANN that deal with different issues, but in order to have some consistency everything should come in through one interface, through one person that's responsible for dealing with all the communications with that applicant or with the applicants.

Any comments or questions on that? Maybe we seek come clarity as to whether that's "Yes, we're okay with different people in ICANN serving as the experts on these subject areas", but it does sound like it's -- like they don't want applicants to reach out to these people separately. So it may actually be a disagreement with the recommendation.

Steve is typing. "The GSC farms out the questions to subject matter experts for context." Right. So Steve, do these two, especially the ICANN Org one, is it really saying -- so if you look at the recommendation, the recommendation was being provided, "clearly defined contacts of who to contact -- or it doesn't say of who to contact. It just says, "Clearly defined contacts within ICANN that are responsible for different types of questions." I'm almost thinking this is -- well, I'd rather ask for clarity instead of making assumptions. It is clear that ICANN wants you to go in through one interface, but it's not clear as to whether they support releasing the names of contacts for different types of issues. Steve, please.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Jeff. I was actually going lower my hand. But I guess I can conjecture and say that you could probably infer that, as you're saying, that this is probably opposition to that idea. They'd rather use the system that's set up, which is the GSC, of course, rather than providing the specific names of folks within ICANN Org for parties to reach out directly. I don't think they necessarily want to set up a new system to allow for that direct outreach. I guess that could be a point you clarify with them, but I think you're probably right that you can infer this is probably opposition to that idea.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Okay, thanks, Steve. Let's put it as opposition, but if you could just clarify that quickly with Trang and just say, "Look, this is - we're reading it, we're kind of interpreting this more as an opposition or divergence." Okay.

And let me see if there's any other comments before I go to the last one. I think Justine agrees. Yes, "Subject to clarification, this could be divergence."

All right. The last item, which is just kind of the miscellaneous other. There's a suggestion from the Registrars that more frequent updates during each portion of the evaluation process -- or there should be more frequent updates and allow interaction between evaluators and

applicants. So they say that updates would be specific to a specific section of the application or indicate to the applicant completion of a section. For example, Finance, it would be particularly helpful if reviewers were able to interact with applicants regarding their applications status.

So this is definitely a little -- it is definitely new in the sense of I think the only communications really came in the form of clarifying questions and then ICANN only provided those updates when a definitive stage was reached. So once string similarity review is done, I think there as an update -- they at least updated the portal. I'm trying to remember the order or whether it was all just released at once, once the evaluations were all done, the initial evaluations for that set. I mean anybody remember offhand?

I think if I'm remembering, I'm pretty sure it was ICANN did 100-or-so and then they would release the full initial evaluation results at one time for all 100 and then they, in that full release, it provided both, again, the geographic, the string similarity, the initial evaluation technical at once.

Okay. Steve says, "Right. For string similarity, I think they did publish it all at once or they did say that everyone met it except for these couple."

So I think the Registrars are basically saying that maybe rather than just releasing everything at once, maybe there could be updates with those different statuses. All right. Any questions on that last one from the Registrars?

All right, no questions. Wait, there's a comment. "At the end of the tab, STPC initial analysis, Steve, Jeff, we should introduce how the -- how Sub Group C has seen and analyzed triage work in prep for working group's review and discussion. Obviously, I recommend the system." Yes. Thanks, Cheryl.

So, "First, congratulations to everyone for finishing all these tabs." I agree with that one.
And then, "Steve, do you want to give an update on the Sub Group C?" Well, just summaries and how were going about this.

Steve Chan: Sure. Thanks, Jeff. This is Steve from staff. So at this point, as you can see there's some agreement from the co-chairs at least, but we're still going to take this to the full leadership team, so including all of the co-leads for all the respective sub groups. And then also, of course, run it by all of the working group members as well to make sure that the system that we're putting in place is useable for everyone.

So the idea is to try to take the summaries of all of these sub group discussions and then try to provide a high-level overview. And the way that we're trying to do that is to provide a section summary. So for each

tab, we'll try to assess the level of support for each of the recommendations and options and probably not so much for the questions because it's not really about support. But in that sense then we'll try to identify key themes from the questions. So that's one thing. There will be an overall summary of an assessment of the overall section for each tab. And then for each of the recommendations, options or questions, there will also be a summary-level assessment for each one of those.

And so, again, that's to try to level -- to get a high-level sense of the support for the recommendation, but again also to try to pull out themes that were raised by the comments. So that can be new ideas, I guess a theme of divergence or a theme of concerned. But again, essentially it's to pull out the themes.

And so just to summarize, at a high level for each tab, there would be a summary and then for each line item, so each recommendation, option and question, there will be a summary as well. Yes and, as Jeff said, I think this is something we intended to cover in the next meeting. So great suggestion. I think we'll take that onboard. And I can actually provide a link to this. As I said we haven't gotten sign-off from all of the leadership team yet, but you can actually get a sense of what it looks like right now pending approval from everyone including leadership and the work group. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, Steve. And absolutely, this is one of the items for the next full group call. So -- okay. Thanks, Steve. Steve just put the link in there so please feel free to just look at that and so you can kind of get an understanding of how we're proposing doing this moving forward.

All right. I think I don't have anything else other than reminding everyone about the full group meeting next week. So if you just, Steve or Julie, if you could just publish that again. This is the full group. We're going to cancel the Sub Group A one because we got through everything, which I'm happy about, and just have the full group call on, I believe it's Monday next week, if I'm not mistaken.

Cheryl, anything to add? Or Steve? There you go. Monday the 4th at 20:00 for 90 minutes. And then we'll go into detail as well about ICANN 64 in the session and then talk about this and the methodology, assuming, again, that the rest of the leadership team is good with the way that we're moving about the summaries. Great. Anybody have any --

Uh oh, Steve is saying there's a conflict with the Special Counsel call. All right. So we will figure that out right now or after this call and perhaps push it 30 minutes in one direction or shorten the call to an hour. And I think that's probably what we'll do, is shorten the call to an hour. So look for an announcement quickly. I guess we had not anticipated or maybe it

was hopeful that the Counsel would have resolved the EPDP stuff on the last call. But they did not. So we will figure that out ASAP and please look for an email on the list.

All right. Thank you, everyone, and I guess we can end recording. Thanks.

Julie: Thanks, everyone.