

**ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP - Sub Group B
Tuesday, 04 December 2018 at 17:00 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/gns0/gns0-new-gtld-sub-pro-sub-group-b-04dec18-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p95npcj9m5f/>
Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/ogTuBQ>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Operator: The recording has started. Please go ahead.

Julie Bisland: Great. Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sup Group B Call held on Tuesday, the 4th of December, 2018. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect Room. If you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourself be known now? I do have Juan Manuel Rojas on audio only. Anyone else? Okay. We just want to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for the recording purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. And with this, I will turn it back over to Christa Taylor. Please begin.

Christa Taylor: Thank you. It's Christa Taylor for the record. Thanks, everyone, for joining us. As you can see from the agenda, we have 4 items to cover. The first topic is review of the agenda, and are there any items that we should add to it? As always, if everything arises during the call, we can add it to the end or in any other business. Seeing no typing or hands, I'm going to jump to the next item which is whether anyone has any updates to their SOI. And if so, could you please let us know now. Seeing no hands and no comments, I'll jump right into Item number 3 which is continuation of section 2.5.1, the Application Fees. And we'll begin where we left off last time which is c-4 which is I think Cell 38 in the Excel doc.

Just one, or a couple notes, I did add a couple of columns in my review in hopes that it kind of makes it a little bit easier as we proceed going forward. And secondly, if we seem to get off topic a little bit, I'm hoping to reel us back in, in the interest of time before we get too far. So I'll correct that from last week.

So starting on Cell 38, the question is, The application fee floor is a predetermined value that is the minimum application fee. By definition, an application fee floor will not -- sorry, will not meet the revenue neutral principle as the floor amount will be greater than the application fees creating an excess. In the event that an application fee floor is used to determine the application fee, excess fees received by ICANN if the application fee floor is invoked should be used to benefit the following categories. Support general outreach and awareness for the New gTLD Program, i.e., Universal Awareness and Universal Acceptance initiatives, Support the gTLD long-term program needs such as system upgrades, fixed assets, etc., and Application Support Program. Top-up any shortfall in the segregated fund as described below.

In here we have the ALAC, or the first comments, we have the ALAC, the Brand Registry Group, the BC, Neustar, the Registry Stakeholder Group, Vanda all agree with this. And I'm just trying to review for any other little comments. The registry stakeholder group has a bit of a different note where they describe the transparency which I've added to the parking lot. That is, sorry, I got lost in the document here a little bit. The other item is Valideus. They seem to agree. Again, the item of transparency arises and INTA, sorry, going back -- Valideus doesn't strictly agree. They seem to agree, but they add in the comment on transparency. And INTA agrees, but they've added the comment on how to use the funds and they note contractual compliance. So those are all of the items in that one section.

I'd like to note that there are a lot of comments around transparency and we're going to see that a bunch of times through this. So I did add one suggestion in I think it was Cell G12 where I just put a comment and maybe something we should consider going forward is lumping it all together that we can bring back to the full group on improved accuracy, transparency, accountability and determination of how any excess or shortage of funds should be described to applicants before they start the application round. I think this was a little bit, this was implied, but you'll see it keep coming up, so I'm just going to plant that seed now and as we roll through these, you're going to probably see more of that. So that's kind of in the parking lot there. Any comments to Section 2.5.1.c.4? Seeing nothing there, I'm going to jump to -- oh, Jim, go ahead. Sorry. Go ahead.

Jim Prendergast: Thanks, Christa. Jim Prendergast for the record. Not specific to this section, but the two columns you added were the parking lot and then suggested action, is that correct?

Christa Taylor: Correct.

Jim Prendergast: Okay. I kind of like this. Maybe it's something we can replicate in the other two Work Tracks. I think it's a helpful addition. Thanks.

Christa Taylor: Thanks. We'll see how it works. You'll see it more hopefully when we get into the second section, hopefully we can cover today, on the variable fees where I've copied and pasted. So if I say it's in the parking lot, it means I've already posted it in the other sections. So hopefully that helps. We'll see. It's a test one and I can always delete them if it doesn't work. So seeing no comments on this section, I'm going to jump into 2.5.1.c.5 which states: To help alleviate the burden of an overall shortfall, a separate segregated fund should be set up that can be used to absorb any shortfalls and topped-up in a later round. The amount of the contingency should be a predetermined value that is reviewed periodically to ensure its adequacy. So we have the Brand Registry Group and INTA who agree with this. We have the ALAC that agrees, but they also have the idea that the amount set aside for contingency should be funded from the excess fees received because of the application fee floor. We then have the Registry Stakeholder Group which also notes the comment that there shouldn't be a shortage, i.e., should be conservative, as I noted before. And we should err towards excess funds as opposed to having any shortfalls. So they agree, but just with a little bit of an adjustment there. And then we have the Neustar comment which is the same one which we reviewed several times and it doesn't really specifically address this section from what I can see. Any comments to this section? Jim, is that a new hand?

Jim Prendergast: It is. On Row 48, I believe what you said is correct and that is the Brand Registry Group supports the recommendation, but the working group response has it listed as divergent. So I'm just wondering if I'm missing something there or if in fact it is somehow considered divergent. That's all. All right. So according to Steve, it looks like it might be an error which rarely ever happens. Hmm.

Kristine Dorrain: Christa, if you are speaking, we're not hearing you.

Christa Taylor: Oh, my apologies. Thank you. Sorry. I'm seeing no other hands on that section, so I'm going to jump to the next section which is 2.5.1.e.1. Just trying to locate it on Excel. My apologies. It says, to the extent that warehousing/squatting of TLDs has taken place and may occur in the future, what other restrictions/methodologies, beyond pricing, might prevent such behavior? So we have the Registry Stakeholder Group who bring a new idea forward which is commit to make use of their TLDs within a given -- let me back up. Consider having applicants commit to making use of their TLDs within a given period. Potentially have a lack of use be a valid reason for revocation of a TLD upon challenge by a third party. Providing this obligation would not apply to Brand TLDs. And we have the Brand Registry Group, they are not really having any ideas, they are just saying the application process is a deterrent enough being that it's taken so long. We have the Registry Stakeholder Group saying again, they're not really providing any new ideas, but they are looking for data to support the warehousing concept. And then we have INTA also relating to the data concept and they are not aware of any warehousing/squatting to date. And I did -- 2 items which is TLDs which contain common words,

which really isn't related to the question. And then, if objections to proposed TLD is successful, then the cost of the objection would be borne by the applicant. And I added that to the parking lot in that section. So I'm not sure if anyone has any comments to this section or ideas? So Anne says, although this is a substantive comment, I'll venture to make it anyway. The issue of warehousing is going to be very directly related to application fees. We don't have any other comments when we were discussing the first sections on it and this is the only place where the warehousing concept has come up. And everyone seems to think that it's not an issue, but perhaps something we can bring up maybe to the full group on that if we would like for further discussion. Jim, please go ahead.

Jim Prendergast: Thanks, Christa, it's Jim. Yeah, I agree to your last point there about bringing it up to the full group. I think that might be beneficial only because I'm having a difficult time remembering one, who raised this issue, but also, whether or not it did or did apply to .Brands. I think there was some specific concern about all these brands that applied for them and then not doing anything. I think that's where this comes from, but I can't be 100% sure. So it would be helpful if whoever raised this issue can expound upon it a little further in the plenary note. Thanks.

Kristine Dorrain: Hey, Christa, we lost you again.

Christa Taylor: Sorry, I'm being really bad with the mute today. Yeah, so Anne also agrees to bring it to the full group. So seeing no other comments to that section, I am going to jump to the next section, which is 2.5.1.e.2 which is line 58 in case that helps anyone. It says, the question is: What happens if the revenue-cost neutral amount results in a refund that is greater than the application fee floor value? Should it be only the difference between the cost floor and the amount refunded? Should there be a minimum dollar value for this to come into effect, i.e. the amount of the refund is a small amount, and if so, should this excess be distributed differently, i.e., Universal Awareness, Applicant Support, other? So we have INTA that disagrees. They want -- they don't support any fees to Universal Awareness, Applicant Support, etc., and it should be all refunded back to applicants. We have the ALAC which agrees with the excess fees from the fee floor support other items. And I'm inferring that a little bit when I refer back to other items because it doesn't specifically say that, but when you combine it with the other comments, it seems to be aligned. And they also have the concern that it's -- yeah, so that's where I went back, whether this is -- they make the note that whether this is about what is left after spending the excess fees received to benefit the categories as described. Apologies there. We have the IPC which agrees to the excess funds, but they have a difference on the different categories which is to advance the public interest. So suggest that I'll see if anyone has any comments on whether they agree or any ideas around the public interest comment there. Then we have the last comment which is the Registry Stakeholder Group. They agree A, with fees being returned, B, where to use the fees. And then I'm adding the comment on

transparency again to the parking lot comment that I was mentioning earlier. Kristine, no it is not a recommendation so I think it's hard to agree or disagree, it's really an open-ended question. Agree, I was just trying to figure out a way to kind of put it all together. Rubens says -- oh, okay -- is INTA comment an agreement or disagreement? And Kristine's comment I think is responding to that. Any other comments to 2.5.1.e.2? Kristine agrees, thanks, and says working group needs to consider how the auction proceeds solution may address the IPC regarding the events of public interest if those funds could be used there. I'm going to put that in the parking lot. Can we make sure we capture that? And then we can add it to that comment. Because we're going to see some overlap with the auction proceeds on a couple of other comments. Perfect, thanks. Going to jump now to --

Steve Chan: Hey, Christa? Before you move, you have a hand up from Donna. Thanks.

Christa Taylor: Sorry, go ahead, Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Christa. Donna Austin from Neustar. In relation to the IPC comment, do they at any point explain what they mean by public interest? So in my mind Universal win is in the public interest, but others might have a different view of that. So absent an explanation of what the IPC thinks is the public interest, I think it makes it -- it's pretty broad if they're not defining what public interest is. So that's a bit of a concern for me. Thanks.

Christa Taylor: Thanks, Donna. I can't differentiate in my head all the different comments right now, but I'll add it as an action item to see if it's defined somewhere else in their responses and return back to that hopefully on the next call or in the mailing list. Section 2. -- Anne says, I can go back and ask the IPC about this comment. That would be great, Anne, but I'll also refer to the document, I'm sure it's in there, but we'll check.

Section 2.5.1.e.3. The question is, what are the considerations and implications if we move to continuous rounds, in this case limited to how it relates to ensuring the program is run in a revenue neutral manner? We have INTA that refers to applications that the costs will become lower. We have the Registry Stakeholder Group also suggesting the item of periodic, no less than annual, true-up costs and revenue which would be used to provide a periodic, not more frequently than annual, adjustment to application fees. Then we have Vanda who also refers back to the transparency item and I added part of that to Section 2.7.7 with the new idea that the whole independent panel shall be registered as a list of persons open to join a different panel any time for a specific task they are experts for each application. When needed, a reduced panel of 3 will be selected for a working day to analyze the application. So that's been added to that section and that is all for e.3. Any comments there?

Seeing no comments, I'm going to jump to the next section which is 2.5.1.e.4. Are there policy, economic or other principles or factors that might help guide the establishment of the floor amount? The Registry Stakeholder Group has the idea that the floor amount should be kept as low as possible in order to avoid discouraging underserved communities and to encourage competition and innovation. The Registry Stakeholder Group also believes that the floor amount should not be so low as to encourage speculative applications.

We're going to see this also a lot and I think this would be an item that we should bring to the full group on how we could possibly balance these 2 different perspectives. Because it seems to be an ongoing item that keeps coming up and we don't really have any solutions to it, so worthwhile to bring to the full group.

We also have Alexander Schubert who has a few comments here, a couple of which I've added to the parking lot in the other sections. So he does address the supply/demand aspect but nothing on how to set the fee floor. He's got the processing time and it's addressing the processing time and the revenue neutral. And he's suggesting that in order to keep the amount manageable in order to prevent an application stack that would take 2 or even 3 years to work off, we should set the applications high and then bring it down over time. The amount he suggests be set at \$500,000 US for the next round, to hopefully reduce it to only 100 applications or less. Of course, this won't be revenue neutral I wouldn't guess. And that's his comment. I added the time aspect of the 2 or 3 years to the parking lot to 2.7.6.c.2, but any comments?

I'll actually do one more comment and then see if there's any other items, which is the last one with INTA, they disagree as they don't want a fee floor. Any comments to any of the items brought forward on that section? Seeing no hands, a few people are typing, I'm just going to wait a second.

Okay, I'm going to jump to 2.5.1.e.5 which is line 71. The question is, under the circumstance where the application fee is set at the floor amount, do you have any additional suggestions or strategy on the disbursement of excess funds? So we have the ALAC who has the idea, also the separate fund in 2.5.1.c.5 could be funded by/planned for excess funds. We have the Registry Stakeholder Group that has the idea that the excess remains after taking into account the minimum fee floor, then ICANN should A, add that excess amount to the segregated fund as described, and B, adjust these in future TLD application realms to account for any remaining excess fund amount. I believe I added that to Section 2.5.2 in the parking lot.

We then have Vanda saying probably the best alternative will be to fund to be distributed as defined in Section 1.5.c.4. And then we have INTA that believes any excess funds should be refunded to applicants. Any comments? Sorry, I missed 2 items. Anne, just a side note, don't know if the ICANN Board can actually determine the public interest, but I believe I

would, it would have to be limited by ICANN submission. Steve, and I've added a note in the suggested action column to state review full comment to determine if public interest might be defined. I'm not really seeing any comments to this section. So I'm going to jump to the next section. We're moving right along today, hooray.

So 2.5.1.e.6 which is line 76, are we acknowledging and accepting of ICANN being a so-called registry of registries, i.e., does the community envision ICANN approving a few thousand, hundreds of thousands, million of gTLDs to be added to the root? And should there be a cap? Overall, the comments are it is technically sound and doesn't risk the security and stability of the internet, there shouldn't be a cap. And this is the ALAC, comments that any cap set on the number of new gTLDs should be initially determined by what the root zone system can handle technically. We have the SSAC stating that there shouldn't be a cap. We have INTA, again, no cap. And the Registry Stakeholder Group, no cap. Any comments?

Seeing no hands, no typing, no comments, going to jump to 2.5.1.e.7 which is on line 81. And the question is, is there a way in which the application fee can be structured such that it can encourage competition and innovation? And again, this is going to see that balance again I was referring before. So we have the ALAC which has the idea that numbers and statistics are necessary. Clear estimates and contingency planning in order to determine a level of application fees to be set. And they agree with the statement on page 79 that "the Work Track recognizes that additional analysis would be needed to establish a new estimated cost". So this is aligned with the costing as we discussed earlier. We have INTA, who don't seem to have any new ideas here, or anything new directly related to this question, but suggests that they support a pricing system that reflects actual costs to ICANN. And competition and innovation will follow with predictable fees and delegation outcome. Then we have the Registry Stakeholder Group, again, no new ideas here, but they believe the best way to encourage competition and innovation is to keep fees as low as possible with the revenue in principle. And to be structured in a way that all applications incur the same base application fee amount. Any comments? Kristine, you're suggesting -- so Kristine has a comment. So we're referring to the SSAC comments then? You have your hand raised. Please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks, this is Kristine. Just wanted to clarify, I may have like looked away for a split second. In the previous section there was an SSAC comment that had some new ideas and some concerns. I didn't actually hear you mention that. So I don't actually have any objection to moving the SSAC comment to the full working group, but I didn't hear you mention it, so I just wanted to make sure that I wasn't the only one that just didn't hear it.

Christa Taylor: My apologies. You're correct. I have that entire item, suggestion, move it to section 2.7.6. And that is the full excerpt from SAC100 with the

recommendation there. I see you're typing, so I'm just going to wait to see if that makes sense. Yep, thanks. My apologies and thanks for the catch. So I'm not seeing any comments on 2.5.1.e.7, so I'm going to jump to the last one, hooray, which is 2.5.1.e.8. And I think Cheryl probably has the line item for me which is, How do we address the timely disbursement of excess funds? Can this happen prior to the end of the evaluation process for all applications? If yes, please explain.

Sorry, I'm having problems finding the rest of the comments. Ah, looks like it got deleted and needs to be replaced. I'm sorry, I do not have the rest of that comment. If anyone has a printout and wants to read the rest after the "If yes, please explain", that would be great. If not, I'm just going to jump to the 2 comments. One was INTA, believes that the disbursements should occur at the end of each round. The second one is the Registry Stakeholder Group that believes that it should be refunded in phases. And again, there's that comment on transparency. Seeing no hands there or comments other than we will fix that and hopefully I wasn't the one who messed it up, which it could have been, and my apologies. Seeing a couple of people type. Yeah, Anne, that one question I think was messed up in the document and it could be me, but we will fix it or it looks like it's already been fixed. So the actual question in full is, if yes, please explain. If not, what is the length of time applicants should expect a refund after the evaluation process is complete? So I think we've still addressed the question in the review or the responses in the review.

Okay. So moving into variable fees, and actually this is a little bit shorter than the prior section, but here you're going to see where the tie-in and the overlap occurs between the different items. So reviewing the document online is going to be your best bet. So jumping into variable fees, Section 2.5.2.c.1, the question is, I'm going to wait for the update in Adobe, thanks Steve. Though Work Track 1 discussed a number of different potential alternative approaches, there was no agreement on the alternative to the 2012 round. Namely that all applications should incur the same base application fee amount regardless of the type of application or the number of applications that the same applicant supports, submits. This would not preclude the possibility of additional fees in certain circumstances as was the case in the 2012 round of the program, i.e., objections, registry service evaluation processes, etc. The BC agrees with this that the fees should be the same for all applicants. MARQUES believes the evaluators, or adds a new category there where they say review of a business plan. And I suggest that we do parking lot on that to section 2.7.7 with that idea where the review process is noted. MARQUES also suggests that the brand participation includes from the Global South and SMEs, but the base application fee, which all applicants should pay for the standard with supplementary top-up fees pay for more detailed evaluation. We have the Public Interest Community with a new idea, at least in a given category of new gTLDs. And suggests a single fee structure be adopted. Sorry, let me rephrase that. We recommend that a single fee structure be adopted at least in a given category of new gTLDs. So they are not against having different fees by category. We

have the Registry Stakeholder Group that has the same base application fee amount regardless of the type of application or the number of applications, and also notes there was no additional fee to registry service evaluation processes, it was part of the application fee. There was a possible fee of registry services technical evaluation panel, RSTEP, therefore this reference should be corrected. We have the ALAC that suggests to consider discounted application fees for community applications with non-profit intentions. We have the ICANN Org ask for clarifications on the all applications should incur the same base amount application fee amount. Extend to scenarios beyond the "type of application or number of applications". For example, when an applicant proposing to use a preapproved RSP pay the same application fee as one who proposes to operate it on backend registry functions and thus requiring technical evaluations. I don't know if that's more of a comment. I think the idea when we were discussing this before is the application fees would be discounted for that and the cost savings would be passed along to applicants which would be reflected in the application, the amount.

Then we have the Government of India, submitted by the IN Registry which has a divergent perspective here saying, a different application process or requirements can be developed for different categories. Instead of the current single fee amount, a cost-based fee structure suitable to each TLD category be developed so as to allow for better representation for local communities in developing countries. And then we have the Brand Registry Group which is suggesting that metrics be required to assess whether significant cost differentials occur across the different types of applicants. And if identified, they should be adjusted accordingly in future and can be refunded proportionately in the event of excess fees being returned to applicants. And they are suggesting an amount greater than 20%.

So that's the end of that section. Reading a comment, there's a long one here. Rubens, I'm not sure where you're reading from, can you help out? It was a commenter ID. I'm not sure if you want me to read that entire section there or -- don't read your note, okay. I was referring to the public interest committee. Sorry, my apologies. Seeing no comments on that section, I'm going to jump to 2.5.2.d.1. Clicking on the document again, the question -- sorry, I can't find the line item.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's line 17, Christa, it's Cheryl here, but Anne has her hand up and I think you missed a Registry Stakeholder Group comment.

Christa Taylor: Thanks. Please go ahead, Anne. Go ahead, we can hear you.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I'm sorry, it's Anne for the transcript, Anne Aikman-Scalese. I just had wanted to note, Christa, that on that Government of India comment or the IN Registry and the Brand Registry Group comment about variable application fees for different types of application, is that a topic that we

are referring for discussion to the full working group? Because it seems worthwhile to do so. Thank you.

Christa Taylor: I believe so. I'm just reviewing. Yes, that would be a comment we're going to bring to the entire working group. And as Rubens --

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay, so the assumption -- I'm sorry, I guess the assumption we should have is, if it says divergence, the issue is coming to the full working group? I don't want to make an intervention on everything that -- if the assumption is that everything that says divergence is coming to the full working group, that's one thing. But if it's not the assumption, then we'd have to make more comments on the call, I guess. Sorry I'm not really clear on the protocol there.

Christa Taylor: I think it depends on the degree or I don't know -- I think it depends on the comment itself of whether or not it should go to the full working group. If it's something that's so different, like in this case, then I would say yeah, it should be, and we'll note it to make sure that we do bring it. If it's something that sounds a little bit similar, then it's up to us to kind of make the comment or the call on should we send it to the full working group? At least that's my interpretation. Go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay, thank you, Christa. It's Anne again, and thanks for that clarification. Happy to know. Thank you.

Christa Taylor: Yes, and if I don't capture it or if we don't capture it in the notes then in the different items on the working doc, please make sure you catch us on it. Okay, so moving to the next section which is on line 17, 2.5.2.c.1, different application fees for different types of applications is only warranted if the cost incurred for processing those different types are significant. For discussion purposes, 20% was used. We have the BC that agrees with the comment along with INTA. We have the NCSG agrees, however they have no changes to fees due to processing resources. And then we have the Registry Stakeholder Group which disagrees, there should be no change to the fee retroactively. And we have the BC which disagrees, they want the same for all applications, and I'm referring to the prior section to give that some context. And then we have the ALAC. They agreed somewhat with consideration to community applications and the likely increased cost due to the nature of the application. Any comments to that section?

Juan Manuel Rojas: Juan here. Juan Rojas here from NCSG. From NCSG we are concerned about variable fees, especially those that would lower the cost of application of (inaudible) brands. Because by extension, these regular costs for new comers in the (inaudible) and trying to offer gTLDs to other communities, and we have to have deny them, this is not an applicant's fault. So we need, we think we need a fair balancing pricing for all. That's our comment in that section specifically. Thank you.

Christa Taylor: Great. Thank you. Any other comments? Okay, seeing none, I'm going to jump to line 24 which is 2.5.2.d.2. Fees imposed for changing a type of application should be higher than applying for the desired TLD type originally. For discussion purposes, the applicant must pay 125% of the difference between the different application types in terms of fees plus any other related processing fees. So we have INTA that agreed. We have the NCSG who agrees with the variable fees and also notes the accreditation program which I suggest we park in section 2.2.6 which is a separate subgroup, so we'll make sure we bring it to them. Then we have Neustar which diverges from this saying that the application fee for new gTLDs should be the same regardless of the type of TLD an applicant intends to operate. And all applicants should be responsible for the development costs of the application systems and evaluation process and other required resources. We also have the concern that we believe that different application fees could potentially add an unnecessary layer of administration to the process that may become a source of disagreement and impact the predictability of the process. And then the comment on it is a unique and valuable piece of the internet. So I think part of that was addressed in Section 2.5.1.c.3 on the application fees. And then we have the Registry Stakeholder Group which has a divergent comment which believes the applicant should not be charged a higher fee for making any changes to their applications that are permitted changes under the Applicant Guidebook. So I'm not sure if that's really addressed at the question or just in general, because I didn't see anything in the Applicant Guidebook on the actual fee amount there, but please correct me if I'm wrong. Any comments to that section? Okay. Seeing nothing, Section 2.5.2.e.1.

Steve Chan: Hey, Christa? This is Steve from staff.

Christa Taylor: Oh, Steve, go ahead and then Donna.

Steve Chan: I also had my hand raised too. Thanks, this is Steve from staff. I was going to say that the -- which one was it, the one you were just talking about -- sorry, actually, Donna, go ahead, let me find my spot in the document. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Christa, Donna Austin from Neustar. Just in relation to what the Registry comment meant, and given this was done a long time ago, I might be off base here, but I think the reference to what was allowable in the Guidebook was that you could actually make a change to your application. So I think that's the part that the comment was trying to address. The changes were allowed, so there shouldn't be any additional fee associated with it so long as it's captured in the Guidebook, there shouldn't be any additional fee. I think that's what it was getting to, but I'm not 100% sure. Thanks.

Christa Taylor: Thanks, Donna, I'll do a little bit more research there. Steve?

- Steve Chan: Thanks, Christa, this is Steve from staff. And thanks for letting me find my spot. The part where it talks about permitted changes under the Applicant Guidebook, I was thinking that might make sense to reference to one of the topics actually in the supplemental issue report related to application change requests. So I just wanted to suggest that might be a good cross reference. Thanks.
- Christa Taylor: Yes, that would be great. Okay, I'm going to -- unfortunately I was trying to get through this entire doc, but let's try one more little section here and it's only got 2 comments. So Section 2.5.2.e.1, line 31, if the number of applications exceeds capacity limits and the projected processing costs, assuming these are limiting factors, should there be an option to increase capacity in the cost to meet service expectation? If so, how should capacity versus increased costs and/or limits be set? What is an acceptable increase and how would the actual percentage be determined? INTA has a comment, it's not really directly related, noting that ICANN should become, as it becomes more efficient in processing new TLD applications, costs should become relatively stable or decrease. And then we have the Registry Stakeholder Group saying that there's no clear reason that the per application processing costs should be higher since the number of applications increases. So I think I'll probably have to stop there. Unfortunately, not the end of this section, but on the next call, we'll pick up those last couple of sections in these variable fees. And I'll jump to any other business. 4 minutes left. You know, I could run for the next one. I'm actually going to call it there because the next section I think is a little bit too long.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The next section does go on a little bit more than 3 minutes, I think.
- Christa Taylor: Thanks. Okay, on that, everyone has got the extra couple of minutes and thank you for their time and we'll join up or we'll continue on the conversation, finish off this section on the next call and I don't have the time directly in front of me, but I believe it should be a week from now. So thank you, everyone, and if you have any comments or items afterwards, please feel free to let us know. Cheers.
- Julia Bisland: Thanks, Christa. Today's meeting has been adjourned. Thank you, everyone, for joining. You can disconnect your lines and I can stop the recording. Thanks.