

**ICANN  
Transcription  
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP - Sub Group B  
Tuesday, 26 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-b-26feb19-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p1s5rn8mukq/>

Attendance is on wiki agenda page: <https://community.icann.org/x/IJsWBq>

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

Julie Bisland: Thank you Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Sub Group B call on Tuesday, the 26th 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 are only on the audio bridge at this time, could you please let yourself be known now? All right, hearing no names, I would like 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 Christa Taylor. You can begin.

Christa Taylor: Great. Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. This is Christa Taylor for the record. Again, thanks for joining us and as you can see, we have 5 items on the agenda. First of all, is there any item that we should add to the agenda? And as always, if anything arises during the call, we'll be sure to add it into the any other business. Next, whether anyone has any updates to their SOIs, and if so, could they please let us know now? No big lineup of people to respond to that. Moving onto the third topic which includes the discussion of public comments on 2.7.7, Applicants Reviews. And we'll start on line 63 and then discussion of public comments on 2.7.8, Name Collisions, time permitting. And then any other business. Some great suggestions on how to get people to join the call, but in the meantime, I'm going to jump to line 63 in the document and start moving through it. So on line 63 we have Section 2.7.7.c.11 and the question is, for financial evaluation, to the extent that it's determined that a COI will be required, it should not be part of a financial evaluation, but rather, should only be required at the time of executing a registry agreement. We have actually everyone agrees, or no, sorry, we have the ICANN Org, Neustar, FairWind Partners and Valideus agreeing with this. ICANN Org asks the

PDP working group to discuss the challenges associated with the use of standby letters of credit as discussed in the ICANN Program Implementation Review Report and provide guidance. And that program I'm referencing, it should be required only at the time of executing a registry agreement. So I'm going to let everyone think on that if you want to take it to the full working group. Neustar agrees, FairWind Partners adds that requirements should kick in no earlier than contracting and the COI should not be required for single registrant TLDs like .BRANDs and those who have spec 9 exemptions. Valideus adds a template of acceptable COIs should be provided to applicants. And then we have a divergent point of view from the Registry Stakeholder Groups or a bit of a mixed bag saying some members agree, where others believe that the COI is a valuable mechanism to check for good financial operations. And by eliminating it, we lower the bar and invite unwarranted behavior that minimizes the trust in registry services and the internet in general. However, they note that not everyone shares that point of view. Any comments to that section and/or do we want to bring the ICANN Org comment to the full working group? I'll let you guys respond to that while maybe I jump to the next section in the meantime and I'll circle back.

So the next section is 2.7.7.c.12 and don't worry, I'm not going to read the entire thing out. The question is for financial evaluation, substitute the 2012 AGB evaluation of an applicant's proposed business models and financial strength with the following: The first one is the applicant must identify whether the financials in its application apply to all of its applications, a subset of them, or a single one. Sorry. The second one is ICANN won't provide financial models or tools, but it will define goals and publish lists of RSPs, organizations and consultants at the evaluation to look at whether an applicant could withstand not achieving revenue goals exceeding expenses, funding shortfalls, etc. In recognition that there will be proposed applications that will not be reliant on the sale of third party registrations. And that the criteria should not be established in a one size fits all manner. And if any of the conditions are met, an applicant should be allowed to self-certify. And if company is publicly traded, if the applicant and/or its officers are bound by law in its jurisdiction to represent financials accurately. Or if the applicant is a current registry operator that is not in default of its financial obligations under the applicable registry agreements and has not triggered the utilization of the COI. The applicant is required to provide credible third-party certification of these goals if self-certification above is not used or achievable.

And we have the Brand Registry Group, ICANN Org, FairWind Partners, Registry Stakeholder Group and Valideus all agreeing with this. ICANN Org notes the word demonstrate and that it is unclear on how self-certification would allow the applicant to demonstrate meeting these goals as self-certification by definition does not require the applicant to make any demonstrations. The other comments are more just we agree. The Valideus comment suggests that ICANN, if ICANN is to provide lists of RSPs, organizations and consultants, it's important that such lists should be accurate and exhaustive, and we question whether ICANN is in a

position to develop such lists. And then with the exception that existing registry operators not in default of any financial obligations under the registry agreements, or have not triggered the use of their COI should not be permitted to self-certify. So I guess that's a divergent point of view on that. And the fact that the registry has not currently failed to meet its financial obligations to ICANN or had its COI invoked is not sufficient evidence of its financial liability and they should be required to have an independent certification of their financial means in relation to any future TLDs.

Now we have the NCSG which has a divergent point of view that they do not support self-assessment as it makes no sense and the applicant has no obligation to prove to ICANN Evaluators that it has the wherewithal to ensure long term survivability of the registry and that further it's unfair to raise these showings by the largest companies and require them by the smallest. And results in an unequal playing field in regards to the cost of the application becoming much higher for new entrants, smaller entrants and entrants from the Global South. I assume that means it's on some kind of different cost basis rather than a fixed. Not sure that matters, but just a note. So any questions to that section? Anne, please go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks, Christa. I noted -- this is Anne Aikman-Scalese for the transcript. I noted Steve's question about ICANN Org's comment, should that be changed to new idea? And I agree with Steve about that. The reason I had my hand up had to do with the Valideus comment with respect to (c). Because in line 75, Valideus says for (c), that brands should be evaluated differently. I'm not sure, maybe I'm not really clear on it, but that seems like a new idea, to evaluate brands differently. So that's the question for the group.

Christa Taylor: Great. Thanks, Anne. And agree with the new idea both by yourself and Steve. I'll let the -- give the group a moment to respond. Rubens asks, in line 75 or a prior one? I believe she is referring to the Valideus comment which is on line 75. And then Steve adds, probably both 65 and 72 are referring to it. Anne agreed with that. That was what was brought up earlier with the ICANN Org's question. Rubens, please go ahead.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks, Christa. Regarding the Valideus' comment on .BRANDs, what's in the initial report includes the following phrase. However, there should also be a recognition that the group B purposed an application that would not be relying on the sale of third party registration and thus should not be subject to the same type of evaluation criteria. So I believe that encompasses what we know as brand TLDs in a more general manner that also includes closed registration of TLDs and others. So I believe the Valideus comment is more of an agreement than a new idea. But that's just my personal opinion. Thanks.

Christa Taylor: Thanks, Rubens. I agree. And we're going to see some more comments that also reflect that as well. So I'll continue on and then if we want to change that, we can. I see you're typing, so I'll just wait a second for

people to chat. Rubens' hand is still up. Okay. I'm just going to go -- sorry, did not understand the logic on that, should we cross reference? Yes, I think the logic, sorry, was that both ICANN Org on line 65 and 75 I believe should be classified as a new idea rather than just straight agreement. If I have that wrong, please let me know. Anne, please go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks, Christa, it's Anne. I think that Rubens is putting forth an opinion that in line 75 is a Valideus comment that I suggested should be listed as a new idea should not actually be listed as a new idea. Maybe I'm not understanding what Rubens is saying, but it sounded like he was cross referencing something else too. She adds an underlying reason why brands should be evaluated differently is not a new idea. So I mean I guess I continue to think that that is a new idea. But I don't know what exactly Rubens was trying to put forward there or if I misunderstood, that's also possible.

Christa Taylor: Thanks, Anne. I think he's referring to the other report that makes kind of like a basic movement to go forward, so they're saying it doesn't apply to this section. But I'll let other people correct me if I'm wrong on that. Steve is replying seems directly towards the idea, however, there should be recognition that there will be a proposed application that will not be reliant on the sale of third-party registrations and that should not be subject to the same type of evaluation criteria.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks. I just -- if that's what we're really saying, then it just seems like it should be cross referenced to that provision. Because it is a different -- evaluating brands differently from a financial standpoint is a very different idea from my point of view. I don't know. I mean it's maybe a good thing because obviously being an IPC member and there are a lot of brands that may be based on some of the other discussions about whether they are listed on stock exchange and that kind of stuff and which stock exchange. But evaluating them differently from a financial standpoint is not consistent I think with what was done in 2012. So it's a new idea.

Christa Taylor: I would agree with that. And I think, it's Christa, I think what people are getting to has mentioned in other areas, but I think you're still correct. Wow, Steve. Here's the entire bullet. The goals of financial evaluation are for the applicant to demonstrate financial wherewithal and assure long-term survivability. Therefore, the evaluation should look at whether an applicant could withstand not achieving its revenue goals, exceeding expenses, funding shortfalls, or inability to manage multiple TLDs in case the registries are dependent upon the sale of registrations. However, there should also be a recognition that there will be proposed applications that will not be reliant on the sale of third-party registrations and thus should not be subject to the same evaluation criteria. In other words, although the goals of the financial evaluation are to determine the financial wherewithal of an application to sustain the maintenance of a TLD, the criteria may be different for different types of registries. Criteria should not be established in a one size fits all manner. Yeah, I know, I like

to really make sure everyone's stats are clean. Anne, did the Initial Report recommend that brands be evaluated differently? Thanks. New in this respect of the Initial Report and therefore something new for the Working Group to consider. So is there any reason why we shouldn't mark this as a new idea?

Anne says I don't think the recommendation is a firm recommendation that the financial evaluation should be different. So I think we really should just mark it as a new idea and then keep going forward. I'm just going to hop onto the next section and then if anyone disagrees with that, I'll circle back. But I think it's probably the most prudent thing to reflect the comment correctly. Anne agrees, it does not specifically identify the financial process as being different for brands, so let's capture that. Thanks.

Okay, so I'm going to jump onto line 70, Section 2.7.7.c.12. Sorry, I won't read it all up here again. 2.7.7.c.13, for Financial Evaluation: To provide further clarity, the following are sample questions of how financials would be evaluated. Question 45, identify whether this financial information is shared with other application(s) not scored. Question 46: Financial statements, audited, certified by officer with professional duty in the applicant's jurisdiction to represent financial information correctly or independently certified if not a publicly-listed or current ROI in good standing with a score of 0-1. And Question 47, a Declaration certified by officer with professional duty in the applicant jurisdiction to represent financial information correctly, independently certified if not a publicly-listed company or currently registry operator in good standing, of financial planning meeting long-term survivability of registry considering stress conditions, such as not achieving revenue goals, exceeding expenses, funding shortfalls or spreading thin within current the plus applied-for TLDs with a 0-1 scoring. So we have FairWind Partners, the Registry Stakeholder Group and Valideus all agreeing with this. The Registry Stakeholder Group adds the comment that no final limiter where it says there will be no additional financial questions should be added. I'll let everyone -- agree, Rubens, in general if we don't agree on classification, we should default to the more different view. In this case, that it is a new idea. Right. Any comments to Section c.13?

I'm seeing no typing, so in the meantime I'm going to jump to 14 which is on line 82. The question is they propose the following draft language. "Applicants must be able to demonstrate their financial and organizational operational capability in tandem for all currently-owned and applied-for TLDs that would become part of a single registry family." The Brand Registry Group, Neustar and the Registry Stakeholder Group all agree with this and the Registry Stakeholder Group also adds than an applicant must demonstrate it can viably run 3 TLDs even if it claims its 3 TLDs are a "family". Any comments to section c.14?

Seeing no typing or hands, I'm going to jump to c.15 with the question: Allow for a set of pre-approved services that don't require registry

services evaluation as part of the new TLD application, that set should include at least A), a base contract requirement services (EPP, DNS publishing etc.), B), IDN services following IDN Guidelines, and C), BTAPPA which is the Bulk Transfer After Partial Portfolio Acquisition. The Brand Registry Group, ICANN Org, Neustar and Registry Stakeholder Group all agree with this and ICANN requests to confirm that the applicant would still need to go to an evaluation process to ensure that the applicant is capable of providing that preapproved service and to confirm that this evaluation is not the RSEP but is limited to assessing the applicant's ability to perform the preapproved registry service. Additionally, they say it would be helpful if a PDP working group can confirm that this understanding is correct and if it is correct, ICANN Org understands this evaluation is not an RSEP but rather another form of evaluation that is limited to assessing the applicant's ability to perform the preapproved registry service. It would be helpful if the group can confirm that this understanding is correct. So I think perhaps we should take that one to the full working group to confirm and I'll let you guys discuss if you don't believe that is the case or if it is the case. And then we have one other comment from Neustar saying that the registration validation per applicable law should be included in the preliminary recommendation.

I see Steve typing but one more item on there is the NCSG which has a divergent point of view stating that non-technical submissions are varied amongst -- sorry, the technical language and must be removed. At the outset this section is about an applicant's proof of technical, operations and financial readiness to offer a New gTLD in a stable and secure manner and it does not mean that the applicant has any right to extend any form of content control and excessive intellectual property protection into its evaluation and registry agreement. They reject the idea as an ICANN Community because it is completely inconsistent with trademark law. And there is widely-disputed and highly-controversial proposals via the Voluntary Public Interest Commitments and later the RSEP tech modification process does not make them technical, financial or operational commitments in any way, shape or form. Any comments to section c.15? Rubens, on line 91, we need an action item to respond to the NCSG that no content policy was buried by SubPro. Was used in order to not individualize to DPML, a service by specific registry. Agree, let's add that as an action item to follow-up on and also applies to line 103 which is the comment by the NCSG. And Anne adds, agree that ICANN request for clarification on qualification to render a pre-approved service. So let's bring that also to the full working group for clarification.

Moving to line 92 in the meantime, I don't see any hands or typing, line 92 on Question c.16, the question is since the content of Registry Agreement Amendment Templates for Commonly Requested Registry Services satisfies the criteria above, referring to it instead of exhaustively enumerating the list is preferred. Applicants would inform which of the pre-approved services they want to be initially allowed in the registry agreement for that TLD. It should only be used to assess services that are not pre-approved. And should be consistent with the criteria applied to

an existing registry and the same personnel that currently reviews the registry services for existing registries be the same personnel that reviews new registry services proposed by applicants. And that applications proposing non-pre-approved services should not be required to pay a higher application fee, unless a security or stability risk requires an RSTEP. And those proposing new non-preapproved registry services should not, to the extent possible, be unreasonably delayed in being evaluated.

The Brand Registry Group, ICANN Org, Neustar and the Registry Stakeholder Group all agree with this and ICANN adds that the group may want to consider for revisions to the RSEP workflow to fit within the program process and timelines, i.e., using priority numbers to order evaluations using CQs to address issues. I'll see if there's any comments to that. I'm not sure if we need to take that one to the full working group. I don't think we do, but if anyone thinks that we should, please make a comment or raise your hand. Anne notes on line 94 should be a note on a new idea which is the ICANN comment.

Jumping to line 97 on c.17, the question is the Work Track proposes the following draft language. Applicants will be encouraged but not required to specify additional registry services that are critical to the operation and business plan of the registry. The list of previously approved registry services will be included and that the applicant must specify whether it wants it evaluated through RSEP at evaluation time, contracting time, or after contract signing, acknowledging that exceptional processing could incur additional application fees. If the applicant has not included additional registry services, the RSEP will only be available after contract signing. The Brand Registry Group, Neustar, United States Postal Service, the Registry Stakeholder Group, the IPC all agree with this. The Registry Stakeholder Group has a couple of comments that tweaking the language for IDN languages, GPML, BTAPPA to follow the recommendation on c.16 which is the one just above it a few lines. To include all registry services with a template at that time. And that individual implementation of those services by different Operators can vary significantly which is relating to the idea above and making sure it brings fairness to everyone. And that the services being implemented do not vary from the implementation that is preapproved. Additionally, they add that applicants should bestow all proposed registry services as part of their application submission so the evaluators should review and assess all co-services as part of the overall evaluation application and that applicants should not have the ability to defer the evaluation services until after launch. And they do not recommend splitting out the new gTLD application evaluation process in this way, as it has the potential to create logistical issues and/or unequal treatment of applications. So I believe that part is a concern on the splitting out and perhaps we should capture that.

And then finally, we have a divergent point of view from the NCSG that states that the GMPL should not be included in the list of approved

registry agreements, in its list of additional registry service that are critical to the operation and business plan of the registry. They are highly controversial and not aligned with what's been approved by the registry service and needs to be flagged. They know it's a huge controversy and again, it should be removed from technical, operational and financial sections. Anne, please go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks, Christa, it's Anne Aikman-Scalese for the transcript. In line 100, for United States Postal Service, agreement is not the correct characterization. The comment from the Postal Service is that all services should be disclosed upfront. And so recommendation says something very different from that and so that is, that should be marked divergence.

Christa Taylor: Thanks, Anne, you're correct. Sorry, I missed that. Sorry, I'm trying to catch up on the chat. Line 101, I think that's what you're referring to Rubens, so I think we're good there. And I see Kristine, minimum concerns. So I think if we record it as divergent, I think we should be okay. But if we want to just move it to concerns, we can do that as well. And Rubens' note is already changed, so we're good with divergent. Anne, is that a new hand or an old hand?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Sorry, I'll get that down.

Christa Taylor: Kristine, it's okay either way as long as it gets discussed later. I think we're good with divergence and then it will get discussed later for sure. One item that I should have noted here is line 141, and it's at the end of a document from the Public Interest Community. It's the very last line and I think this would be best fit into this section even though I didn't move it there yet. But it says they have concern about reference to the GPML and that it should be considered by the RPMs group. But should be completely eliminated. It's kind of the same sentiment as the one by the NCSG where the global protected marks list and the protection is applied to a string of letters divorced from the context of specific goods or services and geographic territories of use was roundly rejected by the GNSO and ICANN board. And that these issues are being handled in another working group and that's the review of all rights, protection mechanisms PDP Working group. And that the GPML must not be grandfathered in. So perhaps we can move that one comment by the Public Interest Community up above so it's properly reflected. And as Rubens says, possibly one to add to the NCSG action item. Great.

Moving to line 104, Section 2.7.7.e.1, to the financial evaluation they are seeking feedback on an option with a more complex evaluation that was proposed that would be specific to a scenario where there are already many commercial TLDs operating and a number of delegated but yet unlaunched ones. The Registry Stakeholder Group has a divergent point of view that they do not support the heavy weight financial model believing there are too many different usage and business models to accurately accommodate each and every model in a standardized

process. On the flip side, they had some members believing that market forces should govern here.

The next question on line 106, 2.7.7.e.2, If it is recommended that a registry only be evaluated once despite submitting multiple applications, what are some potential drawbacks of consolidating the evaluations and how can it be mitigated? Lemarit has a comment that there will be no drawbacks and the Registry Stakeholder Group supports batched evaluations with 2 potential risks. The first one is how will you evaluators determine if applications are substantially identical? Having to pull out some that are flagged as having substantive changes could slow down the overall evaluations; and 2, whatever process is used to queue applications will be impacted by batching and the IRT should take that into consideration. And then I would also suggest that we look at the Google comment on line 140 that suggests support for consolidating review of applications where appropriate and that we should streamline the process including consolidating review of parallel applications or applications section by applicant or registry service provider. Any comments to section e.2?

Steve agrees with moving it. Rubens says it seems both are divergent, although of different nature and intensity. I think the question isn't whether they agree or disagree, it's just here more for feedback. Sorry, I'm not online, I'm not open yet. So maybe we can just capture that as more of a new idea rather than agreement because the question really isn't asking for agreement. I guess we've kind of surmised that they are for consolidating agreements.

Seeing no hands, I'm going to jump to line 109 which is section e.3. The question is which financial model seems preferable and why? The Registry Stakeholder Group has a new idea that again which reflects the one which was just above which market forces should govern here. If there is an accepted model or pre-approved financial model, then they suggest we retain the evaluation whilst leaving it open to accommodate more complex models. So that's the end of that section there. Sorry, I have a printout, so when we're inserting line I auto line because I think now we're on line or Section e.4 which is line 112. The question is suggesting that ICANN provide a list of persons or entities that could assist applicants in establishing a proposed business model. Should ICANN be allowed or even required to maintain such a list? Registry Stakeholder Group agrees with it that they should be allowed to but not required to maintain such a list. Whereas the Registry Stakeholder, the RrSG, Neustar and Lemarit have a divergent point of view or have a concern that ICANN be seen as endorsing a list of vendors and potential liability issues. Neustar notes it's not appropriate or desirable for ICANN to maintain such a list. And Lemarit says they strongly disagree, it's not ICANN's purpose to promote individuals, entities, products or services, the applicant or anybody. Any comments to that section? Kristine notes to characterize the RrSG position as having a concern and agree with the liability aspect. Actually, I think that's actually referring to the RrSG and

not the Registry Stakeholder Group. Actually, no, you're correct, sorry. I wasn't reading it completely. Agree with the liability due to lack of performance of such contractors -- so yes, note that as divergent. Rubens agrees and they are both concerned about liability. Yep.

Line 117 I believe, hopefully, yep, question e.5, The requirement to submit financial statements (especially with respect to non-public applicants) was one of the main reasons applicants failed their initial evaluation in 2012. The Work Track is not suggesting changes to the requirement to submit financial statements. However, are there any potential alternative ways in which an applicant's financial stability can be measured without the submission of financial statements? If so, what are they?

FairWind Partners, and the Registry Stakeholder Group both agree but the Registry Stakeholder Group has concerns and brings up the point that was brought up earlier on the new idea that single registrant TLDs only need self-certification which isn't what was brought up earlier, sorry. So FairWind group is suggesting that single registrants only need to self-certify, and the Registry Stakeholder Group has the suggestion that they could be replaced by an affidavit and has a concern about submitting the affidavit suggestion as they are concerned it may encourage applicants to engage in activities that place trusted and domain name registries and put the gTLD program at risk. Steve notes the Registry Stakeholder Group has an element of concern. Yes, and I believe you're referring to the section above which was e.4, so even better. Thanks.

Moving to line 120, Section e, 7.e.6, the question is in the event a 2.d evaluation exemption for public-traded companies is suggested. The Work Track hasn't considered whether to include affiliates in that exemption; should it be changed to also allow exemption in such cases? And FairWind Partners and Registry Stakeholder Group both support exemptions to affiliates. The Registry Stakeholder Group also notes that using the same definition of affiliates from the base registry agreement. And there's notes or some clarification in the chat for coloring items.

Moving to Section 7.e.7 which is on line 123, the question, alternative to the Registry Services Evaluation was not to allow any services to be proposed at the time of application and instead to require all such services be requested after contracting. What are some of the pros and cons of that alternative? The Registry Stakeholder Group, the biggest pro is streamlining the application process and no cons. Additional caveats provided. We don't see it as a requirement for the program to succeed and it is okay with not proceeding with it as a consensus compromise. The IPC notes new services should be disclosed at the time of application and subject to public comment which is a divergent point of view. I see no hands or any comments to that section. In the meantime, I am just going to jump to line 125. Actually, I see people typing, so I'll wait.

The IPC divergence on line 125 is noted and line 122 is fixed. So jumping to Section e.8 which is line 126, the question is: it has been argued that applications without additional services being proposed are subsidizing applications which do not propose new services. Do you see this as an issue? The Registry Stakeholder Group and the IPC both have a divergent point of view with the Registry Stakeholder Group noting it's an issue in theory but unlikely -- it's likely to be a small enough issue for not being too much of a burden or increase too much time for publishing evaluation results along with application queuing results on some of these issues as well. And the IPC doesn't want to discourage innovation by fast-tracking certain types of applications that do not propose new services.

Seeing no comments or typing on that, I'll skip the Cher comment. Section e.9 on line 128, question: Are there any other registry services that should be considered as pre-approved? Neustar notes that the registration validation per applicable law should be included. Registry Stakeholder Group notes that it should be expanded to include the RSEP instances. The RrSG has a concern that allowing existing registries to expand their registry services without allowing for a comment period could result in stability or security issues and lead to registrars spending significant time mitigating life cycles for existing registrations. And notes in the new idea that all services must be reviewed even though it might not be as thoroughly as new services. But it would be beneficial to have some kind of synch function. Then we have the NCSG with a divergent point of view that they believe all additional registry services should be preapproved, especially protected marks lists. Kristine, I see you have your hand raised. Please go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: This is Kristine Dorrain and I apologize because I think we've discussed this and I know it's probably just me not remembering, but when we get to these open-ended questions where it's sort of essay answer, not yes or no, agree/disagree, concerns, how are we going to be handling the group discussion? Because here are 2 ideas of agreement but there was nothing to agree with. It was just sort of tell us your ideas and then explain. So is the idea, just refresh my recollection, is the idea that we're going to, for the open-ended questions, we're going to go through all of the written answers, the essay answers as a larger group? Is that a correct understanding?

Christa Taylor: My understanding of it is everything will go to the larger group for review and for comment. But if there is something specific that I think we want additional feedback directly on, I think we should also kind of note that, so then a separate conversation can occur on that. But perhaps somebody can tell me if I'm incorrect in that or if there is a better way. Steve, please go ahead.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Christa, this is Steve Chan from Staff. Hopefully I can elaborate on that or expand on that in that staff started going through all of these public comments or review documents and our goal is to try to summarize these elements for consideration by the full working group. Which is not

always an easy task. So the idea is essentially to -- for something like these questions, which Kristine has noted is not as easy as for a recommendation. So the idea in our heads at least is to try to pull out the themes. Often cases, there is several comments that touch on a similar theme and so our thought is to try to identify those trains of thoughts and highlight those in what you'll eventually see is a separate column in these documents which summarizes themes and new ideas and all those other elements that are going to be needed for the working group to consider. But I think to answer your question directly, at some level, yes, all the questions will need to be reviewed in some sense rather than recommendations where maybe you can highlight that most of the respondents agree with the preliminary recommendations. The questions are a little more tricky. And that's our thought was to try to summarize themes and new ideas. Hopefully that sort of makes sense. Thanks.

Christa Taylor: Thanks, Steve. Go ahead, Kristine.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks, this is Kristine and yeah, that was helpful, Steve. I think we'll just all have to be sort of on watch for those ideas as we're going through it with the full working group. I noted only, this sort of addresses maybe Christa's point, because if you look at the 4 different answers to e.9, you've got basically 4 different variations. If we were to look at this and just say, oh, we're going to take 130 and 131 because those are disagreement and we're not going to really discuss those because those seem to have a lot of agreement, that actually goes against 132 and 133. Now, I would support obviously 131 as a member of the Registry Stakeholder Group, but I would hate to see us sort of just not discuss it because we needed to discuss 132 and 133. So I guess I just wanted to make sure that we're going to discuss all of the open ended questions as a group together. Because they all are kind of - there's a lot of interplay as Steve pointed out. So you did answer my question, I was just sort of addressing Christa's first question, whatever she was getting at there, that sort of thing.

Christa Taylor: Great. Thanks, guys. We have one more section. I know I think we originally thought this call was going to take an hour and a half, but I'm happy to not put you to sleep for the next half hour unless Rubens wants to jump on the next section. So I'll let him and everyone else discuss that and then I'll jump to Section e.10 for the final question of this wonderful short section which is: changing the 2012 implementation of asking for disclosure of services versus disclosure being required, while others argued it does not, keeping this aspect unchanged. Do you agree with one of these interpretations of the recommendation contained in (c)? Please explain to the extent possible. We have the Registry, the RrSG stating that the registry services not being exposed prior to approval could be beneficial to protect proprietary business plans, should be required to undergo the RSEP process and for those services that are not disclosed, true rigor should be applied when reviewing them to ensure the integrity of the approved application is maintained and that competition is not compromised. The Registry Stakeholder Group notes it doesn't agree

with the interpretation but believes that the registry services should still be declared by applicants if known at that point in time. And that disclosure of the registry services in advance is not required. And then we have the IPC that supports the disclosure of new services and the requirement should not be changed since it is essential to the evaluation. Steve notes we decided not to extend it. Aw, shucks.

Actually, one last comment because I didn't address it in the other sections and it's in the other comments on 139 which is the ICANN Board suggestion to look at mechanisms to allow blocked applications to move forward. Regarding applicant reviews in Section 2.7.7, the board is interested in recommendations for a mechanism that can be used when there are issues that block an application from moving forward. So I think perhaps that might be already captured, but just want to note it to make sure and maybe Steve or somebody can confirm. And finally, we have MarkMonitor that supports the efficiencies that don't sacrifice the evaluation, especially for multiple submissions from a single applicant in applications which share infrastructure. They agree that the evaluation should not be one size fits all, particularly for .brands where notarized dates, statements could be sufficient, and supports the fast-track approval for standard RSEPs. And I think all those captures above in the prior comments as well. I'm just noting it here. So sorry, not knowing that we did extend it, I'm going to jump to any comments on that section along with any other business. And a couple minutes of lenience, great. Our next call is on Tuesday, March 5th at 17:00 UTC and I think that's a wrap unless anyone has anything to add. CLO is probably saying thanks for joining as will I and thanks, everyone, and see you next week. You can stop the recording.