

**ICANN Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group
Monday, 7 August 2017 at 2000 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group Call on the Monday, 07 August 2017 at 20:00 UTC. 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.

Attendance may be found at: <https://community.icann.org/x/wAAhB>

Recordings may be found at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-07aug17-en.mp3>
AND <https://participate.icann.org/p25mnmq00e8/>

Michelle DeSmyter : Well, good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all and welcome to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on Monday, August 7th at 20:00 UTC, in the interest of time, there will be no roll call, attendants will be taking the Adobe connect room, so, if you're only on the audio bridge today, would you please let yourself be known now. Alright, thank you, I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I'll turn the meeting over to Jeff Neuman.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks (Michelle), welcome everyone and I will start with reading of the agenda as we normally do, we've got about 40 participants, 42 participants so, it's looking like some good attendance today, so, the agenda will just be to go through some work track updates and then talk about a quick update on work track five and steps that have been taken since the last meeting we've had two weeks ago, then we'll go into the bulk of the discussion on drafting

team discussion, the first one on accessing applications in round, which actually is proposing a name change of that.

So, we'll talk about that when we get there, and then talking about the predictability framework, Aubrey will lead the discussion on that and followed by Hope, who says I'm talking too quickly, apologize, just a lot to cover today.

So, finally we'll end with any other business, so, I will ask right now if there is any other business that someone would like to add to our agenda? Okay, I'm not seeing any, so, I will go to agenda item number 1, so, if anyone has any updates to their statement of interest, could you please let us know and if you'd like to report it.

Okay, I thought someone was going to speak up there but I guess not, which is great, we'll go on to the work track updates. So, in order to kind of shake things up a bit, I'm going to start with work track number three first, so, either (Karen), I don't know if Robin Gross is on, (Karen) or Robin Gross? Who'd like to give the update? (Karen), please. (Karen)? If you're on.

(Karen): Hi, sorry about that, forgot to unmute my phone. I apologize but I am not able to give an update because I've been on vacation and totally haven't caught up yet, I see Robin Gross has joined the call so, maybe she can save us here.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks (Karen), Robin Gross, is you are by a mic and you could speak, that would be great, thanks.

Robin Gross: Can you hear me okay?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks.

Robin Gross: Yes, okay, great. Right, so, we had a meeting last week and we continue to go over some of the legal questions, in particular we went over, let's see,

independent objector issues, and concerns about that, we've been going through the objections or the theme document, the objection to the same document from July 26th, and I think we got as far as 3.16 or 3.17, so, our next call will be next Tuesday, about eight days from now and we'll pick up, I think it's on 3.17 and we're going to continue to go into the discussion about the objections and independent objector and even some of the community objection issues and that is on the 15th, next week.

Jeff Neuman: Great, thanks Robin Gross. Okay, Kavouss looks like he has a question, so, Kavouss, please. Kavouss, are you speaking?

Kavouss Arasteh: Do you hear me please?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, now I can hear you, thank you.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, sorry, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, I'm sorry, please bear with me, I just get out of clinic (unintelligible) recovery (unintelligible). I have a question, do we have any positive or negative experience of this concept of independent objection? We have seen the result of many of them, of these we have seen something in the, and I would like to know if colleagues could share their views with us? Are we really on the correct track to have this independent objectors or it has been subject to some (unintelligible) some difficulties, some problems, or still we are we on the good track? I'm not opposing anything, I am not suggesting anything, I'm just asking, what are, what is our experience on the (unintelligible) on this case innovative case of independent objectors?

Because I have some difficulty to find somebody being independent. We are all human and we are all affiliated to some extent, yes, so, I want to have some (unintelligible) discussions about this, if not now, but maybe next time, thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, this is Jeff, I'll just jump in because we're just doing some summary updates to the full group right now, that issue has been discussed as Robin Gross said within work track three, there have been a number of positive and negatives that were pointed out about the independent objector, who the independent objector was but also the role of the independent objector, there was a discussion of the statistics of the objections that the objector brought, the independent objector only prevailed on two out of I think seventeen of them, but the recordings are available from that last discussion and maybe someone from ICANN staff can put up the link to the recording, but, there certainly was a great discussion about, you know, why an independent objector was put into place, to basically give a voice to those who could not have standing to make an objection, but also to some of the opinions of people where they thought he may have exceeded his scope. Avri, please.

Avri Doria: Yes, hi, this is Avri speaking, just to add a couple of points to that, I think the discussion is still ongoing in the sub, in the work track and two of the things that are happening now is people are going back and re-reading his report because within his report he did discussion issues and then possibly even inviting him in. So, I don't think that the independent objector is the same as, in fact I know it's not, as the independent review team which is where the dot Amazon came in.

So, they are different things but that discussion is still going on in the work track, thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Avri, Kavouss, if we could make it short and do a quick update because we have a lot to talk about with the drafting and the discussion.

Kavouss Arasteh: I want to (unintelligible) to Avri, I know the independent reviewer and independent review team are two different things. I'm just referring to just part of the independent objector of that. (Unintelligible) no problem, if the discussion still continues I would like to have some clear idea before we are deciding whether or not we have the same track and the same course of

action and the same (unintelligible) and same (unintelligible). I have no problem, go ahead with your discussion please.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks Kavouss, let's go to work track 4, and so, is that going to be Cheryl or Ruben? Who's going to volunteer.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: I'm not showing Ruben, looks like it's you Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, it does at that, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the record, thanks Jeff, yes, well last week we had our continuing discussion in work track four on the community consultation, round two, documents, responses and some of the proposed text for the recommendation. So, in the not too distant future, as a result of that, we will in fact be continuing with that this coming meeting, our conversation last week was particularly focused on universal acceptance and our upcoming meeting, which is next week on 17 August at 0300 UTC, we will indeed be continuing and hopefully finalizing a few more of the comments to responses.

With that, we also have a number of other pieces of work that are poised to be done but we do want to finish this block on our CC2 at this stage, thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks Cheryl, also hearing a lot of typing in the background, so, if everyone could just remember to put your phone or computer on mute when you're not speaking that would be great. Next, we'll go to work track one, so, Christa Taylor or Sara, who would like to volunteer? Christa Taylor, thank you.

Christa Taylor: Hi Jeff, and everyone else, we have a call later tonight for some and tomorrow at 3:00 UTC, and we have two that we're doing for the CTC, CT2 review, excuse me, one is going to be systems and the second one is the

application fees and there is quite a bit of details on the application fees, it has been encouraged to maybe review the comments ahead of time just so it won't put everyone to sleep and are reading it and I think that's about it, thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Christa Taylor, for those of you, Christa Taylor I think your mic was turned up a little bit too loud, but for those of you that couldn't hear Christa Taylor, there's a call in approximately six and a half hours or so which is 3:00 UD on work track one, talking about application fees and I want to thank Donna Austin who actually coordinated some comments on the mailing list over the weekend on application fees. So, I think that along with the comments that were received is a good basis to get discussion moving on the whole issue of application fees for work track one.

Moving along to work track number two, I know Michael is not able to be on and I see (Phil), okay, (Phil).

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: A little bit muffled, (Phil), is there a way you can?

((Crosstalk))

(Phil): I'll try and speak up, right, so yes, (Unintelligible) so, I just put something together, so, basically in July we began to review the CC2 inputs on review of names with the focus on any proposed changes to that in section 22132, we had a call on the 27th of July and we gave names and comments and quite frankly it was (Unintelligible), so, since then, huge amount of work from Steve, Steve Chan and Michael, Michael Clemmons, and we've now put together a spreadsheet matrix on review of names, it's under doc and Emily can give them the link so everybody can have a look at the top level and the second level. (Unintelligible) and the recommendations and then by the 2012 guide and then we put a column in there for thoughts and ideas going

forward, which any of you can input information in there if you like, and then we've specifically done a column which is basically marrying up all the CT2 coverage with the relevant category.

So, we've got a call on Thursday which you all are welcome to and I think that Jeff, you're not going to be on the call are you? So, it's really Michael and me that will be running that call on Thursday. We're going to continue to look at CT2 comments and we do have names and a chart and we're going to start looking at protections for the CT2 comments on that. So, back to names, what we're going to do now is we need to start discussing whether this is the right categories, whether we need to add or delete some of them and then we start to finalize the rationale of why the decisions are made in the original version of the reserve names list.

For instance, the whole issue behind the ICANN names and where we go with that. So, yes, in conclusion, we have the second level names as well, what ones should be included in those categories and again, understand the rationale of why they're in there in the first place. So, one final note, on a personal level, I think we should – this is my thoughts on it – is we should start (unintelligible). So, yes, we're going to be at 2100 UTC.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks (Phil), so, just to reiterate, we will confirm what is actually going to be discussed on the next meeting and my understanding, (Phil), you can jump in but my understanding is that there's a matrix that we're working on, actually there it is, Emily has posted, on the reserve names at the top and second level and we're going to go through that in kind of an orderly fashion, make sure that the comments reflect what our group thinking was before the comments came in, consider the comments where they differ, and then hopefully try to firm up some recommendations on reserve names. Now remember this discussion is excluding the geographic, sorry, top level, yes, geographic names as top-level domains. That one is carved out of work track two and will form the basis of work track five, which we will get into right now unless there are any other questions on work track two?

Okay, seeing no questions on work track two, the update on the new work track five, we, being Avri and I have sent out an email to each of the SO and AC chairs to ask for nominations of a person from their respective community to serve as a co-leader for work track five. So, we sent that now to the GAC, to the chair-person of the GAC, the chair-person of CCNSO, the GNSO and the ALAC. We have not gotten any responses back yet but we have asked for responses by August 18th if possible, so that we could try to get a call in the month of August with the, with those that have been selected to or volunteered, to serve as these co-leaders.

At that point in time, we'll discuss initially a call out to the wider community to get participants from each of the SOs and ACs like any sub-team or any working group, it's open to the entire community to participate and hopefully we can get an initial draft of a terms of reference for this work track by the end of August or mid-September so that we can review that on the first call of the full membership.

I see Anne in the queue followed by Kavouss. So, let's go to Anne first, please, Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, thank you Jeff, this is Ann Aikman-Scalese, for the transcript and the question relates to reserve names, I think excluding the work track five stuff, this is not a question about work track five, but more on the questions that, you know, about reserve names with respect to registries having either a certain number, an unlimited number of reserve names, that became an issue I think as you know, for trademark owners when the reserve names matched their trademarks, and I wonder what the public comment was on that and where the group stands on that? Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Anne, it's a great question, and that is one of the topics in the matrix that Emily sent around for, not with the top level domains but for the second level, that is a topic that is discussed within that work track, there were early

discussions back a while, several months ago when reserve needs was discussed within work track two, but they have not yet formed a position and they'll be going over the comments on that subject hopefully on the next call on the 10th, if not then the time after that.

So, we have not quite gotten there yet. Kavouss. Yes, Kavouss, I can't hear you, I don't know if you're still on mute.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I'm sorry, you talked about the independent objector (unintelligible), okay no problem. But what about independent review, whose (track) is that? Just a question quickly and then I don't want to discuss (unintelligible) I want to know which track I have to follow for the independent review.

Jeff Neuman: Sure Kavouss, that's to the extent that independent review is being discussed, that would also be track three, note that we're not talking about the process by which independent review operates, right? Because that's being discussed by well it was discussed by the accountability working groups, and still being discussed in workstream two, but really to talk about when accountability, or sorry, when independent review can or should – when independent review should be or what's the role of independent review should be in the new GTLD process, so, that will be in work track three.

Kavouss Arasteh: Okay, so I go to work track three and I would like to know what is the mandate for the (unintelligible) I don't discuss it now. (Unintelligible) please can you just answer my question, what is the mandate (unintelligible) of this group one. And two, how many do they expect to be? We have, I don't know, five or six or seven or (unintelligible), how many people do you expect to receive? Two from each, one from each, and is there any idea as to how many (unintelligible) team leader. And what is the term of reference. If it is one person, the other person understand that (unintelligible) should not be in (unintelligible). I am not supporting that idea (unintelligible) thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Kavouss, we've noted your questions down and we'll make sure that's addressed by work track three. Okay, Jim, I know you're.

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Excuse me, about the team, team leader you're talking (unintelligible) someone from each. How many do you expect the team leaders of this work track five?

Jeff Neuman: Oh, I'm sorry, the question is how many reps in the new work track?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, how many people (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Work track five, okay, I'm sorry, thanks, I misunderstood the question. Yes, so, at this point all we've asked for is for one leader to be nominated from each of the SO and ACs, once those leaders are nominated, then we'll hold an initial call to discuss membership and to discuss voting and all those other issues, just to get an idea from that leadership group. Ultimately all working groups are open to everyone and so, membership will be open to everyone. The question of whether votes will be taken or how those votes will be conducted, we, meaning Avri and I envision the work track five leaders to discuss those questions and then to make a proposal to the membership of work track five.

Kavouss Arasteh: Is the term of (unintelligible) the leadership is clear now? It is written somewhere? It is available, what is the mandate and (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Not yet, yes, not yet. Work track five the terms of reference have not been drafted yet, ICANN staff and Avri and I are trying to put an outline together so that we can discuss those with the, those that are nominated to serve as co-leaders of work track five.

Kavouss Arasteh: Okay, thank you.

Jeff Neuman: And Jim notes in the comments that we have addressed this question, sure, okay, so moving on then to drafting team discussion, so, item number four on the agenda, this is applications accessed in rounds, for those of you that have access to Google docs right now, it may be easier for you to read the Google docs as opposed to this version, I find it difficult to read on Adobe Connect but, so, I will be reading from the Google docs version, the first thing I'd like to do or you'll notice, is that instead of calling it applications accessed in rounds or other mechanisms, I proposed that we call it application submission period, just to not say that we're definitely doing rounds.

You'll also see a number of other edits that have been made primarily by myself, Donna, Avri, anyone is welcome to come in and suggest edits, so, I would certainly encourage you all to go into this document as we encourage you every week to do, and so, what I thought we would do, we tried to start this one on the last call and got a little bit derailed for some of the call, hopefully to keep it a little bit more focused is to look at the section called the requirements considered and to discuss about what any future methodology this is what we would hope the requirements to designing that future methodology.

One thing I'll also remind everyone on the last call was that it seemed to be a, not going to say consensus, but it seemed to be the feeling of the group or the feeling that I got from the group that we all acknowledged that the first application period, so, I'm hearing some crackling on the – I'm not sure if it's mine or if it's someone else that has their speaker open, okay, it's gone.

On the last call, the feeling of the group was that whatever we do in terms of an ongoing process, that the very next application submission period will be that of a round. Meaning that it will be a time period in which we would collect application, then we would stop collecting applications and we would go into an evaluation period. As opposed to do it in a first come first serve manner, it seemed that most of the group, if not everyone on the call at least

on the last call, thought that would be the way forward, again, with at least the next application window.

Now in designing application windows after that, the requirements in the section called requirements considered, which is on display now on page one of the Adobe Connect, are criteria by which we should measure any selected methodology against.

So, whatever we decide moving forward after that first initial round, we should make sure that there is clarity and predictability about how and when applications can be applied for in the future, there must not be undefined gaps between the processing of applications to the acceptance of additional application, and we'll go back and discuss this in a second, the choice of application submission methodology must address the potential impact on other areas of the program like objections, strength contention, etcetera, the application submission mechanism should not negatively impact the stability and quality of the program and the fifth requirement, the application submission mechanism should not negatively impact operational effectiveness and the fiscal feasibility of the program.

So, going back to requirement number -- the second one -- the second bullet point - there must not be (unintelligible) gaps between processing of applications to the acceptance of additional applications. So, what this means is that in the past -- in 2012 -- we had a round. That round started in January. That round closed -- as least for the acceptance of applications -- in - well it was supposed the close in May -- or in April -- but I think it ended up closing in early June -- or late May -- because of the glitch.

So, between that time period -- May, June of 2012 and so far, today -- we are no over five years past that and no definitive opening of an application (unintelligible) has been announced. So, there is still a lack of clarity and a lack of predictability about how and when applications will be in the future.

The hope is that in the future we will have that clarity and predictability whether it's defined in terms of number of months or in terms of some other criteria that we use but that there is more predictability such that we cannot or should not have -- what in this is called -- undefying gaps for processing applications.

Now the question we started talking about last week is whether or not review periods should be built in between the application -- at least this next application window -- and the application window or first come first serve or whatever we do after that. And so, some on the call last -- or two weeks ago -- had said, "No they do not believe there should be planned evaluation - or review periods of the previous round built in." And others were advocating for review periods.

I want to open up that question again to see what the feeling of the groove is on whether after we close this next application submission period, whether we should build in a set of months -- or whatever that time period is -- to conduct additional reviews or whether we should go into a more predictable timeframe for the subsequent round after the next one. Alan Greenberg, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Ignoring the fact that we don't have a clue how many will come in this round and therefore, you know, what kind of backlog we're likely to be generating on -- whatever -- the process that is put together by staff, I don't see how we can presume that there will be no problems encountered during the round and -- therefore -- no potential adjustment or changes in the next round. So, I can't see how we cannot allow for some level of review and adjustment going forward. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Alan Greenberg and I've written that down. Yes, (this side). Let me go to Donna and Kavouss and then I'll introduce the next question. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks Jeff. Donna Austin from (unintelligible). My preference would be just to move forward with the next round. I mean, isn't the reason that we are doing such a comprehensive review of the 2012 round to try to get rid of, you know, all the challenges that we've had a result of 2012 and move forward. I take Alan Greenberg's point but I'd rather find another mechanism to do some tweaking if that's what's required rather than go through, you know, another considerable crisis that we're going through now.

So, my preference is that we move forward as quickly as possible and I think, you know, in some of the discussions about predictability the - a next round or what do we do about (unintelligible) demand. I think there was a suggestion from Kurt Pritz that depending on what -- well not even -- dependent on long the next application window is but to provide some quick predictability there might be some value in running, you know, a subsequent round as quickly as possible after the close of the first round because that gives people who aren't necessarily ready for whenever we kick off the next round. They know (unintelligible) so that they can gear up for that.

So, you know, I think that was another suggestion that at the time that it was made it got some reasonable traction so I would to, you know, perhaps have some more conversation around that as well. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks Donna. Kavouss then Paul.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. The issue present that the third review is a (unintelligible). It could be studying or re-studying from (unintelligible) and it take many months or years. Perhaps we should call them adjustments but not review. (Unintelligible) come to square one. So perhaps we could call them adjustment and (unintelligible) associates some time for that would not last more than (unintelligible) I would say each month. Then we would have no difficulty. No doubt Alan Greenberg is right that we might have a need to look at the issue and overcome the difficulties the vision is but we don't call them review -- we call them some adjustment. And then there should be time limit or time

period associated with that but is making a mixture of both. But more or less around the line of what to do (unintelligible). But we don't call them review because in ICANN (unintelligible) and every review has sometimes on the specialty meaning (unintelligible). Perhaps we should use some other word such as adjustment. Maybe some other things. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Kavouss. Paul.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Jeff. Paul McGrady. So, I guess the question is what do we mean by review and do they ongoing review process like the kind Kavouss was referring to or do we mean stop everything and take everything down to the studs and rebuild it like we are doing on this review. If we have a calendar where we say okay the next round opens, you know, at this time and there is -- as Donna mentioned -- perhaps we calendar at least one other round or maybe we can calendar ten other rounds. There is no reason why we couldn't do that. If we're going to calendar the next round after the next round, then it sounds to me like it needs to be the kind of review you can do while the airplane is still in the air rather than landing it and taking it all apart like we are doing now.

So, I think we need to define what do we mean by review. Do we mean another one of these? Another, you know, three or four year or five year, you know, complete diagnostic by taking every part off the airplane and looking at it or do we need something else? Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks Paul. That's a great, you know, both of the comments - or all the comments have been great. It sound like -- if I could just recap -- so, you know, there is a feeling there -- by some -- that we should go straight into to cut that out into the following rounds but then there is also some feeling here that we should have some kind of lightweight process -- I'm using my own word here -- or adjustment period or something where even for a short period of time we talk about, you know, try to clear up any major issues that have

arisen and correct that before the third round or the third application window. Then the questions I have - and I see Kurt Pritz is in the queue which is good.

A couple questions. Number one is if we had this adjustment period -- and called it an adjustment period instead of a review -- when would we start that? You know, what would be the triggering event? Would that be an adjustment period started as soon as the application window closes from the second round or at some other point in time. And then going back to Alan Greenberg's first comment, if we get a lot of applications or more applications than expected, that would be one variable to potentially think about whether we need to extend the period between the first round or the second round closing and the third one starting. But if people could also talk about what other variable they see would -- or could -- potentially either increase that time period or decrease that time period between rounds. I'll go to Kurt Pritz and maybe others can think about the questions I've asked. Thanks.

Kurt Pritz: Hi. This is Kurt Pritz. Thank you, Jeff. So, I guess I'll just come in on your very last question and that is what other variables are there and I think, you know, one of the, you know, I've said this before -- but one of the other variables is the processing rate of (applicaæ) so currently we can only process - or we're supposed only process and delegate 1000 TLD's a year and I think it's incumbent upon us to ask (SAC) or some other body to come up with a better figure because that figure could lead us to a disastrous low processing rate and throw the process into turmoil and the number was just generated somewhat arbitrarily a few years ago. And so, I think that's a very important question.

But to get back to the question at hand, I think that, you know, we have a policy in place that says we're going to have an application round, you know, one year after the last one and of course that didn't happen so I almost think it's something we should draw on the too hard pile to say that these are the reviews that must be conducted or should not be conducted or they should be lightweight because something is going to - some superseding event is going

to happen between now and the next round that will cause it a different type of review. So, we can make a recommendation but we should do it with our eyes open and not spending too much time -- like Donna said -- over, you know, agonizing over our words there because we have no way of really controlling what's going to happen after this next round.

And my third point is - so I think at a high-level policy that we're left with, you know, two choices. One is, you know, we turned a round with a review period of some type and then a follow-up round or we should recommend a round and then immediately after that, you know, create -- where there is no demand -- the open sort of application period that Rob Hall and others recommended on the document. So, those are my three points and thanks for letting me talk.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks Kurt Pritz. I think some great answers there. If we did a - so I think there's other ways -- too -- to think about how we would recommend an adjustment or remedial period. I'm just looking at the chat. If we said that there was, like, a -- if we had maybe potentially a standing committee -- or something like that -- that would look at an issue had to rise to some level in order for that standing committee to review and then they had to solve those issues within a certain period of time such that the next round or open period had to begin in a year or otherwise they had to come to the community with justification why not.

We could make recommendations like that. But -- again as you said -- it is a tough issue. There is a lot of time intervening events that we could never control but potentially we could make - we could satisfy, you know, Alan Greenberg's thoughts of well what if something comes up that we absolutely need to adjust or review but also how to predictable, you know, saying - a predictable saying look unless that review committee can come up with something better by a year from the date that the last application, you know, closes then the default is we are going with the next round or whatever it is.

Just looking at the chat - or Kurt Pritz do you have your hand again or is that leftover? Old. Okay. Just going through the chat - sorry I have not been following it as closing because I have been looking at Google Docs. There is some discussion here on numbers - oh so back on the variables. So -- obviously -- even if we said that the next round should be - or the third round should be one year after the close of the acceptance window for applications, we know that the number of applications could be a variable causing a delay in the third round. Are there any other variables that could cause a delay? Or actually Kurt Pritz said -- as well -- that the rate of processing applications -- and there are two elements to that. There is one. The (SAC) technical community's recommendation of 1,000 per year delegation rate but then also obviously the -- or maybe not so obvious -- but the rate at which ICANN itself or its evaluators could process the evaluations of the applications. Do people see that as a variable as well or do we just keep collecting applications building up the queue so that when the evaluators get to it they get to it even if the next round has begun while other applications are still in the evaluation phase? Kavouss please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. Jeff. Some of these problems are addressed by the so called the option that you propose we should colleagues to have some understanding upon it to look at the adjustments almost to reach the result by that. However -- since we don't know the number of applications -- perhaps we just teach one year. We should teach two limits (unintelligible) and saying that depending on the number of applications that just beyond that two years (unintelligible) 12 to 18 months depending on number of applications but not beyond 18 months because don't to have two long periods because people will be disappointed or frustrated. But I think we should put some of disqualification in the (unintelligible) -- however -- some of the answers of your questions will be (unintelligible) the adjustment period. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Have we lost Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Sorry. Alan Greenberg you're up.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Thank you. We're talking queueing (period) here of where do we want people to be waiting. I mean, preferable you want no waiting anywhere. You want applications to be submitted without a delay for a window to open and you want applications to be processed infinitely fast. That's not practical in real life. So, the real question is where do we want the delay to be? From my point of view, I would think a delay prior to submitting an application is better than actually laying your money down and then perhaps if the queue is built up unreasonably taking an inordinate amount of time to process it. So, there are so many unknowns here I don't know how we can set up a schedule today definitively. I like the idea of saying the next round will begin at, you know, some point in the future determined by how many we got the last time then at least we can make an educated guess of how many we can turn through as we go forward.

I'm wondering are we really serious about worrying about 1000 per year as being the limiting factor. Clearly the number that we delegated per year in the current and the last round wasn't near ,000 per year. I don't know what the number is but, you know, the roughly 1000 TLD's -- or 1000 plus TLD's -- were spread over quite a few number of years. So, I guess some real information will be useful there. We may have it. I don't have it though.
Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks Alan Greenberg. What I'm trying to do - and I agree with you that there are - there is no way to know all of the unknowns. But if we can try to map out what the types of unknowns might be or the variable, then we can provide for more predictability.

So -- in other words -- I'll be making this up. But in theory if you said, "Look if we have more, you know, the plan is to have round three one year after round two closes or the application, you know, closes unless we have more than 3000 applications." In that case -- if we have 3000 applications -- it will go to 18 months after. If it is above 5000, it will be 24 months. I don't know.

I'm -- again -- just throwing that out there. I'm trying to see if we can map out what the variables are because, you know, otherwise we going to be left -- after the next round -- in the same position we are in this round. Part of that is going to be determined by how fast ICANN can process applications and -- as Kurt Pritz says in the chat -- you pay someone enough, you know, they are obviously going to be scale up more than what they've been or we should know what their plans are to scale up. But -- also -- the second part of that is to make sure -- from a technical perspective -- we are not threatening the secure and stability of the root by increasing the potential number of delegations per year.

So, with that I want to go to Donna, Kavouss. Yes. Donna, please.

Donna Austin: Thanks Jeff. Donna Austin (unintelligible). Alan Greenberg, just to reach unto you a suggestion that we should, you know, understand the queueing rights from last time or the processing rights from last time. Part of the challenge from the 2012 round is that there was substantive policy implementation issues that were resolved along the way and some hiccups along the way that were outside of the evaluation processing elements.

So, one of the reasons that we had that long delay in getting TLD's to delegation was not necessarily the processing that ICANN had to go through but there was some substantive discussions going on about plurals and name collision. There was significant changes to the registry agreement at a time that we didn't expect it. So, there were other things that got in the way of processing, you know, 1000 applications. So, I think if those things hadn't been in the way -- because they were substantive and they did take a very, very long time to resolve -- we would have seen a faster delegation rate. So - - while I agree that it would be helpful to go back and have a look at what happened in 2012 -- we need to acknowledge that there were some serious, you know, road bumps in the way in the implementation in the 2012 round after folks had submitted their applications. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks Donna. I'm hoping that -- like you -- the road bumps that we faced certainly those will be eliminated and that in theory there should not be as major road bumps -- things like glitches and digital archery and name collision -- things that delayed things for so long -- will hopefully be resolved and any of the unknowns would be of a more minor type than the ones that we suffered in 2012. Alan Greenberg, your hand is still up? I don't know if that was an old one.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry. That's an old hand.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks. So Kavouss and then Anne. And then I'm going to wrap up this discussion on application submission period in the next five minutes so that we can go on to topic number 5.

Kavouss Arasteh: Okay. Yes. I will (unintelligible) about a minute. Yes. I think could we have some indication of the ICANN based on the different categories of application of the first round. What is the processing capacity of ICANN with respect to application. This is one question. Second, Jeff instead of fixing 2000 or 5000 (unintelligible) we won't a curve or a linear indicating that for the basics 1, 1000 is six months say nine months and after that is go according to the number and we define that if it is 2000 could we take the curve or 3000 or 4000 and that's how you should be exceeded. So -- in that case -- we would have a good safety guard if the number application would be an avalanche. If not, we would have - I think that the better mathematics other than (unintelligible). Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thank Kavouss. And -- on the first point of ICANN's capability -- yes. You know, it seems like we go back and forth with ICANN and for very good reason which some people think of, like, you know, what came first? The chicken or the egg? We come back and, "Well how long does it take you to process?" And ICANN comes back to us and says, "Well how do you want the processing to be done?" We can't figure out, you know, we can't figure that out until you tell us how you figure out, you know, how you want things

done. And so, what ultimately I think what an outcome could from our group is to present ICANN with a list of variables saying, "Okay, ICANN, assuming you get these amount of applications, these are the processing roles, this, you know, all different types of variables, you know, how long would it take you to process or could you scale up?" If we present scenarios to ICANN - I think - I'm hoping that they could come back with, "Okay -- based on those assumptions -- this is the way it would be." So, you know, I think if we can make - we can make a little progress doing something like that.

And on the second one, yes -- I think once we present these variables -- it's not going to be a definitive number like 3000 this time period 5000 but it is going to be some kind of scaling curve that hopefully ICANN (oric) will help us figure out. Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. This is Anne for the transcript. Thank you, Jeff and (unintelligible). I note in the chat to Alan Greenberg's point that a couple good points have been made about variables and one is about how long it takes to get GAC advice on new applications and deal with GAC advice and another comment from Robin saying that there will always be glitches. So -- while I do think it's a good a idea for, you know, you to -- as you suggested for us -- identify variables. I think it's a reasonable assumption that -- even when this round opens -- there will be road bumps. There are some policy changes occurring. There are, you know, one thing that I was thinking about in terms of (GAIT) is within work track four we've said that -- in accordance with (SAC) advice -- every string applied for should be identified as -- well it's not final yet -- but should be identified as either high, medium, or low risk in terms of name collision. That is a new process that will also take time in the next round. I'm not sure we really know the results of the policies that we are making now in terms of timeframe for processing applications and I don't think it's safe -- really -- to assume that everything is going to work a lot faster at this point. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Anne. I want to wrap up discussion on this. I think this has been great. I know all of the comments have been caught in the notes and I think this will help us for the next time. What I would like to do with this topic is - we had initially set forth a drafting team to talk about these issues. I'd really like to do -- now that we have some good information -- is to get that drafting team -- those that volunteered for the drafting team -- and anybody else that's interested back together to work, kind of, on the side to flush out these things a little bit more so that we can come back to the full group with any additional information or some flushed out thoughts.

So, I am going to try again to kick off this drafting team. If you are interested in joining this drafting team -- which ICANN staff can put up the link to where the drafting team is at some point too -- please let us know and we can add you to that list but I'm hoping we could get some discussions between now and the next meeting that we talk about this issue to progress on this subject.

So -- with that -- I'm going to turn it over to -- I'm hearing some beeping -- but I'm going to turn it over to (Aubrey) to start draft item number 5.

(Aubrey): Thank you, Jeff. This is (Aubrey) speaking. Yes. I hear the beeping too. At first, I thought I had a call waiting. I'm not sure whose it is though. It's not mine.

Okay. Now we lost. Or did I lose? No. You hear me. Okay. So, it's not me that dropped. Okay. Can we stop that somehow? Thank you, Michelle, for trying to locate it.

Thank you. Okay. So, it looks like it's been dealt with. Okay. So, this is the framework for predictability and this was last discussed -- and I think the only time it's really been discussed -- was in May when it was first presented. And what I wanted to try and do on this this -- since the drafting team idea hasn't really worked out on this one yet that we have had comments from at least one person -- is to actually walk through it and look at the changes that have

been made, look at what's there, and see where we're at on it; see if people have comments and such.

So I'm going to walk through it paragraph by paragraph. I'm not going to read them. But again, they'll be in the screen there. And as with Jeff, I recommend that you look in the Google Drive document because it is much easier to see the changes and such.

So basically, you know, an anticipated outcome, the first paragraph talks about, you know, we're looking for predictability.

The second paragraph -- and please raise your hands when there is comment -- has received a certain amount of comment and edit. And I think it was Donna that contributed some of this or I'm not sure; it really doesn't matter who contributed. But basically, it talks about - no, it wasn't Donna in this case - talks about policy implementation and it being governed by the consensus policy implementation framework. And basically, talks about this being something that's meant to complement that; not change that.

And just wondering, when looking at the outcome of this, are people in agreement that that is really where we're going with this? Does anybody have any immediate reaction or I should move on?

Okay, I'll move on with it. And I would like to think because I would really like to start accepting these changes and, you know, we can accept the change and then we can always change it again. But if there is no objection as we walk through this, I'd like to start accepting changes so that our base document actually gets more solid as time goes on.

So then we talk about community engagement. And first of all, one of the things there's different here is that at the last time -- the process -- and we've talked about this before, the process was to put together a general policy

framework and then let implementation go through from there with perhaps a few implementation guidelines.

In this case, the policy - the method of developing policy has gotten far more specific. We're getting down into a lot of details. So hopefully, we will develop clear recommendation that can be implemented in order to result the program with as minimal ambiguity or change required. And to make sure the process is well supported by community engagement and it goes on.

So the multiple mechanisms already existing that support community engagement, these are, you know, what's mandated in the PDP manual, the outreach to everyone, utilizing liaisons, supporting early engagement with the GAC, providing newsletters to keep the community involved in what we're doing, holding community focus sessions.

So hopefully at a certain point, we're producing something that won't be surprising to people and that will have been able to be looked at in terms of its implementation, you know, issues.

Next thing, and any comment on that or does that look like it's a reasonable start to people and we could use that as our base to build on? I'll stop for a second.

Okay, yes Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Hey, thank you very much Avri and for the work as well.

I'm trying to understand the - and this is Anne for the transcript - the relationship between the consensus policy implementation framework and the work previously done by the policy and implementation working group that was done on the GNSO side -- with, you know, since GNSO is responsible for policy development.

What's the relationship between the mechanisms currently contained in the Policy and Implementation Working Group and in the manual -- that were developed for implementation -- and this?

Avri Doria: Okay, first of all, I think most of this - this is Avri responding. And please, others jump in when my explanation isn't adequate. Those things that were done in that group and have -- I think at this point -- the mostly accepted and put into the guidelines, for example, the expedited PDP. And you'll find that that is mentioned later in this. And I believe they're part of the framework of developing the policy.

So I believe that those things were added to this framework once they were approved by the GNSO Council, put in the book went to the Board, et cetera.

I don't know if anybody wants to comment further on that. But I do believe that that review group has since been sort of folded into our manuals and it is the way we work. And you'll see mentions of them as I move on further in this document.

Yes Anne, is that a new hand? Please.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, thank you Avri; it's Anne. It's just a follow-up.

Could you go over again the procedural context of the Consensus Policy Framework Implementation -- Consensus Policy Implementation Framework? I think I didn't quite understand where the problem statement came from and where this policy came from?

Avri Doria: I don't understand your question. You're asking why are we talking about flexibility and predictability and referring back to policy and implementation.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: No, thank you Avri. I'm referring to is this part of - is this a work track in subsequent procedures or where...

Avri Doria: No.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: ...where did this come from?

Avri Doria: This is the policy process that has been established by the GNSO.

Steve or somebody - Jeff? I think Kavouss is there, but if you raised your hand, Jeff, to come to my aid and answering where this comes from other than the GNSO and such, please do. And I see Steve has his hand up.

Jeff Neuman: And I think (unintelligible). Yes, this is Jeff. If I'm interpreting it right and you ask, this is one of the overarching issues that we came up with before we divided up into work tracks.

So the original charter for this group had a whole bunch of issues in it. And what we did is we took the issues and grouped them logically so that they would be in discreet work tracks. But there were five or six overarching issues that we needed to go through that permeated through each of the work tracks.

One of them was what we just discussed which was rounds versus first come/first served. The second -- this one -- is on a predictable model. And really, what do we do when something unforeseen happens? You know, how do we solve those issues within a framework of predictability to ensure that we're not just driven off the rails like we were with name collision or with the new registry agreement that Fadi had announced that he wanted to change shortly after taking office as CEO.

So if we can establish a framework for resolving these issues going forward, hopefully we will shorten the gaps between processing or even eliminate them if we have this predictable framework. I hope that made sense.

Avri Doria: That is but I don't think that answers her question. She was asking where did the consensus policy implementation framework come from. That is a GDD published document as of, I guess, May 2015 if you go to the footnote there. And I guess it's meant to be consistent with GNSO consensus policy recommendation. But that is the framework within which GDD is working.

And I see Steve's hand is up.

Steve Chan: Thanks Avri; this is Steve Chan from Staff.

To add to what you just commented on, that Consensus Policy Implementation Framework was indeed drafted by Staff, but it was done so in collaboration and in conjunction with the non-PDP working group on Policy and Implementation. So did the community did collaborate in the development of that process.

And in the note that you'll see underneath the anticipated outcome on the document being shared, implementation by ICANN is essentially governed by that document. And so the document that we're staring at -- this Framework for Predictability -- is indeed not intended to substitute for that framework which ICANN follows for its implementation.

But it's also, as Jeff mentioned, you know, when things do arise that surprise the community and maybe not accounted for, it tried to provide a predictable way in which those issues can be resolved. So the CPIF comes from GDD and along with community implementation.

Hopefully that helps, Anne. If you have other questions, please let us know. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. I'll go to the left now. I've got Kavouss and then Alan. Thank you, Kavouss, for your patience. Please go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I understand with the standard of terms that Consensus Policy Implementation Framework, if I put it differently, would be a framework that should be used for the implementation of consensus policy.

Is that what you're discussing because I'm told differently. You told the framework (unintelligible) functions. (Unintelligible) (unintelligible). Consensus Policy Implementation Framework (unintelligible) because and who is going to do that framework and call this framework will be used. So please kindly clarify.

The other reason, Avri, is different from what I understand from the main (unintelligible) -- Consensus Policy Implementation Framework. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay but please forgive me for being so confusing. Let me try to clarify.

There is the CPIF -- the Consensus Policy Implementation Framework that was established by GDD that is existing that was established -- as Steve just told us -- at the same time that we revising the rules about the intersection of policy and implementation.

What we are discussing now is how to deal with issues that come up during the implementation when - this is basically, there is a policy implementation - there is a policy, there is an implementation guidebook, the process of processing applications has begun. Oops, there's something that needs to be changed in the policy.

Now, what is going to happen?

Now, within that framework, there is discussing of working with the implementation review team, et cetera.

What this does is when completed is accompany that document and sort of say if this kind of process change is happening, well then this is what needs

to happen; how is it mitigated. If you look through this document, you'll see various levels of change are discussed and what would be necessary to mitigate them.

So what we're looking at now is within the new gTLD policy where we know that absolute predictability is probably not available to us, how do we deal with the flexibility needed while still being flexible, still being within the Consensus Policy Implementation Framework, and still adhering to GNSO consensus policy as approved by the Board. Hopefully, that was less confusing.

Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much; two things. First of all on the GDD framework, I have to comment that the development of that was one of the more collaborative things between the volunteer community and ICANN Staff that I have ever seen in my life. There was a real openness to make sure that it worked and fit everyone's needs.

So I don't think we want to reopen that or question how it was developed. It was really a remarkable process.

However, I question how much predictability we can get -- period -- given that the Policy Implementation Group came up with recommendations which are implemented which say that if we determine that things really are policy, they must go back to the GNSO.

And I don't see how we can get predictability unless we have a way of holding the GNSO to schedules -- or GNSO and its working groups. And I think we have to think about that from that perspective. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. Thanks for that Alan and thanks for the endorsement of that process and remembering that and going back to that.

I think some of it gets discussed; I don't know about holding GNSO to schedules. I don't think that's in there so that may have to be added in the right point.

Yes, Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, so for this topic, I think about things that came up for which everyone kind of looked at each other and said, "Oh, shoot. How do we resolve the situation?"

So like I put in the chat Digital Archery, right. So I think the initial like mechanism to allocate or to queue up applications was this Digital Archery.

Well, we subsequently found out that that process was flawed for a number of different reasons until we had to make a change to that mechanism. And we were thrown off for months because we did not have any mechanism to deal with changes that had to be made in order to move forward with the program.

Now obviously in our review, we're going to come up with something different and hopefully that issue won't come up again.

But there may be issues like that that arise for which we need to have a framework in place so that we can predictably and reliably resolve those situations without too much -- if any -- delay of the application processing.

Avri Doria: Thank you. (Unintelligible) please.

Woman: Thank you Avri. I just wanted to get some clarification on this.

From our perspective, we have actually two phases that we're looking at that maybe you'd advise just a single word -- implementation -- here. I mean in

our minds, there is the policy implementation phase and that follows the policy processes of the PDP process.

And during that phase -- the policy implementation phase -- we work with the IRT and the community via RD consensus implementation policy framework.

So it's pretty clear there that if any issues that arise, you know, we work through the IRT to determine whether or not it's in line with the policy, and if it's not, then there's a process to escalate it back to the GNSO.

But in our mind, we also have another feed which is when the program is in operation -- and I think most of the issues that are being referred to here for the 2012 round -- are issues that came up when the program is in operation. So to us, that's sort of like an operational phase.

And you're right; it would be great to have some guidance or predictability framework to deal with changes that occur during the operation or phase of the program.

And so I'm just wanting to get some clarification as to this predictability paper. I'm assuming that this paper is for that operational phase and not for the policy implementation phase?

Avri Doria: Thank you, (Trying), for the clarity. I believe that that is the case though I am not sure that it's quite that sharp. But yes, it is for the operational phase predominately, I believe, because it's -- as it's said there -- it's meant to be complementary to it; not replace the existing framework.

Woman: Right, great. Thank you, Avri.

Avri Doria: Thanks. Anne, please.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, thank you Avri; it's Anne. I guess I'm still a little confused because I know that, you know, Alan pointed out the collaboration among policy and implementation working group that there were, as well, represented widely in the community. And certainly at the time, I think we all thought we were working on issues that arose during the, you know, "operational phase."

A lot of the discussion at that time in Policy and Implementation Working Group was based on the fact that it was a little bit of a red-herring to say, "Well is it policy or is implementation?" And that the way to resolve issues as you move forward is not to try to put them in a certain box, but just to recognize that the GNSO itself is the policy development body, and to have three processes that are designed to resolve the issues during implementation -- during the operational phase. I mean, yes, this goes along with the idea that you always have an IRT; that was one of the recommendations in the group.

But, you know, there were three; GNSO input, GNSO guidance, GNSO expedited PDP. Even all those processes aren't necessarily fast. The reason they came about the way they did was because of the, you know, somewhat half-hazard and unpredictable implementation that occurred in a 2012 round and the thought that you've got to do that as an exercise of the multistakeholder community.

So I guess what I'm not really getting is where this takes us, you know, to the possibility of a faster process. Okay, that's faster but is it really the result of multistakeholder participation?

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. I think there's nothing -- as I've read this -- there's nothing inconsistent in this proposal to that current existing framework. But I'll go to the rest of the people in the queue. And we do have seven minutes left on this call today.

So (Trying), please.

Woman: Thanks Avri. So to follow-up with just something that Anne just said about implementation versus policy, one of the things that we certainly were challenged within the last round was when faced upon an issue that arised, if the policy itself was silent on it, does that mean that it's an implementation issue or does that still need to go back to, you know, the GNSO? And what criteria do we use to make that determination.

So that, you know, is a huge area where if there's some clarity around (unintelligible) really helped. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Jeff, please.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, the way - thanks; this is Jeff Neuman. The way I separate in my mind is kind of how I wrote it down.

I think that there is a difference between implementation of the policy versus implementation of the program.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: So when there are issues of the policy, so I would include issues like, you know, look. After the policy was determined, that was when the IRT and the CTI and others came into existence to talk about intellectual property rights.

That is more of, Anne, what you're talking about in terms of protecting people with intellectual property rights, and that should have been done in a more predictable manner. And now we have the processes through this implementation, discussion with - sorry - through the GNSO.

But I view that as being different than, oh gosh, Digital Archery doesn't work; we need a new solution to queue up application. Or Fadi introduces a new

registry agreement at the last minute -- which is more implementation of the program than it is the policy.

Or - oh my gosh; Name Collision. Name Collision has nothing to do with the policy but was still an issue for which we needed a predictable framework to resolve that issue.

Or the technical glitch or the security breach that we had with people viewing other people's applications. Or - I mean there is probably 20 of them I could rattle off in the next five minutes -- which I won't. I view that as all issues for applicants that need to be resolved in a predictable manner, that are more implementation of the program than implementation of the policy.

(Unintelligible), I hope that makes sense, but that's how I distinguish it in my mind.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you Jeff. Kavouss, please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, Avri. I think we have discussed in other form of ICANN like (unintelligible) implementation is different from policy. I don't understand how we mix up the policy and the implementation of the policy.

Policy is obviously some functions of action and then those actions would be implemented, but not the policy itself. If something arises stems from the policy, so those are two different things; they are not the same thing. You cannot implement the policy.

To (unintelligible) policy and policy have something to develop and we get out of it, and then you implement those. There is no direct relation between implementation and the policy. So I have some difficulty to what Jeff is saying; implementation of policy and implementation of (unintelligible).

But I think (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you Kavouss. We're going to have to carry this conversation on. I would just like to mention that if there is no relationship between the policy we make and the implementation, we do have a very big problem here.

But this is also well discussed in that policy and implementation documentation that discusses the relationship between the two and how they affect each other. So I suggest - and we can put a pointer up to that document to go on.

What I'd like to suggest on this one before I turn it back to Jeff to do any other business, is that people read through this document. And you'll notice that, you know, we never got to that, but within the predictability framework, you know, there is the minus process updates, revised process, new process and procedures. But there's also revisions where the revision may have policy level implementations, and that is specifically what we're talking about here.

So I'd like to suggest that people read this. And then there's also a discussion on role of the Implementation Review Team and the GNSO policy change process. So please read through that so that the next time.

And in fact, if indeed we do still have a concept of a drafting team working on these -- although there weren't many people that volunteered for this one -- I'd like to ask anybody that's got thoughts on this to please check out the document; comment on it, suggest changes, suggest edits.

Thanks. And with one minute, I hand it back to you Jeff. Sorry I went on so long.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Avri, that's quite all right.

The only other any other business that I have so far was to just make the point that the next call is actually in three weeks' time. I know we normally

have the full group call every two weeks, but because of vacation schedules, (unintelligible) is not until the 28th of August.

So that's three weeks in between full-group calls. But the work tracks are still meeting this week, next week and the following week. So the next full-group call, again, is on the 28th.

Does anyone else have any other business? Kavouss, please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, (unintelligible). This is (unintelligible) the plea in which they (unintelligible) with have a meeting. Yes, I would be interested to attend that, but I (unintelligible) discussion.

Could it be quickly made available that we know what is the time for the (unintelligible) and also (unintelligible)? Is this so our meeting (unintelligible). Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Kavouss. We have the schedule of the existing work tracks is already up on a Google Doc that's accessible on the main page of the Wiki -- which hopefully someone from ICANN Staff can publish that calendar or the link to the calendar on the Chat. So that will tell you when topics are being discussed in Work Track 3.

With Work Track 5, you know, as soon as we know when those are going to be, we will publish them and send a note around to the entire full working group.

Okay, is there anyone else with any other comments or questions? Okay, thank you everyone. It's been a great call and I look forward to talking to you all on the 28th.

Thanks everyone.

Woman: Thanks Jeff. Again, the meeting has been adjourned. (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Bye.

END