

**ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call
Monday, 08 October 2018 at 15:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-08oct18-en.mp3> Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p60kyo33lir/>

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/4wirBQ>

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

Operator: Recording has started.

Andrea Glandon: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call held on Monday, the 8th of October, 2018. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room. If you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourself be known now? Thank you. Hearing no names, 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 will turn it over to Jeff Neuman and Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Please begin.

Jeff Neuman: Hi, this is Jeff Neuman. Sorry. Just got myself off mute. Welcome, everyone, to this call. And I know that we have -- or I see that we have a little bit lighter attendance than normal, as it just came to my attention, or I just noticed the conflict between ICANN's session on GDPR update and this one, which obviously does not make me too happy since this has been on the calendar for a while. So, I will certainly try to have a word with ICANN that, just as they expect us to check their schedule when we schedule our meetings, it would be nice for them to check our schedule and make sure that they don't do these conflicting calls. So, I will take that upon myself as an action item, but we're going to continue with our work as we have previously planned to do.

So, the schedule is up on the right-hand side, so it's really just to essentially review the supplemental report. We'll address a couple of the e-mails that have come in, and then we'll talk about the ICANN 63, and then see if there's any other business.

So, with that said, any questions on the agenda? Okay. Not seeing any questions on the agenda, and then I will ask if there's been any changes

to any statements of interest. Okay, not seeing any hands or any statements in the chat, just a reminder, if you do have any updates to your statement of interest, please do submit in writing, as well as announcing it on the call that takes place afterwards, or the next meeting.

Okay, so let's get right into it. A revised version of the supplement initial report has been set around and should be the same one that's posted in Adobe Connect at this point. If I can ask staff to -- thank you, never mind. I see it's been unlocked right before I asked, so that's good. This version, unlike the previous version, if I'm not mistaken, should be just indicating the changes to the previous version. Previous to this, every week we've sent around a cumulative version of redlines to see all the changes that have been made since we first submitted the -- or first sent around the draft a month or so ago. This one only has the changes since the last call, and Steve Chan is confirming that.

So, what you will see in the first section, and Jim, I see you have your hand raised, so let's go to Jim, please.

Jim Prendergast: Yes, thanks, Jeff, Jim Prendergast. Just -- I sent around some -- as you'd requested, I sent around some language regarding the section on registrar support for registries, the final section. Just -- to me, it doesn't appear as though that was worked into this version. I just want to confirm if that's accurate or not. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Jim. I am taking a look here. Let me just check out something really quick, just scroll down a little bit. Steve, do you want to - - I don't see anything in there. I don't remember seeing an e-mail. So, yes, I was just trying to double-check my e-mail archives to make sure I didn't miss anything. Jim, I don't think I got anything.

Jim Prendergast: Maybe I screwed it up.

Jeff Neuman: Let me take a look.

Jim Prendergast: Yes, that's weird. Okay, it looks like it didn't go around. My bad. I must have screwed up my e-mail, but I'll take a look real quick.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. And if you could please, yes, send that around, all right, that would be great. And if we made the mistake, let us know, but I'm not--.

Jim Prendergast: --No, it's probably operator error on this end.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Jim, we've all been there. Okay, so let's start on 1.1, and then as Jim's checking his notes, that's not until 1.5 anyway. So, we can get back to Jim's point at that -- when we get there.

But, on 1.1, what you will see is the big change there is in section D. And what I wanted to do with that part is there was a lot of discussion in the actual deliberation section that pointed out different mechanisms other than -- well, one, different types of auctions that were discussed, and then

different alternatives to auction. So, rather than just having it all kind of buried in the deliberation section, I thought we -- it would be easier for the group, or we thought it'd be easier for the group to put it in the option section that we're considering, and then put it in the form of a question. So, there were questions already that dealt with some of the alternatives, but, like I said, I wanted to move up the discussion of the different mechanisms into section D.

So, the language crafted, although it all looks like it's new, really it was all taken from previous drafts, just moved up in certain cases from a deliberation section, or in some cases there may be a copying where it's in both sections. So, I'm not going to read it now. Everyone should read it this week. There is nothing really new in terms of material except for where we talk about the different types of auctions. So, it's the first bullet point, page two, under D, the very bottom of page two. And that talks about the Vikrem (sic) [Vickrey] auction model, which was discussed on the last call. And I will note that Sarah has sent a note to the group saying that she's got some additional language on those types of auctions. We'll get to deadlines, Sarah, in a second, but let me just see if anyone's got any questions on the material that's there at this point, in section D specifically. Sorry.

All right. On deadlines, so our goal -- and I know we're going to discuss this, so I'm going to -- assuming the deadline stays this Friday of publishing the report, I'd like all comments in by tomorrow, or the end of the day today, really, latest tomorrow so that we can -- people could have a day or two to at least look at any of the subsequent changes, which we do not expect too many of them. If there are things that you'd like to -- comments that you'd like to make on a specific -- either a new model completely or something other than changes to the draft language here, then I would ask at this point to hold off on those until the public comment period. I think part of the reason some people are asking for an extension of this, or to not release this draft, is because there's some new material that gets introduced every time someone new comes back to the conversation from the working group, even though we've been discussing this for several months now. So, Sarah, when you say you've got comments to make, is it comments on the draft language here, or is it, like, a whole new kind of model you're proposing? Okay, mainly related to what you said, all right, then that's great, yes. Then please, if you can get those in as soon as possible, definitely appreciate it simply because we do still want to keep in with the deadline.

Just looking at the comments, which I think are mostly related to section 1.2, but let me just zoom in on this a little bit, so there was a -- okay, this was on the question. So, in section E, many of the questions it seemed to -- well, the comment from Christina was that they were worded in such a way as it seemed to be biased against the mechanism of last resort that was in the guidebook. And so, we did work on trying to make that language a little bit more objective. But, certainly please take a look at that language and see if it's met the expectations, or if it still seems to be not as objective as it could be.

So, section E, other than that comment and a couple of the wording changes to try to make it a little bit more objective, there really weren't too many changes to the questions, but there were some additional changes in the deliberation section, which is F on page four through seven. And so, those changes are really just to reflect the discussions that took place last week. All right, any questions on this particular section?

Okay. Moving on to 1.2, the private resolution of contention sets, including private auction, so this one starts on page seven -- I'm sorry, is it page seven or page eight? Hold on. Page eight, sorry about that. We changed the title so that it now is not just discussion of private auctions but also of other forms of private resolution of contention set. We -- a little bit of clarifications on the -- how it was implemented in the new gTLD program, which was the section B. And then -- and I think some of these changes were to respond to -- I think some of these changes were from Kristina, some from John, and some other comments that came in, and then to delineate between private resolution versus private auctions, because they are not necessarily the same thing.

The other major change that we made was to take the recommendations that we had in there under section C and put them under options in section D. Now, this was to reflect there were a couple of people on the last call that said that either they supported private auctions or that they thought it was too early to call it a -- or too preliminary to call it a recommendation of the group, and that they seemed to be okay with moving it down to options that we're considering as opposed to necessarily a recommendation. Now, it may become a recommendation, but at this point I think, rather than try to classify it as a preliminary recommendation, it was just probably better at this point to just call these things proposals.

So, if you look now, there are -- there's a delineation between those that expressed concerns about private auction and the concerns from others that said that, even if there is a concern about private auction, that enforcement of a no private auction rule could easily be circumvented with other forms of private resolution. And that was what we discussed from primarily -- initially from John Nevitt's e-mail from a week ago, along with Alexander's response, and I think there were a couple of replies as well to those e-mails. So, this section should now cover those options. Again, it looks like major changes here, but the reality is the first bullet point under D is taken pretty much word-for-word from what was in the section C as a preliminary recommendation and moved down to D. So, that's not really (inaudible). And then, the second bullet point is taken from the points that were discussed on the last call and in the e-mails from John and Alexander and others.

The third bullet point was taken from a string of -- that I had started. And I'd just say it's from a working group member, a single working group member, and this is the one kind of trying to get sort of a -- the hybrid type proposal where there's allowing for some possible types of changes

but not private auctions, and then pointing out the drawbacks that I think others had pointed out, which are things like -- I know that -- I think it was Mark Trachtenberg that put in an e-mail basically saying that he wasn't comfortable that ICANN would be put in a role, or in a position of approving or disapproving mechanisms in a private resolution. So, that's what the third bullet point in section D addresses. On the top of page -- (inaudible) nine or 10, nine -- or 10, sorry. Jamie, please?

Jamie Baxter:

Yes, thanks, Jeff, Jamie Baxter for the record. You just mentioned something related to private resolutions and how application changes are obviously part of that. And I think what I want to draw attention to is the fact that community applications do have very strict restrictions around application changes, which obviously puts them at a disadvantage when trying to negotiate prior resolution. So, if the goal here is to somehow sway away from the auction process, I think we need to create fair and equal processes for all applications, including the community applications, in order to make them viable options and give them the same level playing field during the private resolution process.

So, I just want to highlight that, because as I've probably noted more than enough times, there's not a lot of community application voiced in this group. And I just want to make sure that everybody's thinking about that as we talk about private resolution. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman:

Yes, thanks. I think that I had intended to put in a reference to the change section, which is section 1. -- it's either three or four. I can't remember at this point of this. I think it's 1.4, yes, 1.4. So, I think, Jamie - I think your comment is -- although it relates to your negotiations during a private resolution phase, I think it's more for section 1.4 on changes to the application. So, let's just hold onto that thought and see where we can put that point in in section 1.4 if it's not already kind of in there. So, I'm just going to place a hold on that one till we get to 1.4.

Let's see, going back to the chat, and I probably missed a whole bunch, Edmon (ph) says, "Do we anticipate changing reply (ph) for a string as a way of conflict resolution?" Edmon, that is discussed in this section as well as in the change section, 1.4. So, we do discuss that and discuss concerns, or some ways we could see it being allowed, and then some concerns obviously of not abusing that. So, that is mentioned here in this last bullet point, but it's also mentioned more in section 1.4 of the statement (ph).

Okay. The deliberation section -- I'm sorry, I skipped a section. Sorry about that. Section E on page 10, again, specific questions the group is seeking feedback on. There were some questions added as a result of the call and the e-mails last week saying that -- talking about the notion of deriving financial benefit. And then, if you do agree that private resolution overall is potentially problematic, is there a way to prevent private resolution that allows losing applicants to receive a financial benefit. So, it's basically asking about the enforceability and the -- asking about the enforceability and whether there are ways to enforce such a restriction.

So, just going back to the chat, Anne's saying agree with Jamie, lack of consideration of special aspects of community application. So, Anne, hold onto that comment until 1.4 for changes, and then maybe appropriate when you submit a comment to the supplemental initial report to make sure you point those out. John's asking to hear an argument of why private auctions are not okay but paying other applicants to withdraw are. To me, they have to be treated the same as private auction. And so, I think, John, with your comment, I think that's what we're trying to get at, deriving financial benefit. So, that's why the question's asked in that format as opposed to just private auction. But, if there are ways to word things differently, please help us change the wording.

But, I think that is what we're trying to get at. Let's see, John's saying draft's stuck on it (ph), and Liz is saying the question's not why private auctions aren't okay. The question's the reverse, what array of options to applicants have. Liz, I think there is, just to clarify there, there are a lot of people that have commented, and I realize that not everyone's on every call, and not everyone responds by e-mail, but there's certainly been a number of discussions and a number of people that have made a specific point of not favoring private auctions as not -- as that not being in the public interest. So, this section is not trying to appear completely biased in that manner, but there is definitely strong feelings expressed by a number of people in this group against the use of private auctions.

Kristina says I agree with John's view. I would like to hear the answer to the question he has posed. So, going back to the question posed was I'd love to hear an argument of why private auctions are not okay but paying other applicants to withdraw are okay. And then, the personal opinion of that they have to be treated equally. So, I think at this point, I don't think that this group is going to provide that answer, although anyone's welcome to weigh in. I see that there's one person in the queue. But, I just want to make sure that these points are all covered. So, Michael, please?

Michael Casadevall: So, the problem I think we're going here, and what I saw on the mailing list, is basically any sort of private resolution could de facto become a private auction with a little bit of wordplay. I'm starting to feel like pretty heavily that if a -- any sort of solution, any sort of going off the standard process, I guess, the agreement needs to be approved by ICANN and the ICANN community to make sure that a string is being handled properly and there's not just, like, some back-room cartel. Now, that opens a pretty ugly can of worms, but it's the only possible way I could see private resolutions and being fair to both the community and transparent, so those are (inaudible) know what's going on. Oh, that was Michael speaking, sorry, (inaudible) the transcription.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Michael. Okay, going back to the chat, it's moving fairly rapidly. Jim says that -- suggested lots to talk about in the Panama (ph) breakout. Okay. Dan says document should not go out until the options put in it by the working group have been stated in the supplemental report. Okay.

So, are there any options to Anne's (ph) question? I believe this document does note all of the options and does put them in, so unless I'm misunderstanding, I don't believe there are any options here that have not been stated. I'm hearing that there are concerns about the enforceability of some of these options, which may very well be in there, or be legitimate, and that'll come out during the public comment period. But, I believe all the options are there. Steve, please?

Steve Chan: Thanks, Jeff, this is Steve Chan from staff. And so, I actually just wanted to note that, in section 1.2, what we've tried to do is integrate and plot (ph) in the section to, of course, not just be focused on private auction, but private resolution overall. And so, to that effect, what we've tried to do is update a number of sections and make it more broad. So, in section B, you can see that the background on how it was implemented is substantially changed. So, it does talk about private auction because that is something that many have raised and included in the Board. So, we did want to keep that element in there. It seemed like that was an important thing to do. But, at the end of that, you can see section B and C where it talks about -- actually, that's not exactly where it is. Sorry, looking it up on the fly. Well, the idea was to try to integrate the private resolution in that aspect, as well.

But, also in section F, it talks about it substantially. So, I guess for those that are noting that it wasn't included, I guess some specifics about what would need to change to make it properly accounted for, I think that would be quite helpful. And then, actually, just because I was looking at the chat, (inaudible) noted that Sarah's proposal was not integrated. And I think that's true. It wasn't added as an option, and that might be a good idea, but it was integrated into section F in the deliberations. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks. Thanks, Steve. Okay, so we'll make sure that that's in there as an option and not just in F. Michael, I know you're not feeling well. Now, that may be why your hand is still up, but just wonder if that's an old hand or a new hand. Okay, great. John, please?

John Nevitt: Thanks, Jeff, John Nevitt. You keep on talking about enforcement in that there's an issue where, if you ban private auctions, there could be an enforcement mechanism that people could do -- other applicants could do other private resolutions. And I think that's totally missing the point. The point that many of us have been raising is that -- is a private auction is just one mechanism. It's just one way to do a private resolution. It's no different than a private negotiation where two parties go back and forth with a price, and one party pays the other to withdraw. A private auction is only different than that, is that those bids are binding, and it's just a mechanism. So, yes, people have complained about, quote-unquote, "private auctions," but I think this draft's got to be much clearer that it's not -- that we want to ban private auctions, and then we're worried about other ways to get around that as an enforcement mechanism. That's -- to me, that's not the point. That doesn't make sense. If you want to ban private resolution, we should ban private resolution. If we want to ban one applicant paying another to withdraw in any mechanism, that's the

question we should be asking, not do we want to ban private auction and look at other mechanisms for private resolution. The 2012 round could have been totally different if the rules were it's not an auction of last resort that ICANN's holding. ICANN just holds an auction, and then we're done. That is certainly one mechanism and one question that should be asked to the community. But, to have this weird hybrid in the draft, even though some folks have complained (inaudible) about private auctions, they're really complaining about private resolution, and I think we have to take that into account a lot more than we have.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, John. So, at the end of section B, so it's on page -- I think it's page eight--.

John Nevitt: --I've read it. I know that it's in there, that you're trying to get (inaudible). We're not tackling or hitting the issue as much as we should, is my point. I saw the draft. I read it. I know there are references in there. I'll give you language, if you want, that I would suggest. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, John. Yes, language is always much more helpful. But, where I do have a -- where I think there is a -- and I'll take off my Chair hat -- where I do think there's a disagreement is I don't think -- let me say it a different way. There are mechanisms of private resolution that this group has discussed as being potentially a beneficial way of private resolution that is not akin to providing a financial benefit necessarily to another applicant.

So, for example, the discussions between companies that may apply for the same string that can come to an agreement on different strings that they can use, assuming that those strings are not in -- don't put them into another contention set, and assuming that they're related to -- well, say, if they are two companies, they're somehow related to their other application. So, members of the group have not -- have indicated that there are certain forms of private resolution that they could see are different and providing financial benefit to -- or paying off or auctions, or however you want to call it, to the other applicants. And I want to make sure that this draft does reflect that viewpoint as well. I know some people are taking the view that it's an all-or-nothing, but I don't think that's the view of everyone in this group. And I just want to make sure that, although people feel very strongly that it's one or the other, that not all the options are presented in this draft because I don't think that would -- I think we would benefit more from having everything in here as opposed to restating it as a one or the other.

And I understand that there's lots of views that people like or dislike any of these options, and that's great. And that certainly will come out in the public comment period, and then we'll have to evaluate the comments that come in. But, I don't want this draft to eliminate the options that we've been discussing. So, I see the queue now, which is good, Jaime, then Susan, then John.

Jamie Baxter: Yes, thanks, Jeff, Jamie Baxter for the record. I'm not necessarily taking a view on any particular method for private resolution, but I feel like what I was trying to get at earlier was establishing the ground rules for private resolution, and that's why I brought up the issue of community applications having (inaudible) -- being able to change elements of their application. So, I wonder if it warrants having a discussion about what would be fair ground rules for private resolution. Obviously, we understand what those are for auction, but if people have other ideas of what private resolution could look like, maybe they're based in some sort of foundation for what's fair for everybody. So, anyway, I just wanted to add that to the conversation. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Jamie. Susan?

Susan Payne: Yes, thanks, Jeff, it's Susan Payne. Yes, I just wanted to, I suppose in a way, give some support for your comment about not closing off options, and particularly the closing of private resolution options. Just to refer back to the other initial report, the non-supplemental one that we've just had the comment period closing on, and I haven't read all of those comments because there are obviously very many of them, but I had a few. and there are a number of those comments suggesting various support, or support in different parts of the public comment about the notion of allowing the parties to kind of resolve disputes between themselves and allowing them to come to a resolution by various different means. And so, we do need to be careful because, in respect of all the other areas where we've been asking people their views and their opinions, there's a lot of feedback coming back that people are supportive of the notion of coming to a private resolution in some way, which -- not necessarily about payment of money, to be clear. So, we do need to be a bit careful that we're not now implying that coming to a private resolution is some way inappropriate.

I think we're -- I think probably in this group we are clear that what we're really talking about is profiting, one party profiting by financial payment from another, but there's all sorts of means of profiting which aren't necessarily directly cash. And not all of that is necessary unacceptable. I mean, I think we do want to allow parties who are in contention with each other, or in dispute over issues, to be able to find a path forward.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Jeff, (inaudible) muted?

Unidentified Participant: Jeff, it looks like you're -- there you go -- like you were muted.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks, Susan. I don't know if it's (inaudible) -- yes, I'm having issues with my Adobe Connect. So, if that happens again, I will -- okay, that was Susan. If that happens again, then I'm going to then change to a phone line, but I'm not sure if that was just Susan or that was me. So, let's -- if it's me, I will dial in. I think we got the crux of what Susan was saying, just to make sure that there's not a one-on-one correlation between private and resolution -- private resolution and payment (inaudible) financial benefit. So, maybe (inaudible) things in the chat. I

will go over the discussion about looking at the feedback we've already received in a -- when we talk about the schedule, because they are related.

Okay. So, maybe me working with gremlins (ph). Okay. Let me know if at any point you guys cannot hear me, and then I will get a dial out. Okay, Christine said, "I think we need to remember that sometimes the cure is worse than the poison." Absolutely. In looking for a way to stop a few speculators, are we just tying our hands for legitimate purposes?" Yes, Christine, that's a great point. And I think that's something that could likely come out of the comments. But, I think that I do -- we do want this draft to make sure that we are reflecting all the options that were presented. Greg, please?

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Greg Shatan for the record. I agree with Kristina and the general concerns that are being placed here. It seems that what we're really concerned about is kind of negative speculators, or what I'm thinking we might call gTLD trolls, if that's not too negative, those who are seeking to engage in private auctions in order to lose and to be paid for their right that they established by the fact of putting in an application and getting involved in a contention set.

And I think there's a feeling that that's somehow dirty pool, and I kind of tend to think of that as -- I tend to agree with that as I think it goes beyond speculation, which is -- it's not speculating in domain names. That's really speculating in applications, which does seem a little bit like something that should be prohibited, or at least -- but I think that tarring private resolutions in general with that one rather specific brush is going way too far. So, other than that, I don't think it's speculation to hope to get a domain -- a top level domain, and either to get it without a contention set or to prevail in a contention set. So, really kind of speculating in a negative light is really -- it's kind of maybe a form of arbitrage. So, I think that seems to be the issue.

Maybe the other issue, a more critique of capitalism sort of issue is that the winner is by definition the highest bidder, and that may trouble some people too who see this as a public space for the public good, which it is in many ways, but at the same time, it's really hard to kind of get away from capitalism in the 21st century. So -- and I can't think of any way to do it that doesn't get us into a discussion that goes far beyond anything we should be discussing on these calls. So, I think that, by definition, there may be some types of negative issues with private resolutions, but I think -- and putting aside the critique of capitalism for the moment -- I think they are pretty narrow, and I think we need to focus on the narrow problems. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Greg. I just joined by phone, so hopefully my issues are not quite as bad as they were. So, I'm going to assume that everyone can hear me. Is that correct? If someone just says yes in the chat, that would be great. Cool. Thank you.

So, I think Cheryl has put in the key question that I want everyone to focus on. So, obviously, hearing about people's views on private resolution or private auctions or public interest is all really, really good, but I want us to try to focus on the text here. So, if in the next day or so, if you could look at the text to make sure it reflects the different options that are out there in a fairly objective manner, although recognizing that where we say some have noted that they object to auctions, and some have noted that they are in favor of it. That's obviously just a reflection of what -- how people feel. But, other than that, hopefully the questions and the options are presented in a semi-objective fashion, and so if we can work on that text.

Okay, just looking at the chat. I think the other changes really in the deliberation section are to make it clear that we're not just talking about (inaudible) auction. Okay, I'm hearing a buzzing. Hopefully it's not coming from me. Okay, maybe it was just me. Section G in there is no changes, so we are now on the 1.3, the role of application comments, which I think our only changes were to address the comments that Kristina made on section C on page 15, which her comment was on the paragraph in there about ICANN should be more explicit in the guidebook of how public comments are to be utilized or taken into account by the relevant evaluators, panels, et cetera. In addition, to the extent that public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, et cetera, applicants must have an opportunity to respond to those comments. The comment was is there a reason this isn't a question? And the response was because we had interpreted this to be more of a recommendation. So, is it just that -- and when we invite comments on this one, obviously inviting comments on all the recommendations, as well as the questions. So, I think we just didn't create a question that just repeated what was in that section C, and it was sort of just our assumption that -- well, it was our assumption that we would get feedback on all of the recommendations and not need to put the recommendations in the form of a question. But, I suppose we could ask a question that just says what do you think of the recommendation in our last bullet point, but I will let -- we can consider that. I don't want to put Steve Chan on the spot, but -- good. Steve, you are the one to speak to this, because I know Steve has a very particular view on this, and he and I have discussed this a number of times. So, I will let Steve explain the rationale.

Steve Chan:

Thanks, Jeff. This is Steve Chan, and I had a little trouble getting off mute there. So, the rationale for not having both the recommendation and the question is it actually -- there's this confusion for respondents, potentially, about where they should respond to the recommendation or the question. It basically makes it a little bit redundant.

The principal purpose of public comment on these reports is indeed to provide response to preliminary recommendations. So, generally, it doesn't really need specific invitation to provide comment on that section. I think for the initial report, where we did have so many recommendations, options and questions, we specifically talked about that in the preamble to make sure that (technical difficulty) -- so, just to continue, in the preamble

I mentioned that respondents should of course feel free to provide comment to recommendations. So, we can do something similar in the preamble. Of course, if the working group feel strongly that it should also have a question (inaudible) do that, it just -- from a staff perspective, it seems redundant and potentially confusing to respond to both. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman:

Thanks, Steve. And we're trying to find the line that was causing that buzzing. I don't think it's mine because I was muted during that. So, I will note that this has been a subject of discussion, but we will make sure that the preamble, which is I do believe asks -- is fairly clear on this, but we will go back and double-check the preamble to make sure that we aren't (inaudible) feedback on not just the questions but on the recommendations themselves. So, we'll make that clearer.

Okay. I believe the other changes to that section, there's a change in top of page -- well, there was a comment on the top of page 17 from Kristina about the spec 13 application, so we clarified the language to say, per the applicant guidebook, the time period for application comments on initial evaluation is subject to extension, which was the case in 2012 where the pair was extended, 45 days. There were no concerns raised on that period. Hopefully I've (inaudible) the comments. And that brings us to section 1.4, which is on the change requests and the role of change requests. So, to bring up Jamie's comments now, just to make sure that we will go back and put in the point of certain changes not being allowed for communities, which made things like private resolution or other changes to the application difficult. So, we'll make sure that that's covered.

Other than that, there is a comment on page 20, section D, last bullet point, implementation guidance. The comment from Kristina was what if another applicant believes that the new change to string creates string confusion and wants to file a string confusion objection, similar question for legal rights objection. If the change to a string needs new evaluation, doesn't it seem fair to reopen the objection, period? So, in the guidance, we -- or in that paragraph, we've added some language, added the application for the new string would be subject to string-related objections. Examples, string confusion objections, legal rights objections, et cetera, I think that we did discuss that on previous calls, so it's not like we just added this in new. We just forgot to include that in. So, it's not a new proposal, but something that we just omitted accidentally.

Okay. So, other than those couple points, those are the only changes we made to 1.4. we're now on 1.5, and this is -- Jim, this is where you said you were going to send us comments. And do you want to -- there are no changes that have been made to this section at this point. Are you in a position to discuss the nature of some of those changes at this point? Thanks, Jim, please.

Jim Prendergast:

Yes. Yes, Jeff, Jim Prendergast. I don't know, Steve, not to throw it on you, but I -- it was my -- obviously it was operator error. I sent it to the wrong e-mail address. But Steve, would it be easier, since you now have

a copy of it, to maybe put it on the screen, or is that too difficult? Okay, good. Yes. What did I -- just to give a preview there, just added some language to the narrative in that, Jeff, per your request, developed a final question around where -- contention that some people have about this being ICANN inserting itself into the marketplace where it shouldn't be.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, do you want to just start? While Steve's pulling it up, do you want to just start talking about--?

Jim Prendergast: --I can, but without seeing it on the screen, I think it's going to be a bit of a challenge. So, in section -- what is this, B--?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: --It's being loaded now, so it shouldn't take long, Jim. It's Cheryl here. Jeff, did you want to go to N, and then come back while Jim has things loaded up?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, let's -- thanks, Cheryl. That's good. I know it's coming up. But, Anne, why don't you get your comments in, and then we'll come back to Jim?

Anne Aikman-Scalase: Yes, hi, it's Anne for the transcript. And I just -- I'm sorry, I wanted to go back to something on the top of page 10 is very, very brief, which is there's a discussion at the top of page 10 in relation to applicants being able to change their string to resolve a contention set, and then it would say -- and it says that it would have to be with ICANN approval. And what I was looking for there is also a public comment period in relation to that proposed change as opposed to just an ICANN approval.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. We will come back to that. Let's -- because the draft that's now out there I think is an old one with Jim's changes. So, we've noted that, Ann, and we'll -- I think we can put in a question to that effect, or make a reference to that. But, let's go to Jim's revision. So, Jim, your revisions start on -- why don't you take it from here, Jim?

Jim Prendergast: Yes. So, this is Jim Prendergast for the transcript. So, starting on page 21, just a clarification. As I originally said, it attributed the comments just to ICANN registrars, but I know there were others within the working group that felt that way, so just an edit to include the fact that it was beyond the single group.

The next one is -- we talked about applicants doing homework before the application process and doing a market assessment before they even applied, and that's sort of the language here that I have trying to capture that. And then, when we talked about ICANN's role in the marketplace and what they should or should not be doing by forcing registrars to carry all TLDs or anointing a select few to be registrars of last resort, that paragraph there tries to capture sort of the essence of that. And then, to your direct request, on page 23, I added a final multi-part question, which does put a lot of these concerns out to the community to gather feedback and see what they're thinking.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Jim. So, that's the question at the bullet point on E that says, "Does ICANN forcing registrars to carry TLDs," that one, that's the question? Okay, cool.

Jim Prendergast: Yes. And apologies. I screwed -- as usual, it wasn't Steve or the rest of the team. It was Jim screwing up, sending it to the wrong e-mail address.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Jim, and we will take a look at that and incorporate that in there. So, we'll try to submit a revised draft a little later on today with that language. I know, Steve, I'm putting you on the spot to just do that, but it would probably be easier for everyone to look at the final draft with Jim's comments in there sooner rather than later. Anne, your hand is still raised. I'm not sure if that's still on the point you've just raised on the public comment period around changing strings, or whether that's--.

Anne Aikman-Scalèse: --Yes, sorry, Jeff. I'll put it down.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks. So, let me see, just checking the chat. Great. Okay. So, those are the sections of the report, but I do think we should spend a few minutes talking about the timing. And Kristina's just putting a placeholder that, after she sees Jim's comments incorporated, they may want to comment.

So, all right. On the timing issue, so one of the questions that was asked was how can we reach out to the private auction providers on the -- just to see if they would provide a feedback. We have reached out to them. Only one of the auction providers has responded back to us, and it's the one that didn't do the bulk of them, but did do a few of them. And so, this provider, we're trying to work out schedules where they can give us feedback. They are pretty much focused on a proposal of what they would do, which actually is fairly similar to one of the options mentioned here in the private auctions, but haven't really been specific as to whether they could provide us with any data or feedback on the auctions that have already taken place due to confidentiality concerns.

So, we're not sure yet at what point, or what kind of data we're going to actually be able to get from this one provider. Like I said, the other provider hasn't responded back to us yet, so I'm not sure if they will respond back or if they will provide us with any data. Which takes us back to the ultimate question that Jim had raised, which was, because we don't have this data, is it -- should we be delaying this thing until after Barcelona. And we -- the leadership did discuss the timing of this, and also coupled with the notion of we did get some feedback in the initial public comment period on some of these topics, and should we incorporate that in there.

So, just to go back a few weeks and to go back to something that we initially discussed, one of the things that we knew, the leadership team knew would happen is, if we extended the supplemental -- or sorry, if we extended the initial report public comment period, we knew that incorporating any of the feedback from the initial comment period into the

supplemental initial report would be much more difficult, if not impossible. So, if we had stayed with the initial deadline of the public comment period for the initial report, then it would have been possible to incorporate some of the feedback, or all the feedback.

But, because we extended the initial public comment period for nearly a month, we knew at that point that we would not be able to incorporate the feedback into the supplemental initial report. We also knew that, if we extended this supplemental initial report and didn't release it until after Barcelona, that we would then be up against the end of the year holidays and people going on vacation, whether it's summer in your area, and that's a shout-out to Cheryl, by the way, or whether it's winter, then we knew that we would then throw off our schedule not just by a month or a few weeks, but by several months.

And so, while I realize that it could be -- that it would have been nice to have been able to read all of the comments that have come in and sort of incorporate when we did mention public auctions or other things, which, by the way, we didn't ask a question on, but if they did provide those, then we could incorporate it. But, because we extended the initial public comment period, that just did not become possible without really throwing off our schedule by several months. And that's not something we wanted to do.

The other thing that the leadership team discussed was that part of the purpose of public comment period is to get data. And so, we are going to continue reaching out, continue our discussions, hopefully have the providers of private auction services come on and talk to the group, or at least have a special session to talk to the group on their feedback. They're also -- we're also -- we've also made a commitment to send the draft -- or not the draft, sorry -- the initial report, supplemental initial report to the auction providers specifically inviting them to provide feedback on those sections. So, we are doing everything we can to get that data if we could, as Sarah said, with the hope that they could provide anonymized data to eliminate confidentiality concerns. And that was certainly in the notes that I sent to the -- that we sent to the private auction providers.

We definitely mentioned that concept and have said that, if they can't provide the data, or if they're concerned about confidentiality, that we would love to have anonymized data. And I guess I take it that they're considering that, but we have not heard back. We do have a call that we're trying to schedule with that one provider this week to see what they can provide us.

So, while I appreciate the notion of a delay in releasing this supplemental initial report, the leadership team felt that the -- because the data that we're going to get back at this point is just speculative, we don't even know if we're going to get data back, and because even if we got back data, that may or may not impact how people in the community feel about private resolution, and because of throwing off the schedule by a huge amount, we've decided that releasing this report prior to Barcelona and

then discussing it at Barcelona would still be the way that we would like to go.

So, happy to hear comments on that. I know that some of the people that were on the ICANN call may have now joined us, so welcome from that call. But, interested in getting some feedback on what we've been discussing if anyone has any. So, Jim, please?

Jim Prendergast:

Kind of figured I had to go first. Thanks, Jeff, so Jim Prendergast. I think everybody's had a chance to see the e-mail I sent. Just a couple of thoughts and reactions. I think today's call is indicative of how far we are from really having a handle on the auctions issue. There was a lot of stuff going back and forth in the chat. There was a lot of stuff that may be coming via e-mail. We still don't have the research, as you mentioned, from the auction providers. In fact, I don't know what questions we're actually asking them to actually find out what data they have. Sometimes what you ask is just as important as what you get.

What really strikes me, though, is the feedback we did get from the previous report that we put out for public comment, you know, I know, everybody who's been involved in those comment-drafting processes know how difficult they are, how intensive they are. And I just think it would be a mistake for us, especially when we've got comments, specifically on the auctions issue of private resolutions, to not address those and take those into account. And I know the IPC, the ALAC and others have weighed in on this, but the ICANN Board of Directors weighed in on this, and they weighed in with some pretty heavy stuff.

And I just think that for us to go right back out and continue to ask questions without getting clarity or further understanding and taking advantage of time with the Board in Barcelona to find out what particularly they have -- what concerns they have where -- I want to read it so I get it accurately, but how gaming for the purpose of financing other applications or with no intent to operate the TLD as stated in the application can be reconciled with ICANN's commitments and core values. I mean, they don't just throw those words around willy-nilly, so I think we have to be responsive to what the community has said.

As you've said in the discussions that we had around the liaisons, there is perceived, or actual added weight in comments from SOs, ACs, and all the various other letters as opposed to individuals. And when we get that, I think we do need to pay attention to it, and if that means an extra couple of weeks, I think that's important for the process. I think taking advantage -- somebody mentioned in the chat, taking advantage of being together in Barcelona to talk through these issues at another time and try and hash out a little more clarity around it is important. So, I think sacrificing a couple of weeks leading up to Barcelona where, frankly, nobody outside of this phone call, let alone the larger mailing list, is going to pay attention to this will probably pay a lot more dividends, going forward, than if we put this out right now to just hit an internal deadline. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Jim. I'll let Alan go, and then -- I'll let Alan and Donna go, and then I will just provide some feedback from the leadership team. And Cheryl, of course, can weigh in. So, Alan, please? Alan, are you on mute, or -- can't hear you at this point.

Alan Greenberg: Can you hear me?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, now I can. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: I don't know what happened. I didn't touch any buttons. I'll try again. Maybe I was muted centrally. I don't know.

The issues on auctions are not as high on the ALAC's list as they may be on others, although the whole concept of gaming and stockpiling TLDs I think is an issue that's relevant to us. My overall feeling, however, though, is this is a long process we're in. You know it. We all know it. We still have a long way to go. Once we issue a final report and the Board deliberates, the implementation is probably going to take years. We still have not addressed the issue, and I don't know what the sum total of the comments were on the first report on the issue of the SSAC's report on name collision. I know the ALAC has taken a strong position, saying we have to wait for it. So overall, yes, if we delay this by a few days or a few weeks, it may delay the whole process by a couple of months, but I believe that will end up in a much better product, and I don't believe we should worry about that at this point. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Alan. Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Jeff, Donna Austin. So, I'm just going to put my Council liaison hat on for a minute if I can, please. I appreciate that people want the best product possible to come out of this process. I think that, in particular on this auction proceeds issue, we've had quite a bit of discussion about it in Panama, and I think we've moved on. I think we've got some good information in the supplemental report that's -- if we can meet that, let's publish it on Friday deadline, I think that's probably a good thing to do. And I say that because, while Alan's saying, well, it doesn't really matter because it's going to take another how many years to roll out this process even if we get to implementation. That's one view. The Council is very conscious, and we had a strategic planning session at the beginning of this year, that these PDPs cannot become open-ended efforts. I think once we get into 2019, this has been a three-year process already.

So, Jeff and Cheryl have been doing a really good job in trying to make sure that they capture everybody's view and give enough time for extending the public comment period, that they've just done delaying the initial report to make sure that most of the content was covered and people were comfortable. We've had that as being done, but if I could just ask as a community that we be very respectful that these things cannot go on forever, that there has to be an end date to them. So, just a reminder that, once we get into 2019, this effort has been going for three years. And from a Council perspective, we don't think that's tenable.

We need to -- and so, I guess what I'm saying is I'm supporting Jeff and Cheryl here in that we need to try to keep to the timeline that Jeff and Cheryl put up on front of the Council at every meeting and say, well, this has had to slip and this has had to slip, and now we're slipping back even further. We need to work together and understand that this is a job that has to be completed. It can't be open-ended. I don't know how long it takes the Board to finalize the recommendations and sign off and get to implementation is beyond what we're doing here. But, for the PDP itself, if we can all acknowledge that there has to be an end date, and if we could all try to work together and work with Cheryl and Jeff in what they're trying to do into getting us a good product, probably won't be perfect, but rarely can we get a perfect product, but it will be a good product.

But, if we can work with them in trying to meet the timelines that they've set this group, and I think that they are working -- they are being reasonable in the timelines they're setting, so let's all just try to be a little bit flexible in our thinking in supporting Jeff and Cheryl in what they're trying to do in meeting these milestones so that we don't get into that point that, in 12 months' time, we're going to say, well, we're almost four years into this process. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Donna. And Jim I guess has a response, and then I'll jump in. Thanks.

Jim Prendergast: Yes, unless Alan -- unless those are old hands. Just want to clarify.

Jeff Neuman: I think they're -- Jim, you're up.

Jim Prendergast: Yes, thanks. And Donna, thanks, I appreciate that. I think we all know that the role of the Council is to oversee this process and make sure that the process is properly followed. As you're well aware, this group did have a fairly healthy debate around the release of the initial report and whether or not it was truly initial report without consensus calls and without recommendations in all of the different sections that we did put out for public comment. So, I appreciate that -- and I certainly know this is not an open-ended process, but here we go again. I'm concerned we are driving towards a conclusion, but we're ignoring process along the way. And I think I agree, it will not be perfect, this document, and it never will be, but I do think that we need to be mindful that, when this does go to the Council for review, the Council needs to ensure that the proper processes were followed. And when it does pass the GNSO Council, and I purposely use those terms, when it does pass the GNSO Council, it then goes to the ICANN Board of Directors, and it's up to them to determine whether or not it's complete and accurate, and they should approve it.

I sense that the process that we went through at the 2012 round did gather momentum towards the end. That probably set us back over a year, if not longer, in the implementation and the execution of the program. And what I'm suggestion is, and as I think what Alan says, is if we -- we do want to get this done. Trust me. 90 minutes every Monday

night, or every other Monday night at 11:00 p.m. my time is not how I want to be spending the next two years of my life, but we've got to follow the process here, and we've got to make sure that we're taking into account the feedback that we've already asked the community for and not just pushing forward and eventually catching back up to it. So, thanks.

Jeff Neuman:

Okay. Thanks, Jim. So, just reading -- well, before I read the comments, let me just weigh in a little bit, because I have been listening. And we truly -- we do understand what's being said, and we are trying to meet some timelines and deadlines and things to try to keep the process moving. And we had to -- when we'd go -- we have a leadership meeting every week, the entire leadership team of this PDP, and we discuss all the details, everything from scheduling work plan to individual comments that are made during calls and what we should do to address those. So, we do try to get on the same page with the entire leadership team and balance the needs of the group versus the timeline and what we owe the Council. And I should also add that -- as Cheryl does, that the Council liaisons are on the leadership team calls as well. If they -- albeit not everyone can make every meeting.

But, one of the -- and this is not a complaint at all, because I do appreciate all the feedback we're getting. But, what's happened, especially with the private resolution, and this is, again, not to complain, this is not a complaint, but most of the substantive -- we went several months discussing these subjects without really much in the way of comments. And the comments that we did get were leaning in one -- in completely one direction.

Two weeks ago, that changed with some excellent comments from some individuals, and then because they are coming back to the group or are new to the group, or whatever it is, because they have other priorities, which I completely understand, and then that's kind of built a little bit of a snowball effect in terms of other people weighing in and different options being presented. But, what's kind of important to recognize is that, at some point, we have to stick to our timelines, and there's always going to be really good ideas that come in last-minute. We try to hope that they don't come in last-minute. And again, they're excellent comments, so it's not a complaint.

But, we need to kind of stick to a schedule where even comments that come in last-minute, we're getting them into the report, but that does mean that we can't have as extensive a discussion on those last-minute items as we would have had those comments come in during those three months that we were discussing that subject prior to when those comments came in. So, I think at this point, we have to take that under consideration, as well.

So, what I'm going to do as an action item, because I know we're kind of running up towards time, is that on our leadership call this week, we will see what we can do in terms of our options. I think in terms of it we did release the supplemental initial report, or if we released a draft so that

people could have that to discuss at the ICANN meeting in Barcelona, then release the final version out, sort of how we did the initial report, my guess is in just looking at some math and dates, would be that we would push out the supplemental initial report to somewhere around like the 22nd of October, which would mean extending the public comment period from initially November 30th to around December 14th. If we did that, I would just note that we can stay on schedule if we did that. However, there'd be really no room for an extension of a public comment period. So, I just want to throw that out there. If people feel like this is a better way to go, to put a draft out there for Barcelona so that people have something to read on the 12th, we'll call it preliminary, and then put out the final supplemental initial report out for comment formally on the 22nd of October, which is the Monday, then with the understanding that any extension to that time period would be at most a week, but certainly not into January. We can't do that. Otherwise, we'd really fall way off track, especially with the work that ICANN staff have to do to collate the comments. What do people think about that idea? Alan, please?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, clarification. My initial reaction is that sounds reasonable, but then you said issue the report on the first, on the Monday of the ICANN meeting. So, although we're triggering discussion, none of that discussion can have any relevance or presence in the report. Is that what you're -- to be clear, is that what you're saying? So, it may influence the comments we make to it, but it can't alter anything that's in the report itself because it's already issued at that point.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, sorry, my bad. I mean Monday after the ICANN meeting, so that would be the 29th.

Alan Greenberg: One hell of a busy weekend for you at the end of a long week of meetings and staff.

Jeff Neuman: Since our -- thanks, Alan. Since our meeting is on the first day on Saturday, hopefully we can work as a leadership team on the final draft during that week.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, Jeff, this is Anne. I'm sorry I'm on the phone. If I could just -- if you have a chance to recognize me, I want to support your proposal.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks, Anne.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Thank you, Jeff. Yes, if we're talking about the Monday after the ICANN meeting, having a public comment that we extended for the RDS review team that ends on the Friday after the ICANN meeting that is adding an extra week for people to actually say things, I'd prefer towards a little bit farther into the week than Monday, but -- so that would give people a little bit more flexibility. But, what you're proposing is far better than what we're talking about now, so I support that. Thank you.

- Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Alan. Just -- and to clarify, if it started -- wait a second. I'm getting some different notes here. Sorry, I'm looking at sort of the -- we're trying to do the math offline, and so I'm getting (inaudible)--.
- Alan Greenberg: --The Monday following the meeting is the 29th.
- Jeff Neuman: Right. So, if we released it on the 29th and then went six weeks later, that is somewhere in December. I'm trying to figure out exactly when. So, we would--.
- Alan Greenberg: --That's the 10th of December. 10th of December is six weeks.
- Jeff Neuman: Okay. So, yes, so then it would close the 10th, and then, in theory, we could have the discretion to extend it for another week or so. But, I'm just waiting for some confirmation of that, as -- Alan's correct. Okay, Alan, you are correct. So, let me restate that. So, comment period starts the 29th and would end on the 10th, or the 7th, or whatever that Monday is. And then, that will be six weeks. That won't throw off our schedule, but obviously leaves very little time for extension. So, it seems like that proposal has some support. So, just to restate, we will issue a preliminary draft on this Friday the 12th. We'll discuss that in Barcelona, and especially really with section 1.2 as being the main section. I guess that bleeds into 1.1, as well -- but really being the main sections under discussion, and then issue a final supplemental initial report on the Monday -- or sorry, on Monday the 29th of October and closing the comment period on December 10th, with the understanding very little wiggle room at that point to extend. Alan, please?
- Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I guess my feeling is, if you think that very little wiggle room is a week, I would prefer to delay the issuance, incorporate whatever else you can into it, and make it really clear that the comment period will end on the 17th, and there is no possible chance of delay because of the holiday season. That I think would be a better plan, or issue it halfway through the week to give you time to digest things that might come in during the week even though our meeting's on Saturday. Just a thought. No difference in the end date, but it may make it a better report because of the (inaudible). Thank you.
- Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Alan.
- Alan Greenberg: Something to talk about at your leadership meeting.
- Jeff Neuman: Yes, we will talk about that. We'll let you know on Wednesday. But, the plan I'm proposing, it seems like Cheryl's good with it, and it could stay on target is to release it on the -- a preliminary -- sorry, preliminary supplemental initial report on the 12th, so that's -- people have a week or so to review before ICANN 63, discuss it in the first session on Saturday during ICANN 63. The leadership team will then finalize the initial report, incorporating any relevant feedback, including looking at some of the comments if we're able to, especially the Board's this week, to have a

final supplemental initial report come out on the 29th of October, commentary then made December 10th. All right, sounds good.

I know we did not get much time to talk about ICANN 63, but please, within the few minutes we have left, there are five -- sorry, there are sessions on Saturday, both for work track five and for SubPro. They're all on Saturday. Essentially the morning is up until 1:15, is devoted to work track five. The afternoon, starting at 1:30, is devoted to work tracks one through four. The first session will be used to go over the supplemental initial report, which we will pay most attention to at this point on the private auctions, or -- sorry, private resolution of contention sets. The second session will cover what we need to do to get to round two from an implementation perspective and getting thoughts from ICANN staff, GDD in particular, have Council members attend to give us their thoughts of things that we need to do from a council perspective. And then, the third session will be to break out into the subgroups to talk about the comments that we've gotten back from the initial report and the subdivision.

So, that's our plan. We know it clashes, as Cheryl says, with the EPDP. Couldn't avoid it. We know that there's other clashes that some ExComs of constituencies and supporting organizations and others, stakeholder groups have set. Can't do anything about that. We would hope that you would prioritize our sessions and would love to see you all there. But, I think this is -- I think this is our last call before the ICANN meeting, so I look forward to seeing everyone in just under two weeks. Cheryl, anything, Steve, or ICANN, anything we need to add?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: All good from me. I wanted (ph) to wish everyone safe travels for those who are joining us at ICANN 63.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Thanks, Cheryle. Steve, ICANN staff, anything you want to add? Nope, nothing. Great. Well, thank you, everyone, look forward to seeing you bright and early on Saturday morning of day one of ICANN. And have safe travels, and see you all there. Thank you.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And thanks, Jeff. Thanks, everyone. Bye.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines, and have a wonderful rest of your day.