

Transcription ICANN62 Panama

GNSO: Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group Face-to-Face Session 2

Monday, 25 June 2018 10:30 EST

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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 recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:

<http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Jeff Neuman: Can I get a thumbs up? We got a thumbs up great, cool. So welcome back everyone. We're going to get this started. The session is going to be much more interactive than the last one. So if we could just go to the first slide. If everyone could please take your seats, that would help out. If we go to the next one. So what we're going to do during this - or the next one if you could.

What we're going to do during this session is break out into five different groups. There are five different I'll call newish type areas that we have not yet had really substantive discussions on we are going to place the five groups in different areas of the room and hope that you could visit each area or visit, you know, one area if that's your key area of expertise. And I'm going to go really quickly through the five different areas, the work leaders will help us in each of the groups kind of get discussion going on all of this. So the first area if we go to the next slide is to talk about well this is really large. There's

actually more on this slide. I don't know if we can make the zoom lesser.

Thank you.

The first topic is on auctions, ICANN auctions, the auctions of last resort. So Work Track 3 discussed the question of whether auctions of last resort should continue to be an appropriate method of resolving contention going forward. There was some support in community comment Number 2 that supported that the existing contention resolution mechanisms were sufficient. So there's a set of four questions there. Do we still believe that auctions as a last resort, these are public auctions ICANN auctions to be distinguished from the next topic. Are they appropriate? Why, why not? If we support the auction so the way that ICANN conducted the auction is the right way to continue doing those auctions in the future.

If you support the use of auctions what alternative - if you don't support it, I'm sorry then what alternatives could there be other than ICANN running a public auction? And finally are there additional contention resolution methods that could be introduced but still maintaining auctions as a last resort? So we are not talking about the proceeds of those auctions just to be very clear. We are only talking about having them as a mechanism of last resort and the way that those auctions were held. That is going to be Group 1 and that's going to be over in this corner over here.

Group 2 will be private auctions so a number, as many of you know, a number of applicants where there was a contention set used a private auction model where instead of the proceeds going to ICANN they were actually divided up amongst the non-winners of that auction.

Although there were – there's very little detail as to how much each string went for, some public companies have had to report their earnings and some of them have made millions of dollars just on losing private auctions. So community members have expressed the fear that if we allow private auctions to go forward that there are people waiting in the wings that have

seen how much some of these companies have made just on losing auctions and there's a fear that the next round there will be a number of these people or organizations going to get involved just for the purposes of losing these strings to make a bunch of money.

So is that concern legitimate? Do, you know, do we believe those concerns are legitimate? If they are should there be something done? Can there be something done about those, and should this working group look at this issue in more detail, investigate this issue further? That will be issue two. Two I believe is, while it's (Krista) but where are we going to meet? Oh right here. She was over here so one...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible) she can anywhere she likes. Where do you want to go?

Woman: Doesn't matter.

Jeff Neuman: All right I actually want - I'd rather do this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Okay Number one here, two in the back corner there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's it.

Jeff Neuman: So one is public auctions, two, private auctions three...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: ...is the role of application comments. So there was a public comment period that people got to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: There he is. There's three.

Jeff Neuman: There's three. But I'm going to actually ask...

Michael Flemming: (Unintelligible) over here.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Hold on a second Michael. We're not there.

Michael Flemming: Oh great.

Jeff Neuman: So Martin I'm going to ask you to move to that corner. Three will be the role of application comments. So comments came in on each application and while some of those were used by evaluation panels on due diligence there is really not a huge understanding of how those comments were actually used in the last process. So we want this third group to talk about what is the role that they envision of application comments on either objections, on community priority evaluations or frankly on anything? What is the role of the public comments that come in on the applications? So Group 3 with Martin will be over there.

Group 4 is on change requests and Michael I'm going to move you a little bit further just towards the middle there. Michael will work on, take notes on that one. That one is to deal with if we can go to the next slide. So there was a very strict rule in the last round that applications really weren't to be changed at all. So they couldn't be changed even if there was government advice or early warnings or what if there was an objection filed by let's say there was a legal rights objection that was filed and let's say they could privately work out that by changing their application in a certain way then it wouldn't be a problem from a legal rights objection standpoint?

What if, I use this example, what if there were two companies that applied for a string, both of them had rights to that string but the two companies said you know what, if I can have this derivative then I wouldn't care if you have that string. So let's say it was United. I know that there's already a string United but let's say there wasn't and, you know, have United Airlines and United Van

lines both apply for .United. Again let's assume it wasn't already applied for and let's say the two companies get together and they're the only two companies that applied for United and one said, "You know what if you took United Air and I took United Van than neither of us would have any objections and therefore we could both be in the root and not have any issues with each other. That in theory could happen but that couldn't happen during the last round because there were no changes allowed. So Group 4 will talk about the role of change requests and whether we will allow them going forward.

And finally Group 5 which will be back here with Rubens. Actually Rubens I'm going to ask you to move a little bit more this way because there's already two against this wall.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: He's in the corner.

Jeff Neuman: So this one will talk about the, if we can go yes, support for the new TLDs. So at a couple meetings there have been people that have said, "Look I'm a gTLD operator a registry. I can't get registrars to sell my extensions and frankly I don't want to change the nature of my TLD just to get these registrars on board. So is there anything that could be done or should be done that would help these registries in the future?" So this is just to discuss that question whether something can or should be done and there we go.

So what we're going to do because we have to wrap up the session at 11:00 - is that - I'm sorry not 11:00, noon so we have an hour and ten minutes. So what I'd like to do is to have a good 45 minutes talking about these different areas. You can go from group to group if you want. The co-leads that we've assigned will be taking notes and it will help us at the end during a wrap up with any conclusions if there have been any from that group.

So reminder Group 1 public auctions, raise your hand Karen and (Cara)...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: ...are leading that over here. Group 2 which is dealing with the private auctions, (Krista) will be in back corner over there. Sorry (Julie)'s got something to say.

Julie Hedlund I actually I have a question from the chat if I can read that out? It's from Jamie Baxter who's participating remotely. And he asks, "How do remote participants join a specific group once the groups have been announced?" And I'll just note that staff will un-sync, the slides so that people can read the questions. And then they should put their comments and questions in, you know, as comments or questions...

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Julie Hedlund ... so we can capture. But he does ask then, he says, "So will remote participants be unable to hear the discussions, deliberations in real-time in order to contribute with comments or questions in real-time?"

Jeff Neuman: So unfortunately although we had tried to get different Adobe rooms for each of the subject areas there was security and other types of – and logistics concerns about doing that. So at this point the best option is (Julie) said is to submit those comments. Those comments will – we'll be going around making sure that each group has those comments and someone reads them into the group. And then the group will report on those and discuss those. So to the extent that remote participants have those comments, if they could please type them in. Cheryl you want to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well just one thing, if Jamie and several others have a particular focus that they'd like us to take them to we could make use of the roving mic I guess to get it onto the Adobe room. So, you know, we could let them hear part of a conversation in any one of the stations. So we're happy to do that (Jamie) and others in the remote participant group if that's going to help. But

let's move on that as a logistical place with (Julie) who's going to be managing that remote part and get the group started now.

Jeff Neuman: Okay and so again public auctions with Karen over here, number two is a private auction so (Krista)'s going to be in that corner over there. Three is the role of application comment with Martin over where Martin is waving his hand right now, Group 4, change request with Michael Flemming and Group 5 with Rubens who's going to come over behind us here to handle that which is the support for a new gTLD. We will meet back here at 11:40.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And remember you are able to move between the groups. There are sticky labels around. You can, you know, make comments and we'll now work on the logistics for optimal remote participation under difficult circumstances. Gather yourselves. You don't need to use chairs unless your aged firmed. It is possibly better to be standing but however you want to group yourselves do so now and let's get the show on the road.

Jeff Neuman: All right let's start moving and while people are moving we're going to hear from Alan real quick.

Alan Greenberg: I presume one of the slides has the five group titles on it. If we could leave that up projected that might be useful for people who want to move around.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks. I don't think we have one but let's just do that with the title. We'll draw it up real quick and put it up. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: I got my (unintelligible) sit over here against the...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yes. We'll give enormous prize reward for the leaders who can gather the most active group so...

((Crosstalk))

Man: So...

((Crosstalk))

Man: So...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just a little update on about remote participate and for those in the room who will suddenly hear these voice of God moments from (Julie), (Julie)'s going to note incoming information from remote participants and say, Number 3 and activate the mic so it goes into the record, yes Number 5. So we'll act as proxy with remote participants. And so if you hear a number called, you need to pay attention to (Julie). Thank you.

Woman: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yes, (unintelligible) yes.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yes...

Woman: Thank you everyone. We have a comment with respect to Topic 5 that's support for your new gTLD. This is from (Jeff Rebury). I would like to suggest from the perspective of a registrar standardization is immensely important. Having all gTLDs with simple and straightforward pricing, the same renewal pricing, the same expiry process and so forth with lead to greater adoption with registrars. It becomes. It is, becomes incredibly difficult for registrars to make the many small process changes because of different procedures required by different individual gTLDs. End of comment.

We also have a comment from (John McCormick), begin comment. All new gTLDs are not in the same, are not the same and many are dominated by different country markets. A single pricing mechanism might be nice, but it doesn't happen in the real world due to various promotions and discounts. Just finished doing the HHI calculations for all new gTLDs at a registrar reseller level, and the results show very different dynamics in the new gTLDs.

Man: Hello everyone in the room. I just wanted to give you a time check. We're at, we have 20 minutes remaining. As Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Jeff Neuman had mentioned you can go from group to group so please do so. But just wanted to provide a time check, 20 minutes remaining, thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Five minutes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay I'll do a five minutes foils, five minutes, so try to wrap it up in five minutes. I know some groups are running out of steam so I've (unintelligible) to five more minutes.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Okay, if we could have everybody take your seats and we're going to get some readouts from the group.

Jeff Neuman: We have a hard stop at noon because there's a council board meeting I think in here, so if we can just get everyone back to their seats and we'll start getting a readout from each of the groups. So let me just check with the tech people in the back. Are we still good?

Woman: We can write if up.

Jeff Neuman: We're still good, thumbs up. All right so if everyone gets back I'm going to start with...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Karen will do it. Karen's organized.

Jeff Neuman: Karen are you ready...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes she's ...

Jeff Neuman: ...to start? So what we'll do is we'll just have a readout because only about 20 minutes left in this meeting. So we'll allow five minutes, four minutes sorry, four minutes for each group to just give a readout on what they're, they talked about. So if we could have Martin's Group 3 so everyone could take their seats please?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Turn the mic off.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, I think I missed...

Jeff Neuman: Turn the mic back on now. Okay so Karen – Karen’s going to give a readout of some of the things talked about with auctions, method of last resort, public auctions.

Karen Day: Thank you Jeff Neuman. This is Karen Day the record, co-lead of Work Track 3. We were discussing in our group auction, public - ICANN public auctions as a method of last resort. In our group we had one member participant who agreed that yes ICANN auctions of last resort should be maintained. This member felt that the auctions were fair and provided an equal opportunity way of solving a lot of unsolvable contention sets.

We had other, two other members of the group who expressed definitely no, they wanted to do away with the auctions of last resort. Their reasoning was that it was not fair, that it focused on money rather than what ICANN should be focusing on which is principles of community, diversity and the TLD ecosystem. And one of those members proposed that in lieu of an auction of last resort that criteria should be established to award the TLD to the applicant who meets criteria based on diversity.

And some examples that were cited were perhaps if this was the applicant’s first TLD that they had applied for as opposed to another applicant who already had a stable of 50 TLDs or if this applicant was more community focused rather than commercial focused, if this applicant was minority supported or women’s initiative, some other criteria that would be established and scored. The other members of our group were not committal on yes or no but rather were more interested in seeing what could be done to allow more creative resolution of contention sets on a private basis prior to getting to the stage of last resort.

Some of the ideas were thrown out such as allowing things that were not allowed in the last round such as two applicants to come together to form a joint venture to operate a TLD together. This would again feed into the

application change process that one of our other groups discussed. There was discussion of perhaps prior to fees being paid and prior to auction, I mean evaluation starting that there could be a disclosure of contentions sets, two contentions that members who would have a quiet period in which they could work on resolutions so that people aren't out huge sum of money who can't afford otherwise if they can work with, you know, the groups of their contention sets.

And then we discussed some, we got some good feedback on ways to if we ultimately end up with an public auction, ICANN run public auction of last resort ways to mitigate the differences in the economic and social strata of applicants who might end up in a contingent set. As you may know in the last round the auctions of last resort were open-ended. You could sit in a room for a month and continuously outbid each other until you were just passed out from exhaustion.

So we talked about some things like, you know, doing an RFP process to add some criteria that would allow for maybe limits to be set on, you know, a top dollar limit, a number of rounds of bidding. You know, all this would have to be worked out but we felt like in general there could be mechanisms created and implemented that would mitigate these vast differences that we saw in the last round. So I think we got some good input and we are looking forward to continuing the discussions in the group.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks and as I go round to the next – to each group if you could just at the end of it state whether you think the group favored this as a topic to continue discussions on. So I know we have a question, if you could make it real quick just because I want to get through all the topics.

(Danielli): Okay hi, (Danielli) for the record. It's just a quick comment with regard to, you know, mentioning to the members said that there's full support for the auction

proceeds because it's apparent, has equal opportunity, but there was a condition here with regard to the process in which if the contingency is between an applicant with like a big company or with the ability to pay money and the other applicant is actually from a developing country or a community a service application or someone that can actually cannot complete, compete in -within an auction the process should take into consideration such a situation. How do we do that? I'm not sure that we did come up with something but yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thank you. Let's go on to Michael with - or I'm sorry, we read Number 2 - or no (Krista) was sorry. You're just sitting in that corner now.

Woman: It's just to confuse you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thank you.

Woman: They're doing it deliberately.

Jeff Neuman: So (Krista) with Group 2 on private auctions please.

(Krista): Thanks. This is (Krista) the record. So in our discussion, the use of private auctions very similar and sorry I missed your name.

(Hadia): (Hadia).

(Krista): (Hadia), very similar discussions that we tried to pull into ours. So we start off with kind of a pretense on what private auctions would – are used for. And that pretense was people are - who apply for a TLD or a string with the assumption of selling the TLD for a financial gain or a reward. And we figured that was not in the best interest of the applicants or the entire community.

The money shouldn't go back to the applicant was part of our discussions and perhaps could be used to support the program. So for instance it could

be used to, I think one of the comments was universal acceptance. And some of the other aspects that we considered was any financial gains would be used to donate to charities.

We did discuss the intention of if we raise the application fees would that prevent auction. And, you know, just one or two examples and we quickly kind of figured out that might not be the only thing. And the implications of raising that drive right back into the comment of doing the wrong thing for the community. And we're rewarding the wrong kind of behavior and changing the entire program just for this negative aspect of it. So we didn't really like that idea.

We really kind of focused on what we called a gaming the system. We didn't like it. And perhaps one of the ideas that was brought up is if there was some methodology where we discouraged all auctions to happen only through a public means how would we know that wouldn't be happening on the side? So then we were kind of pushing it underground and then how could we prevent that going forward?

So perhaps one of the ideas would be it's in the contract that if you didn't do this private thing on the side and it was ever found out everyone loses and the string goes back so – or some other methodology there to really try to prevent that kind of behavior. Additionally one of the other avenues to look at was say the volume of TLDs. And even though the volume of TLDs isn't necessarily an indication of somebody wanting to gain the system it would – could be a way of kind of looking at those applicants because they're more likely to be able to gain the system, to sell some to pay for others unlike the one or two applicants.

Not – I'm just trying to make it quick, oh, sorry one of the other comments is we really wanted to try to promote those in a contention set to resolve it themselves as the Applicant Guidebook did say the auctions were the last

resort. And we really liked that idea. So hopefully people can resolve it themselves.

So hopefully I've kind of summarize that quickly but hopefully that works. And anyone else if I missed anything please let me know. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Great thanks Krista. And now we go to I think Martin was Group 3 which was the – or am I misstating that? Yes you were Group 3 which is the role of application comment.

Martin Sutton: Thank you Jeff Neuman. Martin Sutton, so we had a reminder as to what the process was. So once the applications were announced in the last round they opened up a public comment period for eight weeks at that time. I understand that, that was extended for 2012. So we had a great discussion so thank you for all those that participated. That was very interesting in terms of some of the comments coming through.

Some of the things that we focused on were primarily the opportunity for the applicant to respond to any comments was felt that there was quite often the openness to receive comments which could be entirely accurate and meaningful but there were always opportunities as well for frivolous complaints to be applied that may go unchecked or weren't responded to in an open manner and in which the applicant themselves were not given an opportunity to respond and correct at that point in time.

And bear in mind that these comments were fed through to the evaluation process for the evaluators to consider. This seems to be an area that could be improved considerably to allow for perhaps a respond mechanism to be in place for an applicant.

Other comments were in terms of more the process itself and the practicalities of it and whether given the numbers of applicants last time and the different types of comments that were received perhaps there are better

ways to take a feed of comments in and perhaps an indicator within the comment form as to whether it is in favor of the application because they're not all just complaints and objections. They could be supporting comments that come into so if there were some kind of filtering mechanism. So if it was more contentious than the comment was highlighting what they felt was something that disqualified the applicant from applying through the rules that were laid down in the applicant guidebook that perhaps that was highlighted as an option was supporting comments so that, that actually fed through perhaps to a higher priority review by the evaluators for instance.

Other comments that we looked at were the period of time that was given. So is eight weeks sufficient given the numbers that we received as applicants in the last round, eight weeks I think was extended. I'm not quite sure how long for beyond the eight weeks to allow for people to review the number of applications that came in. So if that is a similar level in the future or multiple of the previous volume then perhaps eight weeks may need to be considered or a flexibility applied to being able to extend that for comments to come in.

And I think just going back to the point on applicant being able to respond there was another thing that's still niggling me in the back of my mind I haven't commented on. But I'm sure others might be able to come forward with anything that I might have missed from our group. Okay hearing none.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Martin. So overall would you say that this was an issue that the working group should do some more work into to look further into?

Martin Sutton: Based on this discussion today I thought it was really valuable and helpful to move forward with further discussion. I haven't been involved in discussions on this before so I'm not quite clear the extent already in the discussions within the working group. But yes based on our brief interaction today it would seem worthwhile.

Jeff Neuman: Great, thanks Martin. And one of the reasons we picked these topics is because they were not extensively discussed within the – although we touch areas that may have been these individually were not subject to a lot of comment within the working group. All right Michael Flemming, you're on my left side here. I think...

Michael Flemming: Yes thank you everyone, Michael Flemming and Robin Gross from breakout Group 5 discussing chain change requests. Thank you everyone that participated in our discussion. I think that we had a lot of input overall in regards to the content of change requests. Just one thing I wanted to point out before we get into some of the feedback was that the idea of change requests and a lot of the feedback we got I think kind of went outside of the aspect necessarily of change request, but more so in regards to what changes are made overall within the process of a new gTLD is for post-contracting and pre-contracting. And I think that will feed back into a little bit of the discussion that we – a little bit of the feedback that I'm going to share with you now.

I think that we can break the feedback that we had into three main points. That was timing, what we're changing and why we are changing. So in regards to timing specifically I think one of the main issues that was described was clarity. In regards to when you can make changes to what aspects of the change requests were not holistically described initially in the previous round and having that, making sure that's laid out and going forward would be very helpful. And then there was suggestions for example to have a list of what changes you can make. And that also goes into the discussions of what is a required change as well as what is a voluntary change.

Having a list of that, a non-definite list of what you can change and then how that will affect the application, what the process, what you need to go forward would be very helpful because the previous round it was not clear in regards to that. And then another aspect of it is why you can make those changes. So for issues like contention sets or for GAC early warning, for other public

comment, public interest issues applicants should not only be allowed but in some cases required to change their application. And then we kind of got derailed in that aspect and started talking about adopting parts of the application into the registry agreement. But I think not describing that discussion as a whole but I think the kind of the consensus we were able to build out of that was the fact that if an – if a change request deals with the public interest concerns that there needs to be that those public interest in this case in a way it kind of picks, those need to be carried over in regards to whatever change can be made. But at the same time though changes should not, applicants should be allowed to change their business model in regards in change requests. ICANN should not be in the business of regulating that specific.

And it was said that a, the art would be, evaluation criteria used for the RSEP in regard to stability and security as well as competition can be used as a basis for when looking at the change requests for applications. And then I think another aspect of the change request was what role did the public comments serve in regards to change requests because anybody can make a public comment in regards to a change request, but at the same time how did that affect the change request was not very clear in that aspect. I think that describes where we are at a whole. Do you think I'm missing any? No?

Karen Day: Maybe the point from Group 1 brought over the new...

Michael Flemming: Yes so there is - we got punted an issue from Karen's group about the need to revisit the prohibition against joint ventures is should be allowed. So yes I think that summarizes where we were at. Is there - if I'm missing anyone speak now or forever hold your peace?

Jeff Neuman: You lost some...

Michael Flemming: I do think we should talk about this going forward so join us as we move forward.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you. Thank you Michael. Thank you for Group 4 and Group 4, but thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Now to Group 5, Rubens please on support for your new gTLD?

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl from the other Group 5. We discussed support for gTLD that turns out are not achievable predict the number of registrations on (Column B). We discussed that in a true foundational questions on that. One was if that was a policy it should work out and most of the group agreed to only being a policy issue, I mean something that we should tackle. So that already answers our questions at the end so should we discuss it more the workgroup, yes? To my surprise because I usually like this topic but I haven't seen getting much traction during the Work Track discussions.

The other foundational question was if there was enough economic evidence to say that a gTLD not performing well was say a (unintelligible) effect on a (prado) effect. So if not mention any specific TLDs that something that has for that TLD, that TLD wouldn't have that demand or it just has enough demand because of not have the sales channel. And that question was tied to one of the possible solutions that was not endorsed by the group which would be a more scary obligation. Let's say if have you sort of (unintelligible) five would have that obligation. If there wasn't enough economic evidence that could be a solution but not having that that wasn't endorsed by the group as a possible way forward.

There was also an underlying theme about (unintelligible) versus innovation where some people mention (unintelligible) including one comment that was read out loud. And some comments we have used from the group while

others mention the role of innovation the problem that (unintelligible) innovating like having to disclose the innovations to RSEPs.

So but that wasn't an underlying thing that didn't make it into the three possible solutions that came out of the group. One of them is that registers could be allowed to self-allocate more than 100 names so now (data) can but only up to 100. Some members mentioned were like 5000 or 10,000 that would not bring registrars interest but would allow the registry to at least grow into - could be enough maturity then reach out to registers and say hey there is a market out there. We should - you should come on board.

The other possible solution was that wholesale register to be contracted for by ICANN to carry all TLDs that want it. So ICANN would pay for that register for which procurement process to then engage in this would all TLDs that wanted this sales channel and that would bring some of the differences between smaller registries and larger registries. And a third solution there was mentioned was a payment clearinghouse that would cover two issues that were brought. One was is that of deposits that registries that if a registry wants some minimal deposits and a registrar needs to (accredit) itself in a bunch of TLDs it would need to make a bunch of deposits so this payment clearinghouse could be a mechanism for that.

And another issue that was brought up was currency conversion that some registers might not want to do business with registries because of currency issues, currency conversion issues. So that clearinghouse was mentioned to address these two issues.

Jeff Neuman: All right thanks Rubens. We have to wrap up so thank you to everyone participating. Remind you there's a Work Track 5 meeting this afternoon at 3:15.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Follow-up?

Jeff Neuman: And wherever the GAC is meeting in that room.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: And then another Work Track hour sorry, subsequent procedures meeting on Thursday, we're at that session yes, the one...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: One-thirty?

Jeff Neuman: ...1:30, 1:00, 1:30, somewhere around there. It's on the schedule. We'll talk about the red line. So please if you have comments on the redlines please send them over to email but also come prepared to talk and another Work Track 5 meeting after that so thank you everyone.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And thanks for being part of the interactive experiment. We could have polished it more but I'm really excited about the novel stuff we got back so hopefully let's do more of this in the future. Thank you one and all and bye for now, fabulous tech team, wouldn't work without you.

END