

**ICANN Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group
Tuesday 24 April 2018 at 0300 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP WG call on the Tuesday 06 January 2015 at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-24apr18-en.mp3>
and attendance may be found at: https://community.icann.org/x/1S_8B

Michelle DeSmyter: Thanks, Christine. Well welcome everyone. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on the 24th of April 2018. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. As a reminder to all participants also, if you will please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, it is my pleasure to turn the meeting over to Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. Appreciate that, Michelle. I would say, as I said, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And we're going to start this meeting with me actually blind because I have not been able to get into the WebEx room yet, but that isn't going to hold us back any longer than now.

The first thing we're going to do is do a very quick agenda review, Steve and staff sent out three days ago now the agenda for today's call. It's a very lean agenda but similar to last week's, we'll be reviewing our agenda which is roll

call and SOIs, we're about to get onto that now, the review of the initial report will be continuing and then any other business. We recognize that there are a number of challenging and technical difficulties that some of us, me included, are having with this new tool. But when we start our meeting we will just do the best we can with what material we've got to work with.

Under any other business, however, I would like to take a moment to update you all on what is likely to happen with the tools we use in the near future. So staff can note that as a piece of AOB, if we can make sure that we do bring our work track and plenary members up to date on what's going on with Adobe Connect etcetera in the near future, that would be terrific. I don't know which of you want to take that.

With that I want to first of all ask if there - anyone who would like to update their statement of interest? Not hearing anyone. I'm now going to ask, and I should jump and read this in order, is there anyone who is only on audio? If you are only on the phone bridge, could you let us know now?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, Kavouss is on the - I cannot be connected unfortunately. I cannot be connected, this system doesn't work; this system should be stopped.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Kavouss, and we'll come back to the stopping of this system, as I said, under any other business. But if you just say your name at any time we will put you in the queue at the appropriate time. I was aware that you were in fact in the WebEx room earlier on so I'm sorry that it's failed for you. Anybody else who's just on phone bridge only?

Christopher Wilkinson: Yes, that's myself, Christopher.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, Christopher, same goes to you, you just say your name or, "Hand up, Christopher," that would be fine, we'll manage. Right, with that is there anybody who wishes to add anything under any other business? Not hearing anybody there, and just pardon my voice.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead.

Jim Prendergast: Yes, hi, it's Jim Prendergast for the record. I've put it in chat, you may have seen - oh you're not online. Could we discuss the schedule for this group? The reason I raise it is because I saw a few calendar items today for meetings of this group going into I believe early to mid-May and I was under the impression that the plenary meetings would be taking a hiatus while the initial report was out for public comment so if you could just clarify that and timing that'd be very helpful. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Certainly. We'll make that as a point under any other business, and if I eventually get into the WebEx room I'm sure I'll see that in chat, Jim, thanks for that. Cheryl - I've had another overlap in call if by chance I'm totally occupied with that at the time Jeff will be able to pick that up on as well so we'll make sure we cover that off.

Okay with that, is there any other comment or suggestions for agenda? Hopefully not. I'm now 86% loaded in the room. I'll eventually join you. With that I just want to draw your attention to the rest of the email, which did state that what we will be looking at today's Item 3 of the agenda, which is the continuation, the review of the initial report, that we will be looking at what is Section 1.4, the Pre-Launch Activities. And I am hopeful that that is something we will have loaded up in the shared screen shortly.

With 1.4, I wanted to also thank Anne in particular for her contribution to the text there that's here, which is exactly what we asked you all to do. She has contributed earlier today some suggested changes text in 1.4.1, Section F, we'll make sure we pick that up for discussion when we get to there. And also Section 1.4.1G, now this is one of those situations where the proposed change to the word "none" - and you will still find, pardon me - "none" or "no"

in some of the sections, we did discuss this last week. I want to thank Anne for her specific text in this case.

But do remember we did agree that we would go through and make global changes to ensure that we have more than just the word “none” or “no” in any of those sections in the final document. But thanks, Anne, for that and we'll make sure we come back to you in those two sections.

You will also note, as Steve pointed out to you in the email, at the frontend, which is what you're looking at now, we've included the overall report organization, in other words, the numeric listing of the various overarching and other issues as well as where they are in work track - what work track has been dealing with them.

So to that end, we're hopeful that by listing this full section of 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, etcetera, before the 1.4 we're not confusing you but we're helping you to put the 1.4 section, which is all about pre-launch activities, into some context. Is there anyone who has any questions about that at this stage? Not seeing anybody, and I'm hoping that I will be seeing hands more easily. I'm assuming that I've been popped back up for being a panelist and I should be able to see your hands. If not staff will make that magic happen.

And yes, we hope that by putting in the work track references that will also help not only us but the reader when we publish this to be able to manage it as well. So to that extent, if we can now move down, another one of the frustrations with the WebEx tool, can someone move to the next page? Not sure whose screen we're sharing at the moment. Okay, it might be my very slow Internet here as well. After that section, the pre-launch activities, the deliberations and recommendations for pre-launch activities is what we will be looking at.

If I can get you to scroll all the way through. I'm assuming that people will be able to read their way through this reference set. And I'd like to go to Page 4

of what was sent out, which is the recommendations - deliberations and recommendations for pre-launch activities.

Now my voice is not distorted, that is my voice at the moment. I feel, Kavouss, like I am speaking through razor blades so and I'm hoping what will happen is that I will stop talking now and you'll start talking as we go into the actual work that we need to discuss. So at this point we're looking at a section, at 1.4.1, which is you remember the template where we review what was happening in the Applicant Guidebook in the 2012 round. And I really do have to take a sip of water now so, can I - I know Jeff, it's some unearthly hour in London where he is, still, can I get you to talk us through this while I try and make my voice actually audible? Thank you.

Steve Chan: Sorry, Cheryl, this is...

Jeff Neuman: Does everybody hear a beeping?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, we do.

Michelle DeSmyter: One moment, I'm trying to get...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Can we please find that? Thank you. Okay, so while Cheryl takes a little bit of a break as Cheryl was saying, the first section, 1.4.1 deals with just the nature of using the Guidebook as our - what was referred to in the GNSO's policies as a request for proposals. So this - there was no - other than a statement by the GNSO to have a request for proposal, there was not really too much guidance given by the GNSO back in 2007, 2008. There was a statement also, just as a reminder, that it included schedule information for subsequent rounds to occur within one year.

Other than that, if we could just turn the page? Great. I'm still hearing a lot of background noise so is there a way to - it's definitely not from here. Okay, so if you look at the recommendations that we have from these discussions that occurred in Work Track 1, we - the working group generally believes that - or generally agreed that an Applicant Guidebook of some form should continue to be utilized in future waves of applications but that we wanted to make it more user friendly.

We generally agreed on a number of specific implementation oriented changes to enhance the user experience, and some of that's described in Number 3, which talks about making it easier for nonnative English speakers and those that are less familiar with the ICANN environment and part of that includes less of a focus on historical context, less focus on the policy and how we got there but more focused as like a user guide and step by step instructions. Some have phrased it as a choose your own adventure methodology within that work track.

And also that would include things like a table of contents, an index, making it online in html so you can actually - or maybe not html but make it online so that you can navigate much more easily and having a basically tags throughout the text so that users can search. Just looking to see if there's anyone in the queue; there's no one at this point.

And I'm sorry, I missed the last recommendation, which says that any agreements, including, you know, terms of use for accessing the system need to be finalized before the rounds - the next round starts. And they should be provided with enough notice so that they can be reviewed by appropriate legal terms and conditions, I'm sorry, reviewed by appropriate lawyers or anyone else for these organizations prior to the round beginning.

So very - it's very practical implementation type advice, nothing too out of the normal here and nothing to, I believe, too controversial. But is there anyone

that's got any questions, comments, concerns up until this part? Okay, I'm not seeing anyone.

Steve Chan: Hey, Jeff, this is Steve. You have a couple hands actually. You have Christopher Wilkinson and then Kavouss.

Jeff Neuman: Oh I apologize. I am not seeing that up on the - interesting. Okay, cool, Christopher, please.

Christopher Wilkinson: Can someone unmute me?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We can hear you, Christopher.

Christopher Wilkinson: Okay thank you. I still can't unmute on the screen. Well first of all I think this is an excellent report, a good chapter and it's beautifully written. At this stage on Page 5, I would just draw attention to the bullets and particularly the fifth and sixth and seventh bullets. I think they're very important and I support them. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thank you, Christopher. Kavouss, I have next.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, do you hear me, please?

Jeff Neuman: Yes I do.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, last time we made some suggestions for this, we mentioned there are some - some distortion or somebody is doing something, I don't know, eating or what? I don't understand this. What is it? It's a distortion, please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Kavouss, we can hear you. Cheryl for the record. We can hear you perfectly clearly. Please continue if you can.

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, yes, please kindly so tell the people, somebody to - not to do something which is not on this phone call doing something else, chewing something or, drinking something or eating something or making some noise on the phone, please, I cannot understand this, please kindly, yes.

I said that previously I have asked whenever you refer to the outcome of any subgroup or chat group or work track please give the indication where it has come from and we have confirmation that this is the summary of the discussion of that group. We don't know whether has been narrated, whether something has been paraphrased, whether something has been added or not. This was not taken into account. I hope I'm clear. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Kavouss, this is Jeff. So we sent out to - internally to the working group with the table of contents, it has a reference to the applicable group that was discussing this. And this was discussed within Work Track 1. Were you saying that there should be a reference in the actual initial report itself of who was discussing it? Or - I'm just a little unclear, can you just clarify please?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I suggested that at least for the time being when we have this category of group whether it is presumably or what they do, whatever is they - the name is not defined. We should at least know the origin and the source of the material and then we have reference saying that Work Track 1, Work Track 4, Work Track 5. And then we need to have agreement that this is the outcome because I see because they want to change something instead of saying that there is no consensus, saying that the meeting was agreed or the majority or whatever the active members, these are not the words that I think we should have.

So (unintelligible) kindly please reference to the source and confirmation that it is exactly narrated, exactly quoted as it was decided without adding anything unless we are allowed at this meeting to make further comment or further amendment. I understood we are not allowed to do that. Thank you.

Just assembling the thing and proceed (unintelligible) the series of the events but not adding anything from us. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks Kavouss. So in the document that's up on the screen now, you can see that this Section 1.4.1 along with the other sections of 1.4, comes from Work Track 1. They come from discussions that took place within that work track. As you know, work tracks met every other week, in some cases weekly, and so it came from the notes and from discussions and from different - the community comment responses that we got back. But I see Cheryl's got her hand up so I'm going to go to Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Jeff. Cheryl for the record. And hopefully my voice is clear enough because (unintelligible) that distortion now. I apologize to everybody if my croaky voice is a problem, I just can't do a damn thing about it. Kavouss, I think at this stage it would be best if you and others assumed based on the list that you can see on screen now, assuming you're now in the WebEx room, that if it says Work Track 1, against, for example, what we're talking about now, 1.4.1, then what you are reading is either specific quote from notes taken or a paraphrasing from the work that that work track has completed to date.

Remembering of course, that we have not taken any consensus calls in any of these matters as yet and that when we take a consensus call there will be a specific form of language and at that point that is the form of language we will be agreeing to. Obviously after that we cannot make changes without making that tracking of changes very clear and for a particular purpose. But at this stage we're at the drafting point, where if you just assume that unless it states that it is a recommendation and an outcome that the plenary of the full working group has agreed to, that this is simply a paraphrasing or text that best reflects the outcomes of the particular work track. I hope that helps. Going back on mute.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Cheryl. I'm going to turn it over to one of the Work Track 1 coleaders, Christa Taylor, because Christa's got a comment. So please, Christa.

Christa Taylor: Thanks, Jeff. Can you hear me?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, yes we can.

Christa Taylor: Oh great, thanks. I think - it's Christa Taylor for the record. I think a different perspective might help. So as one of the work track coleaders for Work Track 1, our process is really thorough and just to explain a little bit is that we took all of the discussions that we had over the year and a half on all the topics of Work Track 1, we then summarized them, we then produced a document, we then reviewed it and we had questions, we then rotated through this process numerous times and then we shared a document since I think December hoping that if we were incorrect on anything that people would correct us to make sure it was an accurate reflection of what the work track was thinking and our discussions to date. And then from there we took all of that and rolled it into this.

And through that process there's been three or four or five iterations of it. Everyone has worked really hard to try to make it as accurate as possible. And even with that, even with our best efforts, there are, you know, a couple little items that I came across going, well we discussed this a year and a half ago, we said - we described something as X or Y, did we mean this or did we mean that? And we would revert back to the record, we'd go through it again and try to figure it out. And if we don't know then, you know, it was highlighted and we would - three or four of us would kind of put our heads together to make sure it was accurate as possible.

So I don't know if that helps but at least it kind of gives some background onto how much time and effort we've all spent to make sure that this is an

accurate reflection of exactly what happened in the working group. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Christa. That was excellent background and just shows, you know, all the work that you all - you and Sara have put into the Work Track 1 and of course all the other work track leaders for the other work tracks so you did a much better job explaining it than I did so thank you.

Someone is still - a lot of noise in the background. I think it's - if we can just mute that line that would be great.

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Do you see my hand or not?

Jeff Neuman: I hear your voice, Kavouss, I thought...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: No, do you see my hand please?

Jeff Neuman: I see it now. I thought - yes...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Why you see it now because it was some few minutes ago. I think the system does not show exactly when the person...

Jeff Neuman: Okay, Kavouss...

Kavouss Arasteh: ...what was the problem in the system? It doesn't show that?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I apologize, Kavouss, I thought it was an old hand, please go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. I understand that. Either we're just making compilation or we make compilation with some comments, edits, paraphrasing, clarification added, emphasis added, so we should be quite clear, if it is only compilation, without anything I have no difficulties. If we add something we should say "clarification added." Emphasis is added. Additional information is added so we know that this coming from the editors of this compilation. That is what - that was my suggestion last time.

Thank you very much, part of it has been implemented, I see now cross reference to the work track. But when we go to the text would like to know it is purely compilation without adding anything or whenever we add we describe that, emphasis is added, clarification is added, so on so forth. Thank you very much.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Kavouss. We will take that back and see what we can do. Are there any other comments on - up to that - the recommendation - up through the recommendations of 1.4.1? Okay, looking to see the hands, I don't see any hands. Okay, can we move on then to Part D - actually, sorry, move to past page - it was my scrolling so I should have moved myself there, I apologize.

Part D says, "Were there any other options that we considered other than an Applicant Guidebook?" and Work Track 1 early on decided that the work - the Guidebook was the way to go so there were no other options that were considered. And then there's a series of - if we - thank you - to the next page - whether there was any specific questions that the work track had with regards to this particular section. And there were no additional questions.

So at this point I just want to stop for a second and just make a point that when we draft the preamble to this report we are going to make it clear that we are seeking comment on all of the recommendations and the contents that are in this report.

So we're not going to specifically call out questions anymore which says, "Do you agree with these recommendations?" It should be implied that of course we are seeking comment on all of the recommendations that are being made, we're just not going to phrase it as a very specific question. I hope that makes sense. So even though it says that there's no specific questions, the working group is seeking feedback obviously on all of the recommendations that are proposed in this report.

Okay, I see Cheryl, you have your hand raised.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Jeff. Cheryl again for the record. I was busy typing but I just wanted to assure everybody that we are going to be taking all of your input on this document into consideration but as we asked last time, if it is at all possible, could you use this exercise as we go through it in the full group like this as a sanity checking, in other words, is there a mission or oversight or heaven forbid, hopefully not, a misstatement that the work track leaders have not noticed themselves.

Yes, this is paraphrasing and using excerpts where appropriate as Christa outlined, very, very clearly, but if we could just draw you out on oversights and issues that we need to pick up on that, that would be terrific. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you, Cheryl. Sorry about that, I was trying to unmute, it took me a little bit longer than I thought. So if we go onto the next section, and please, if staff could see anyone with their hand raised please interrupt. The next section is the - sorry, I meant Section F, the deliberation section. I'm not going to go through that but it just really goes into all the discussions that took place, what we asked in the community comment, and so this is pretty common in all of the deliberation sections for all of the different issues.

So it's very important to read through that to make sure that all of the positions that were expressed are contained in there but this one - this

section was not a very controversial section so it's not one where there's going to be a lot of new materials in that deliberation section.

Just reading onto the chat, let's see, oh Anne asks, "@Cheryl, just want to make sure that staff is accumulating my written comments regarding dependencies so that I don't have to keep track myself and reiterate them all later." Sorry, Anne, yes, we are keeping track of all of them. If you could just remember to - we'll try to do our best but if you can remember to bring it up during the conversation on that section, that will help us so we can discuss as a group whether those are dependencies we should be noting or not.

I think it's Christopher Wilkinson...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Jeff. Jeff, Cheryl here jumping in. I think because Anne did make comment on 1.4.1F, she was just wanting to make sure that this was being picked up at this time in terms of the notes so her suggestion is one of those text whereas there was no consensus call she suggested a couple of alternatives that active members of the work track commented that or work track members observed that. And I think that's the type of language that we will probably look at repeating throughout the document where relevant. Back to you, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, great. Thanks, Cheryl, and excellent comment, Anne, we will do that - try to do that throughout the document. Obviously the sections that have already come out we'll go back and do that with as well. Okay, Anne then asks, "What do you mean by discuss them all later and why later?" I meant later in this call. I remember there was a recommendation I think on 1.4.3 that you had, that's the one that caught my eye so that's what I meant, Anne, I apologize. I forgot that was one on 1.4.1.

Okay, moving onto the next section, 1.4.2, turn the page there. Okay, this section deals with communications. And it was also Work Track 1. There were three relevant implementation guidelines in the 2007 final report and they include ICANN - and now I'm paraphrasing what it says there - but essentially ICANN communicating frequently with the applicant and also at the public forum - public comment forum. ICANN establishing a capacity building and support mechanism and then ICANN putting in place systems that could provide information about the process in major languages other than English, for example, in the six working languages of the United Nations.

So how was that implemented in 2012? There was a new gTLD communications plan, which we have a reference to, which was authorized by the ICANN Board to serve as the basis for global outreach. And then there was a customer portal which was a custom made customer portal where they employed methods such as webinars, road shows, I'm sorry, where they facilitated communications between the applicant and ICANN and then they also had webinars, road shows, sessions at ICANN meetings and elsewhere to encourage dialogue between the community.

Just reading on...

Kavouss Arasteh: Please?

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: ...chat. Sorry, Kavouss, you have a hand raised ?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, my hand is up since seven minutes ago. Do you see that...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: ...on your system or you don't see that on the system, please?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Kavouss, Cheryl here. We see it on the system but we also don't see your hand ever going down so perhaps you could forgive us if Jeff doesn't notice that you took your hand down, I didn't notice that either, and then put your hand back up again. You may also want to remind us in chat if you've put up a new hand and you think we've missed it. But you are next, go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, yes. Cheryl (unintelligible) some distortion or your system, is it your voice system which is - which has some difficulty because when Steve is speaking he's quite clear; when you speak I see some distortion, I'm sorry, I apologize for that but that is something that I cannot follow exactly. Your line is not very good (unintelligible) understand. Now, coming to the hand raising. Yes, I raised the hand I just check to see whether it is okay or not.

I was returning to the part that it is said that active members of the work track commented. I don't agree to talk about active members and passive member. So please (unintelligible) of the discrimination should disappear totally. The meeting noted or the members noted or observed and so on, that's not active and passive. Thank you. Now the hand is down.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thank you, Kavouss. So we will note that as well and understand I think the point raised there was that it was discussed within Work Track 1 and so we will not use terms like "active" or "passive." Okay, so moving on to the next section of how - one of the preliminary recommendations guidelines and so what we say there is that we do not envision developing additional policy recommendations to communications, but we did - when I say "we" it's Work Track 1, generally agreed on a number of specific implementation guidelines to help improve the reach, timeliness and accessibility of the communication strategy for the new gTLD program.

And if you scroll down, it talks about what these specific recommendations are. They are grouped into different categories of improvements, which I'm not going to read every one but just give everyone a minute to just look that

over to see if there are any questions on that. And if ICANN could - Steve or Emily or Julie could flip to the next page?

Okay, are there any questions on this content here? Kavouss, I see you have a new hand.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, is it possible you do not kindly refer to "next page" or "previous page" to the paragraph number paragraph (unintelligible), Paragraph 4 (unintelligible) rather than pages. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, will do, Kavouss. Thank you. Donna, please.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Jeff. Donna Austin from Neustar for the record. So this may be - my question might be because I've forgotten the conversation but there doesn't seem to be anything in this recommendation to address the need for a global communications effort. I know there's some mention about the GSE team but I thought that there had been some discussion about the need for broader global communications campaign. Now it might be that I'm getting confused with someone else, but it seemed to be that this would be the place where that type of recommendation would be. So I apologize if I'm, you know, confused with some other conversation we've had but I thought that that would have appeared here if it was going to appear anywhere. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Donna. I think that - and then I'll ask Christa, but if it's my recollection that there's a bullet there that talks about a reference to Section 1.5.4, which deals with applicant support. It is possible when we get to that section, and it's released, that we can cross reference a little bit better that it applies more for the whole program. But that I think, you're right, we did have those discussions but I think it was more in connection with applicant support. But let me see if Christa or anyone from Work Track 1 - Christa or Sara has anything to add on that? Christa, please.

Christa Taylor: Hi, Jeff. It's Christa Taylor for the record. It does ring a bell but I think it was more focused on applicant support, but I'll go back and review it to make sure that it is covered properly and also to make sure that if it refers to 1.5.4 that it also ties in so I'll see if there's an overlap and if not I'll make sure that we add it. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thank you. Kavouss, I think that's a new hand or...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, is new hand. is new hand. what do we mean by "global communication effort"? What do you want to say? You want to be ITU? Be connect and non-connected, or connect everybody? What means global communication efforts? What is the sense of that? Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Kavouss. Christa, do you want to jump in? You want me to answer that? Either way is fine. Christa.

Christa Taylor: You can do a first go at it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Yes, so Kavouss, here global communication means exactly that in the generalized sense. So a worldwide plan to ensure that internationally it is known that we are having this program. We are not talking about global communications in the regulatory sense but just a worldwide plan - outreach plan to discuss the program, to let the world know that this program has, again, started and what the parameters are of this program, so it's very generalized sense. Christa, if you want to add anything to that?

Christa Taylor: No, I'm pretty good and you can see how it ties into the applicant support program where we - you know, a lot more focused on outreach was - or was discussed so thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Christa. Kavouss, you okay with that? Okay, yes, I see thanks. Okay, for this section there - we're in Section D now, we are on - there is no other options that we considered. And the specific questions that we're seeking feedback on, which is Section E, was some of them actually come from the initial report of the CCT Review Team, especially the first one which is, you know, we're looking for criteria or metrics for determining what would be success for any aspects of the communications policy, sorry, program.

One of the issues we had was we - because we had no metrics and we didn't define success up front there was no way for us to really analyze whether the communication program was successful or not. We continued to - or we talk about the communications period, was a specific defined period in the 2012 round and it was six months. And we're asking the question, "Was this the right amount of time? Is it too long? Too short?"

And then we say - now this is a - really looking for feedback on this question to make sure it's understood. But in this question we are saying that if we go to some sort of regular intervals for the launch of new gTLDs, let's say as an example you know, once every year that we launch the program, are we going to need as long of a communications period as we are going to have for this next round? Or can those communication periods be shorter? That's really the heart of this question.

So are we saying that we need a constant communications period of let's say six months for every single round we do going forward? Hopefully that makes sense. Christa, you have your hand raised. I don't know if that's an old hand? okay, I guess that's an old hand. I'm just going to look at the chat right now. There is discussion of fees. Sorry, Cheryl, I see it says this is one of the two options - oh okay, I'm sorry, that's back on an old question.

And Karen has said, "I believe it is mentioned in the fees section as a use of excess fees." So I'm not sure what that was referring to. Sorry, I'm a little bit behind on the chat. Kavouss is saying it depends on the - how often I guess

the round is. So I guess that's a good point, Kavouss. If we do a round every year then six months might be a long period of time, too long; but if we only do it once every three years then maybe six months is not as long or too long so I think that's a good comment. And I think that's certainly something, Kavouss, that we - the kind of feedback we're looking for when we put this out for public comment.

Christopher Wilkinson lost sound. Can I just make sure that everybody else has sound?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thank you. Moving on to deliberations, again, this is Section F. Again, this just goes over the discussions that took place. It's an important section but one that we're not going to go through. And Donna has her hand up. Sorry, Donna.

Donna Austin: That's okay. Thanks, Jeff. Donna Austin from Neustar. I just wanted to go back to the comment that Karen had in the chat where she said the communication (unintelligible) picked up in fees discussion, excess fees discussion. So I think - and this is part of my confusion too - I think there are two types of communications here. One is what we're talking about now which is more about the communication of upcoming application processes, and then I think the one that was discussed in the excess fees and that has been discussed within the Registry Stakeholder Group on a number of occasions is more about a communication - an awareness campaign about new gTLDs being available.

So I think there's a distinction here between the two types of communication efforts, so I just wanted to flag that. I think Karen's right, I think where the conversation might have happened about the, you know, an awareness campaign that these new gTLDs actually exist and, you know, you can

register a name in them, is a little bit different to what we're discussing in this piece here. Thanks, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Donna. And if I can ask a favor of you and Karen to make sure you communicate with Christa and Sara to make sure that we are able to define or delineate that as well as you just put it and then Christa says it is already captured. Okay. Let's just double check, Christa, with Donna and Karen to make sure that we've got everything straight. Okay.

Are there any other hands up? I'll take a quick look. No. if we go to the next page please? Okay, that's more deliberations. Sorry, can we go to the - maybe it's on this page. Yes, okay 1.4.3 and I think, Anne, this is where you had your comment or did you have a comment on this section? Just check, Cheryl, old hand. Because I have not had a chance to really digest any comments from earlier. Okay, I'll take that as it relates to the next section.

So 1.4.3 is on the actual systems that ICANN uses for the submission of applications and the communications with applicants on clarifying questions and other aspects. And so for that there was no quote, policy, but there was implementation guidance. But - and I notice a typo there that I need to fix. But it says that ICANN may put in place systems that could provide information about the gTLD process in the major languages including the languages of the United Nations.

Other than that implementation guidelines, there is no - it should say there is no items specifically related to the technical systems that were used. So how did ICANN implement this implementation guidance? They developed an applicant-facing customized system to facilitate the submission and communications.

They have a system called TAS. Kavouss, the technical system is the actual portal that was used to submit the application and the portal that was used to collect the financial information, the system that was used to ask clarifying

questions. That's what we mean by the technical system, not the people but the technology that they use. And so there was a system called TAS, the TLD Application System, which was a customized solution for the last round. There - and there was also a separate customer portal that was used by applicants to submit questions and receive responses and there was also - and that portal I think was also - may have been used to submit public comments.

There were additional systems that were developed to support other aspects of the program. There was a Digital Archery system which was never really used because that program was cancelled. There is - or was a centralized zone data service that was on an old system that since has moved over I believe. And then there's of course the application comments forum. So these are all the systems that were used. If we forgot any we'll - please let us know and we'll include those. But these are what ICANN used throughout the process.

Kavouss says that these are not technical but communications (unintelligible) communication channels. Okay, thank you Kavouss. And Donna said - oh I'm sorry, Christa says, okay, this is on the, sorry, application fees section, so this is going back to the last question. So what are the recommendations here? Sorry, I'm scrolling to see if there's any questions. Let me look really quick. No, okay.

So the - so what are the recommendations here? There's a few of them. One is to make sure that there's enough time provided for the development and testing of the system before it's actually deployed. One of the issues from the last round was that they released a system, they had just developed it and released it pretty quickly and it didn't undergo extensive quality assurance testing, user interface testing, and penetration testing to ensure that it was stable and secure, so that's one of our recommendations.

Obviously security is pretty high up on everyone's list. And with the issues that ICANN had with the portal, the so called glitch, the - we're obviously recommending that data is properly protected and kept confidential where appropriate. Looking at a - the chat real quick. Anne says, "Sorry, Jeff, I'm working with only one screen. The comment I think on the first section regarding the Applicant Guidebook and interdependencies." Oh, okay thanks, Anne.

Going back, Anne, I'll try to come back to that then because we may have missed it. But going back to these recommendations here in 1.4.3, we're saying that there should be a single login for the different systems. And you see that in '12, the applicants, remember there were two different systems and it was hard to keep them straight. We're hoping that ICANN could combine these systems into one where you didn't have to have different passwords and usernames. ICANN should be transparent...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: ...any changes that impact applicants or the application system. And if there is a security breach then ICANN should immediately notify impacted parties. We're saying - we're recommending that ICANN should offer prospective end users with the opportunity to beta test the systems. We know that in the last round ICANN was not willing to do that because it believed that it would be giving some applicants an unfair advantage over others if it had invited a few users to come in and test.

I think we can set up a - something like an operational test and evaluation environment which will allow all users to come in and test and not give anyone an unfair advantage. And I do think that the system would certainly benefit from testing by those that aren't intending to use it. As stated in Section 1.4.1, of course any agreements or terms of use for systems access including any that are to be click-through, should be finalized in advance and

included in the Applicant Guidebook with the goal of minimizing obstacles and/or legal burdens on applicants.

There was additional specific implementation guidance that members of the work track discussed and they include those specific bullets that are listed below really detailed recommendations. I'm not going to go through them all because that would take a really long time. But are there any questions or comments on those? Give everyone a second to read through that.

Okay, I'm not seeing anyone. Sorry. Oh, Kavouss, yes, there you go.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, what we mean by applicant should be able to access live support? Do you mean that there is a continuous 24-hour 7 (unintelligible) live channel system communication? What do we mean by access to live support? You mean technical support? Do you mean what? What is live support? Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Christa, would you like to take that?

Christa Taylor: Hi. It's Christa for the record. I believe and I will have to go back and check, it was, excuse me, losing my voice now, it was like online chat kind of communication thing where if you had a quick question you could say speak to somebody on whatever topic it is to get a quick answer. Does that help?

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Christa. And Cheryl put in the chat that an interactive system. I'm not seeing - Kavouss, do you have - let me just double check. Okay I guess that answered his question. Any other questions on this particular section - on Section C, the recommendations? Okay, I'm not seeing any, that's great. I'm just seeing if there's anything that we should point out here. Okay, were there any other options, Section D, under consideration? No. And then, were there any specific questions that we're looking for feedback on? Again, this topic was pretty not controversial and so there is nothing other than just looking for

feedback on what we're recommending so there's no additional questions that we have.

And then deliberations, which continues on Page 12, talks about where we got a lot of this information and a little bit more background on the systems that were actually used by ICANN. We got a lot of this information from the program implementation report I believe, if I got the title of that report, that ICANN did after - a couple years ago after the program.

Any other questions on Section 1.4.3? Okay, we have a chat comment from Christopher Wilkinson. "In Bullet 5 on Page 11," if we can go back to that real quick? "Prospective end users actually refers to prospective applicants. In ICANN-speak end users usually refer to registrants or Internet users." So let's go to that bullet here that says that "ICANN Organization should offer prospective end users..." So actually, Christopher, we did not use - and I'll have Christa confirm or let me know if I'm wrong.

We did not use the term "prospective applicants" because some of the systems actually are for submitting public comments or for submitting objections or for submitting other aspects and so we didn't want to say "registrants" because it's not just for registrants, not just for applicants, sorry. So we tried to use a broader term so I think that it was intentional there that we did not use the term "applicant." I hope that makes sense. Not seeing any further comment from Christopher. Okay, so, yes.

Okay, Cheryl, we have now walked through Section 1.4, I don't know if we want to go back to the previous one which I'm not sure we got all the way through, which is Section 1.2?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Jeff, Cheryl here for the record. I think if we did go back and follow towards the end, we hadn't gone through universal acceptance in the data, we should do, etcetera, so yes if we can go back to the Section 1.2 that we didn't complete last week I think that'd be a very good use of our time.

Jeff Neuman: Great. I know that Steve has his hand up so Steve, please.

Steve Chan: Hi, Jeff. Thanks. This is Steve. I just wanted to note that I moved the slides back to Section 1.4.1 just in case you want to cover the points that Anne raised in her email. While you do that I can also work in the background to get Section 1.2 loaded. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Thanks, Steve, and that's a good idea. So if we can - I don't have Anne's email handy but, Anne, do you want to quickly just go over the comments you made, if you're in a place you can do that?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I'm sorry, Jeff, it's Anne. Did you ask me if I wanted to do that or, I'm sorry.

Jeff Neuman: Yes if you wanted to go through the comments you made and the email you sent before this call.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh yes, just very quickly. I just commented about how we are phrasing the working - or the work tracks agreed. And I think that was discussed earlier on this call because Kavouss had expressed the preference for not making any reference to, you know, active or passive members of the working group and expressed a preference for the second formulation. And I'm actually just fine with that and I think you confirmed that.

And then the second thing that I raised was this thing - what I was saying about the Applicant Guidebook itself and that whole section on the Applicant Guidebook, you know, in Work Track 4 we have said, many of us have said, I don't know whether to call it, you know, I guess I really don't know that we can call it agreement but we've said, hey, you know, this business of strings that are very high risk on the name collision side, you know, if it comes to pass that there's a group of strings that fit in that category they should be identified early on as do not apply and save applicants from, you know, going

through the whole application process and developing their business model and trying to figure out if it works financially and paying the \$185,000 or more.

And so my only thought on dependencies was that in terms of the Applicant Guidebook, if we actually were to develop, you know, coming out those various recommendations with the Work Track 4 ultimately and the work that the SSAC is doing on name collisions, you might actually end up with a prequalification stage in the Applicant Guidebook where you didn't have to put in full application but you could suggest a string and have it, you know, it just seemed like a dependency because of what's going on the community with that study. So that's why I brought it up.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Anne. Kind of a gut reaction from me is - so right now there's only a proposal to do a study. There's no study that actually has been approved. And of course the SSAC is taking comments on that. I'm not sure that that would be a dependency of finalization of the Guidebook. We may want to include something like that if it was definitive that there were doing a study and what they were doing, we might - that might fit more under things like reserve names. But I think that at this point because it's not definite we might just want to wait for people to put comments in on that. But I'm - and this is just...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: I'm a little reluctant to call it a dependency at this point.

Anne Aikman-Scalèse: Well I was just thinking, Jeff, and this is Anne again for the record, that I probably wouldn't be bringing it up were it not for the fact when we got to the Work Track 4 part of the report you're definitely going to see that, that do not reply right, I mean, you and Cheryl have been pretty active on those calls, or excuse me, do not apply, as that's in the, you know, the bullet points that were on our slides in Work Track 4.

So, you know, maybe think of it in terms of the dependency that, I mean, you don't even want to mention the SSAC NCAP, although, you know, all the comments say please, you know, tell us early on if there's a string that nobody should be applying for. But if it could somehow be - we could put a pin in it until we see our language from Work Track 4 maybe we want to talk about that dependency rather than the SSAC dependency because how do you save people from spending \$185,000 to go through the whole application process or whatever the fee is going to be in the next round, and then have somebody tell them, you know, "this is a do not apply."

So and I think we just need to put a pin in that until we see what Work Track 4 language is.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks, Anne. I think that's a good suggestion so we'll put a pin in that as you said. And we will certainly look to put it into places where we as a group think that those dependencies lie so we'll put that as a to do item and we'll look at the Work Track 4 language. Looking back at the chat, Kavouss, you have your hand up so Kavouss, is it on this section?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, it is.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Kavouss Arasteh: ...this section, other section. I understand that there was very rarely a full agreement of anything but there was some, as mentioned here, broad agreement or general agreement. I would like to know how you want to express that? Do you want to say that as is mentioned here that work track members observed that? Do you say - do you want to say that the general understanding of the work track was?

What is the expression to indicate the area that there was no consensus, area that even there was no broad - because when you say broad is difficult, what do broad means? What is the (unintelligible) criteria of the broad? So

how you want to say that? You want to say that the general understanding of the group was that, broad understanding of the group was that, or it was understood that - so this is very important in this area and other area. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Question, Kavouss, thank you for your question. Let me throw that question out to the work track leaders, see if they have any thoughts on that or I can, we've been using different terminology this week, using things like general understanding. We do use terms like general agreement but does anybody from the work track leaders want to offer up their thoughts on that? Steve, please.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Jeff. This is Steve from staff. And I'll take a first cut at this one. So I don't know that we're operating on formal definitions for general agreement or broad agreement. I think what is important to point out is that there has not been formal consensus calls taken on any of these recommendations. So I guess I just wanted to make sure that we have that as a context for as we're looking at the support. Within the GNSO Operating Procedures which I'll post a link to in the section, it's under Section 3.6, it actually defines what the standards are for full consensus, consensus and the other designations.

So before we complete our final report and to be included in the final report that's where we'd have actually define those consensus levels. So the idea for the initial report is that we'll have a preamble essentially that says that no consensus calls were taken on this report to hopefully make sure that the readers of the report know that the findings in this report have not gone through that formal consensus call process. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Steve. But also just to add to that, where we do use terms in this report like there's general agreement, we do want to emphasize that, you know, there was general agreement that, you know, for things like the Guidebook and communications, you know, everyone in the room and on the emails was expressing their support for it. So we don't want to make it sound

like these are just observations and just being thrown out; for places where we do say there's general agreement and we actually think, again, no formal consensus call was taken but we do think that the group was leaning towards those types of recommendations.

In other places we say that the work track is considering proposing this, and but, Anne, you have your hand raised so please, Anne, go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Under the PDP Manual and the GNSO Operating Procedures the initial report is actually supposed to formally include the words are "should include" a consensus call. So, you know, the fact that we're not doing that is fine but I think, you know, we also cannot say, you know, the working group or the work track agreed that because that - you know, that conveys the idea that you asked for that - that call, you asked for that agreement.

Instead what it really is, is it's kind of more the sense of leadership so you could condition that always on the sense of leadership is that, blah, blah, blah. But you can't really say honestly throughout this report that, you know, the working group or the work track agreed. Because that's not the way the PDP Manual is set up. That's just not the way it works.

And here's the problem with it, guys, you didn't say that when you started the PDP, okay. You said that at the, you know, right before you're drafting the initial report so people didn't know during the course of these discussions that that's how this was going to be treated; nobody knew that. That whole approach was not adopted until you started drafting the initial report. That's why you can't say it.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thank you Anne. I think we've gone over this discussion in a number of times so I'm not going to really want to backtrack. But we will certainly make it very clear that we did not do consensus calls. We're not going to use terms as weak as "observe" because I think there was a sense of the group on a number of these recommendations. So we will, for the next call, or over email

we'll come back with a concrete recommendation of something that's in between agreement and observations, something that's strong enough to actually convey the sense of the group but something not as strong as saying that there formal consensus calls that were taken. But so let us come back on that over email...

((Crosstalk))

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Well, Jeff, I'm sorry. It's Anne again. But the question is not whether or not formal consensus calls were taken because we've already agreed that that has to be in the introduction. The question is what you can say about what was and was not agreed when the folks who are participating on the calls did not understand that there would be a report made without one of the required elements of an initial report and that there would be statements that there was agreement on these points. That was not understood by participants and that's why you need to find better language.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you, Anne. I think that was my proposal that we will come back with some language that's in between that conveys it was a sense of the group but also is not as strong as saying that there was consensus or any kind of formal agreement. But I think the work track worked very hard on trying to get a sense of the group without doing formal consensus calls. And I think for most of these items judging from the - even the lack of comments on this call, the lack of additional comments on the email lists from what the work tracks have been working on, I think the work track leaders were pretty faithful to the notion of getting a sense of the group.

So I do want - I don't want this report to come out and make it sound like these are just general observations that which I think will undermine the quality and the work of our work track leaders. So like I said, Anne, we'll come back and we'll suggest some language that we all can use and hopefully get agreement...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Jeff, you have - you have Kavouss's hand up again. And if you could put me in the queue, my connectivity is such - it's Cheryl here - that I'm not even able to put my hand up at this stage.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so I'll go to Kavouss then to Cheryl and then Jim has a question in the chat which I think is important. So Kavouss, please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, this - my hand is down now because it was up, it's down and I put my suggestion in the chat. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks, Kavouss, suggestion is to use the term "the general understanding of the group or general feeling of the group." Thanks, Kavouss. Those are good suggestions. Let the leadership team take that back and we'll discuss it and come back to you all with a proposal.

Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Jeff. I hear and understand Anne's point but I also am wondering if we, you know, took a straw polling of this group, we have what 23 attendees here or it was last time I was connected, I've now dropped the connection totally, sorry. Is there anyone else who has such significant problems with the language, if there is then that's fine.

Perhaps one way forward would be then to take for example the paragraph that was on screen when I was last in the WebEx meeting with you, which used the language of in general agreement and started off with "there were some work track members that." I think in that paragraph there must have been three if not four different ways of presenting the feel of the work track leaders as to what the current thinking of their work track was.

How about if need be, Jeff, we - rather than have our work track leaders relitigate language that they already have, to be honest, we put that paragraph out as an example to the list and then we could get suggestions just like we just got from Kavouss and the rank and file of the PDP group can have at the language and perhaps they could do that within the next say 36-48 hours? Thanks, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Cheryl. So just to restate your proposal is to put this out to the list with examples, even if it's just that one paragraph but certain examples of how we've stated this general type of agreement and then ask for input from the group as to what their comfortable with. I think that's a good approach if we can do that shortly after this call, then - when I say shortly after this call I mean within the next 24 hours. If we can get something like that out so we can feedback on and then have the leadership discuss those proposals I think that's a great idea.

I'm going to come back to Jim's question in a second. Christopher Wilkinson says, "I feel like neutral about discussion of this language but on the strength of the arguments presented I would support Anne's comments." Okay. Any other comments or questions on that particular point? Scroll through the list.

Donna Austin: Jeff, it's Donna. I don't know if you can see my hand or not.

Jeff Neuman: I do now, thank you, Donna. Please.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Jeff. So it's Donna Austin from Neustar. So, Anne, I take on board what you're saying but I think we also need to appreciate that, you know, this has been a bit of a dynamic effort with a lot of different moving parts so I think it's acceptable that we try to be a little bit flexible in how we think about what the intent of this report is.

And I think we also need to keep in mind that I understand that maybe there wasn't general agreement but this report has been put together based on

going back through the CC1 comments, the CC2 comments, the discussions that were had on a particular topic, you know, staff was actually going back, as I understand it, has gone back through the transcript or the notes and I think the work track leaders have done the same thing.

So I accept that this isn't necessarily the way that things have been done in the past but I think we need to be a little bit flexible in understanding some of the challenges that having, you know, so many topics to consider that the leadership team is looking to innovative ways to deal with this. So to that end if we could, you know, be a little bit open minded and perhaps not so entrenched in what we've done in the past understanding that we will get to the, you know, the final report and those consensus calls will happen along the way but it's just not being done at this point in time.

But I personally don't really have a problem with you know, the general agreement or, you know, the assessment in general or something like that, so I'm not as worried about that. I'm a little bit more worried about people trying to be a little bit flexible and being appreciative of the work that's been put into this and how this report has been put together and the review and the looking back that's been done to put it together. Thanks, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Donna. I'm just - appreciate those comments. I just - we have a time check now, we have a couple minutes left. I want to make sure we cover Jim's question that relates to Jim's earlier question on the future calls. So as you've noticed and as Jim said, there's been only three sections that have been sent around. We do have more sections that are getting closer to completion.

And I suspect the frequency of these sections coming out to you all are going to be increased. So be prepared over the next several days and you will get several different sections that we have been hard at work on making sure that they are accurate, making sure that we're taking into consideration these comments during these calls and also making sure that there are citations and things in there.

So over the next few days, week or so you will be getting a number of additional sections. And it relates to the scheduling of a couple calls in May. We do think that with the pace that it's moving and with making sure that we are able to get working group comments, that we're going to need those first two weeks to finalize discussions on this initial report. And so we've scheduled two additional meetings in - for the first two weeks of May so like essentially for the next three weeks to finalize that because, yes, it's our intention to make sure that the entire working group sees all of the sections and has an opportunity to comment before it goes out for overall public comment.

So Jim, that's relates to both the questions that you asked. Just double checking the chat, see if there's any additional timeline questions. So okay. Then on - I know Steve wants to say a quick word on the systems and WebEx, Adobe Connect and so I will turn it over to Steve if you can give us a quick update. I think it was Steve if not Julie or...

Steve Chan: Thanks, Jeff. This is Steve. I'll be honest, I didn't expect to be speaking now. But I think there was a question early on in the meeting about collaboration systems and the future or I guess what systems we might be using in the near future given the challenges that some of us are experiencing with WebEx right now.

So there was a blog post put out on the 20th actually by Ashwin, he's the ICANN's SVP of Engineering and Chief Innovation Officer, I want to say. But I believe the plan is to start rolling out testing of Adobe Connect instances again on the 3rd of May. So I think we can expect to see that we'll get a chance to work back in our familiar system. And the idea is to - that the system has been hardened, it's been - had fixes done in regards to the security issues. And so that'll be our test bed to make sure that those systems issues are in fact solved. So I'll drop the link in there and I'm sure

many of you already seen the blog post but you'll get a chance to read it in its entirety here. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Steve. Any questions on that? Okay. The last thing, while I check to see if there's any other AOB, is that Cheryl and I and ICANN staff were on a call about five hours ago with the other PDP leaders and GNSO Council leadership on the scheduling for ICANN 62 in Panama. And it looks like we are going to have two sessions - or sorry, three sessions for Work Tracks 1-4. Two of the sessions will likely be on the first day so on the Monday and the last session, the third session, will likely be on the last day on Thursday.

I know that many of you either come in late or travel - or leave early but I think with all of the requirements and wanting to have Work Track 5 on a different day, where it's nonconflicted and making sure that we have some time in between the three scheduled meetings to regroup and to make sure that we could have a productive third session, we are leaning towards having that time period. Each session, as Heather says, is about 90 minutes and, you know, I think it'll be very productive for us to have those three sessions. And stay tuned, you'll likely see this draft schedule going out to the SO/AC leadership and I just wanted to give everyone a heads up before you start planning your trips if you haven't done that.

So just going back to chat any questions on that, comments? Scroll down here, make sure there's none. Is there any other any other business?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Jeff, Cheryl here. Just in closing can I for the record, my thanks. This was a call that I was meant to run because of the unearthly hour that you're connecting to this call from London. Sorry my voice wasn't up to it but thanks very much, I just wanted to put that thanks on the record. We do share and play well with each other but you've gone above and beyond the call of duty today. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Cheryl. I think the whole leadership team is doing a great job and the work track leaders have been working incredibly hard behind the scenes and - on this report so it's everyone thanks to the whole team. And with that, thank you, everyone, and we will look out for emails and talk to everyone next Monday. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, everyone. Bye for now.

END