

**ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group
Monday, 27 August 2018 at 20:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-new-gtld-subsequent-27aug18-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p82b8h6kwvb/>

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

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Julie: Thank you so much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group Call on Monday, the 27th of August, 2018. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect Room. If you're only on the audio bridge at this time, could you please let yourself be known now?

Karen Bernstein: Hello, this is Karen Bernstein.

Julie: Karen, thank you very much. All right, we're hearing no more names, I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I will turn it over to Cheryl Langdon-Orr to kick it off. Please begin.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Julie, it's Cheryl Langdon-Orr with a very croaky voice today, so Jeff will be taking the main topics for today's call to save me straining myself too much. But let me ask first of all, after welcoming you to today's call of course, is there anyone who has an update to their statement of interest? Not seeing anyone in Chat and not noticing anyone typing or raising their hand, I would like to just raise my own minor change to my statement of interest which actually was enacted I guess at the end of the financial year, but we have reporting requirements through to August here in Australia. We have closed down our company after some almost 40 years now and so I am supposedly retiring. So a very minor change, it just means that I will still act in a consultancy capacity, but not be running a PGY LTD. So with that very minor change to let you all know, I'm sure ICANN will find a way of picking up all my spare time. Definitely more time for ICANN, it's been my fulltime job for years anyway. With that and enough trivia from me, is there anybody, and if we can just move to the agenda slide please, away from the one I'm looking at which is telling me to mute when I'm not speaking, if we can just have a quick review of the agenda. On the agenda, Jeff

and I want you to note that we will, under Item 4, we're looking at the work plan. We will go back to the recent discourse in interchanges between some of you. And Jeff and I on the email list, that's where we will pick up that -- no agenda slide? Steve, (inaudible). I can talk through it, it's not too complicated. We have an agenda Item 4 and the agenda Item 4 is about the adjusted work plan and that's where we will pick up our discussion on the recent changes on the email. With that, we have 2 topic discussions for today, both exciting adventures.

The first one is supplemental topic review of auctions, mechanism of last resort. And the second one is supplemental topic review of auctions, use of private auctions. So with that, I will try and continue to draw breath without agonizing pain and hand it over to Jeff. Over to you, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman:

Thanks, Cheryl. Please rest your voice and glad you have more time. Congratulations on your retirement and glad to hear that you have more time for us. So a little preface, or just a full start, you'll see up on the screen and we sent out over the weekend some very, very, very preliminary drafts of 2 of the topics that we've been reviewing the past couple of months. The supplemental topics which will include a supplemental initial report, hopefully to be released prior to the ICANN meeting in Barcelona. So just a bunch of disclaimers. This is a first attempt to put something down on paper that looks or has a very similar format to what you've seen in the initial report. The things here that are listed as recommendations or in the discussions they will likely go through a series of changes, depending on our result of our conversations as well as anything submitted of course through the email lists.

Unlike the way we treated the topics for the initial report where we had several work tracks, individual work tracks dealing with the topics, as you are aware, we haven't had too many sessions where we've gone through and thoroughly discussed recommendations for preliminary findings or things like that. So these meetings will all at the beginning, so for the next several weeks, will operate more as discussion items than they will as a review of initial report text. So again, trying to put enough disclaimers in, saying that unlike in the initial report when we reviewed it with the full group, here we are commenting on the original substance, here we are going to discuss these issues and to see whether or not we do agree or not with some of the recommendations.

Now, this very early first draft was one that was done by the leadership team in conjunction with ICANN staff or I should say done by ICANN staff in conjunction with the leadership team. As always, ICANN staff does a lot of the heavy lifting for us. So please do -- we'll go through this in painstaking detail, but please do go through it, let's get into a discussion on these items, let us know if you think we're on the right track or not.

Okay. I'm seeing a note from Karen that says that the Operator keeps breaking in the line. Is there -- okay, so that might just be with Karen? Just trying to make sure this is not a systemic problem here. Others are typing, saying it's clear. Good. So we'll move on and hopefully Karen will be able to get through. And Jim, I see your hand, so please.

Jim Prendergast: Yeah, Jeff, thanks a lot. Jim Prendergast. Just to clarify one thing, or maybe the cycle in which we'll be discussing this, I know the -- my sense is the vast majority of the input to these documents was garnered from the breakout groups that we did in Panama and then some discussions on the calls since then. But I don't know as a whole how much time the entire PDP working group has had to marinate on this. So is it your intention to just discuss these 2 on this call today? Or are they going to be on another call in 2 weeks or whatnot, just with the rotating times? I know we have about 17 people who are part of leadership or staff on the call which is not a big number of folks, so I just want to make sure we've got ample time to talk these through. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks, Jim. I see us as having multiple opportunities to go through each of these topics. So have not yet caucused with the team to see whether next week, or sorry, the next call in 2 weeks, will just be on like an initial kind of go-through discussion on the 2 or whether we'll try to do all 4. My guess is that we'll just do an initial go-through of the next 2 and then come back. So the plan you'll see, when we talk about number 4, is to have weekly calls. So there should be many times that we should be able to hit these topics. But hopefully, each time we hit it, we'll be making forward progress in that direction.

In the first part, you said that most of it was gleaned in the breakouts. I'm not sure how -- I couldn't really assign a percentage to how much of it was gleaned from the breakout versus how much was from the subsequent conversations on it, but yes, the main sources were the breakouts plus the discussions that we've had since.

Jim Prendergast: One of the issues or one of the things just to keep in mind is, you can't be 4 places at once. So if you were in Panama, you can only do one breakout session. Then the subsequent meetings frankly, they were taking place during, sorry Cheryl, but the Northern Hemisphere vacation period, so I know we didn't have full participation throughout the summer on those calls. So I think it's important once we get here into the early fall, to have some thorough discussions on them. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Jim, and hopefully we'll be able to get discussion going and then if we need to have further breakouts or we need to have further discussions on the list, we'll certainly do that. So let's go through, now that we've kind of given all the disclaimers, and remember, the goal of this is to come out with an initial, supplemental initial report that we will be seeking comments on from the community. So this is a place where we not only want to gather whether there are recommendations that we want to put out there for comment, but also questions that we want to ask the community to weigh in on. So in addition to the community weighing in on the recommendations, are there other things that we think will help us or other information we could try to illicit in order to help us come up with final recommendations down the road?

So all of that said, when we talk about auctions in 1.1 we're talking about mechanisms, the mechanism of last resort. Actually, in the guidebook, the

implementation guide in line F was the really only thing prior to the drafting of the guidebook that discussed how to ultimately resolve string contention if at the end of it that there are qualifying strings. This basically said that contentions should be resolved within an established timeframe and if there's no mutual agreement, that a community, basically a community application, that qualifies as a community, etc., would prevail. But if there was no claim of community, and no mutual agreement was put in place, then the ICANN board was tasked with making the final decision using advice from staff and expert panels. So the ICANN staff took that guidance from the GNSO final report and did a number of different studies and ultimately along with the first draft of the applicant guidebook, ICANN published an explanatory memo that examined different ways of how to resolve something as a last resort and included things like comparative evaluations and included just chance, so just randomly pick one. And it also included auction. And the paper went into a number of reasons why each one would be, or the pros and cons of each one, so the positives and negatives of each one. And ultimately concluded that for a variety of reasons, that an auction should be used as a mechanism, as the mechanism of last resort. Although there were a large number of changes to the guidebook and the mechanics of the auctions, the use of auctions as a concept made it all the way through from the first draft all the way through the final draft. And even though there was this lengthy discussion in the final application, through all the versions of the applicant guidebook on auctions, it still was hoped that parties that were involved in string contention would be able to come to some kind of voluntary agreement prior to being forced into this auction. But as we've discussed many times, there were a number of obstacles that were put into place. Some were intentional, some were not intentional. That prevented parties from reaching mutual agreement. If there was to be a voluntary agreement, it was expected that that agreement would result in only one application surviving and the others being withdrawn. So in many ways, that precluded a number of material changes to the application. So things like joint ventures and others that would have been a natural result of mutual agreement, weren't allowed.

We are going to deal in greater deal with change requests in section, and you'll see it on page 2, you'll see that there is highlighted sections. For now, that's the current section number of where we'll put the discussion, but that may change, that's why it's highlighted. So in 1.4, so for the next call, you'll have a section on change requests. And then also, we discussed in Section 1.2, the use of private auctions as they occurred in the last round and in our discussion on how we think it will play out going forward. And just for more background, on top of page 2, after an open procurement, a company called Power Auctions was selected as the vendor to do the auctions as last resort. They chose something called an ascending clock auction and a number of rules were put into the guidebook on how that would be conducted and the auction process was self-funded meaning that the proceeds from the completed auctions cover the cost and expenses of the provider. And currently there is a cross community working group that's deciding what to do with those, the money so far that has been received from the use of the ICANN auction. So that's kind of the background, and Kavouss, you have a question?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I have a comment in fact. Not question. The comment is that this CCWG on auctions is about 1.5 years old, 20 months we are talking and talking and talking, we recanted them, so on and so forth for these auctions, that they believe that this is the continuing process. And they will cost them a considerable amount of money. Currently they have \$355 million and I think (inaudible) so on and so forth. So this is one side of the coin. The other side of the coin is that in the work that might be discussing who is winners, who is losers? If somebody has an application of 50 names, and 30 of those 50 cannot prevent that and object, but their objection is not taken into account, they would lose the process to the one who has the money. So you have to decide that up to what level these auctions would be used? Whether it will be used on the expense of the people who have rights, they have rights of identity, you have rights of populations, you have rights of society, on culture, so on and so forth. So keep the possibility for the people who have money to push and get that gTLD. So we should be quite troubled not advocating, not encouraging these auctions that's giving the room to the people, okay, you have money, dump it into other things. It is not a fair process. This auction if not fair process. I am not excluding the auction, but I am not going to say that we should try to take auction as much as possible in order to push data out of the bucket. So we should be quite careful and everybody is looking to us to see what we will do there. That is number one. Number two, what is the relation of your group with this auction group? Do you communicate with these others? We have exchanged views with these others or not? Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Kavouss. On the last question, we do not, we're not currently in communication with the CCWG. It was our, at least initially, at least for now, was our belief that the CCWG is really just addressing what to do with the money that's already there as opposed to whether auctions should be used in the future. So we have not really been in communication with them, but I'm interested to hear from others if they think that that's necessary. I'm not as familiar with the CCWG group, so maybe Cheryl or others, if you are, if you want to weigh in as to whether we should be communicating? Alan, you have your hand raised. Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you and I am a member of the CCWG. I don't see any need to communicate. The premise of the CCWG is this is money that is there. It is not expected or that it would be supplanted with additional money from future auctions. There may be future auctions. That money may go in to the same place or it might go somewhere else. There are some people who certainly have said they don't want to see this as a continuing process. I won't go into that. But at this point, CCWG auctions is looking at how to use that money. There is no presumption that there is going to be more and there is no expectation that we need to communicate as far as I can tell. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks, Alan. On the other point that Kavouss raised, so up until today, and then I'll come to Anne, up until today it seemed to be the view of the group that if we can get certain other things straightened out, meaning things like allowing certain types of changes and making sure that all of the priority, the community priority evaluation runs smoothly and everything else, that ultimately at the end of the day, most people, when we've had this discussion, believed that

the ultimate last resort should be an auction. So you'll see that in Section C as the first preliminary recommendation. But you will see, Kavouss, to your point, in Section E, about how some participants believe that an auction obviously favors those with the most amount of money as opposed to those that may use the TLD best, if you could describe the word best, in terms of in the public interest. So questions that we have are focused on whether there are other ways other than an auction to decide those types of cases. And then you'll see recommendation number 2, just to try to go back to C on page 2, it should say, however, there should be additional options for applicants to voluntarily resolve contention sets by mutual agreement before being forced into an auction of last resort. And that we discussed more in the separate section that we'll present or we'll discuss in 2 weeks. So with that, Anne and Alan, please.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks, Jeff, it's Anne Aikman-Scalese for the record. I was just noticing on the summary on page 8, and this relates to the question of possible coordination or not with the CCWG on auction proceeds, that pay date, we comment, members of the working group, and this is the next to the last paragraph on page 8 I think, members of the working group seem to support the idea of only allowing public auctions with the resulting funds to be used to support gTLD related activities such as universal acceptance, applicant support, maintenance fees, etc. So I just wanted to note that I think with respect to the CCWG, there are some, I don't know, charter type guidelines. Although they haven't chosen a mechanism, I think they have some kind of subject matter use of those funds. So my only concern there would be if we came in with a recommendation out of SubPro that was in conflict somehow with those guidelines that came out of auction proceeds, that would present some logistical problems if that had to merge into the mechanism chosen ultimately by auction proceeds. So some coordination might be appropriate. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Ann, this is Jeff, just to clarify, page 8 and the next section that we'll deal with, is dealing with the private auctions as a mechanism for applicants to resolve. That's prior to reaching the auction of last resort. And so some members of the group, and this is in the discussion, it's not in the recommendations or in the -- it's not in the recommendations. But it just says that for private auctions, most of the group, we'll discuss this later, was not in favor of private auctions. But they said that if there were private auctions, the money, some members felt the money shouldn't go to the applicant, it should go to a new gTLD cause. So I do take your point that we'll need to make that, if that stands, we'll need to make that clear and we may need some work on this. Alan, please?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I'm going to try to tie a few of these subjects together. Some of us all along have been talking about the need for different categories of TLDs. One could in theory have a category of a public interest TLD that is not a community TLD. So if there were such a category, one could give those kind of TLDs some level of priority also. So even if a city TLD or a country TLD is not a community for one reason or another, if we had gone along the path of having that kind of categories and giving them special privileges, they could have been among those that are treated differently if there was a contention set. At this point, we haven't

gone that path and I suspect we're not going to go and revisit it, but certainly some of us would have liked to see that as an outcome.

I said there is no connection with the CCWG and our group, and I'll give you an example of how there might have been. One of the things the CCWG could have talked about, and we never have really talked about this, is to put aside a fund that would use public interest TLD applications and fund their auction, their participation in auctions for instance. So addressing Kavouss' issue of it's not fair that some really good TLD applicants may not have a lot of money, and therefore can't win in an auction, and conceivably that could have been funded out of the CCWG cause and the previous auctions, I don't foresee that happening. And to be honest, I don't think there's enough money to do that in a practical way because the money could go awful quickly that way. But it could have been a way that we connected the 2. But that isn't the way it's gone.

And I'll add one more point. We talk about private auctions where the money is divided among the participants. There will be nothing that would stop ICANN from holding auctions and redistribute the money with the losers. That could have been in our design instead of holding onto the money and using it for other things. That's not something that we seem to have considered. But it's not a path that is illegal for any reason. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman:

Thanks, Alan. I've seen some discussion in the chat and I want to make sure we capture some of it. So I'm going to go up a little bit here. Let's see, so Kavouss says, or Phil says, there will be more -- there are still contention sets to complete. Kavouss says, any alternative record to resolve any problem is preferable to auction. Banda says, the previous alternative for communities to get letters did not work. And then there's an agreement from Banda with Kavouss about having a timestamp and I guess first come first serve. That I guess is subject, just to go back to the first come first serve, that was something that was already in the initial report and it seemed like most people were against a first come first serve mechanism. So I'm a little bit puzzled because I know Kavouss, you were not in favor of a first come first serve approach. So this seems to suggest something different. But putting that aside, Anne is correct that the sentence on page 8 does say public auction. I've got to look to see whether that was just a typo or whether we should put that discussion item in the other section. Whether it was really meant to relate to private or to public. So those are some notes that I've taken.

Anybody else have -- if we go back to the questions for or the recommendations, so assuming -- so putting aside the issue of whether we should have, I think Alan, you said another category for public interest. So let's say, put that aside for a moment, let's say we do have that for argument's sake. Even then, there's still going to be at the end of the day, there still could likely be contention sets. And are we all comfortable with the notion that when everything is said and done, when all of the priorities have been decided, when everything else has been put into place, the very last thing, if there are 2 or more applications for the same string that are still in the contention, that the last resort will be an auction? So that is the ultimate question. And Alan, please?

- Alan Greenberg: I'll turn back the question to you. And I should know this, but I don't. What does the current applicant guidebook say about ending up with 2 applications which met the CPE criteria? If we could have had a contention set there, did it call for that? Did it call for auctions or something else?
- Jeff Neuman: Yes, this is Jeff Neuman. It called for auction just like if we had 2 geographic locations, both of which had the endorsement or letter of support or objection from the government. So let's say a government didn't want to pick one, for lack of a better term, winner. And a government supported 2 candidates, that ultimately that could go to an auction.
- Alan Greenberg: Well we only have 3 choices. It's auction, toss a coin/random selection, or put it before some panel who will evaluate the merits. There are no other options I think. So of those, which do we find more acceptable?
- Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks, Alan. And so that's my question. Steve, please?
- Steve Chan: Thanks, Jeff. This is Steve Chan from staff. And actually, I think there might be a little more nuance for the case where there's 2 CPE candidates that meet the criteria. Let's say for argument's sake, there's a third one who is not a CPE candidate. The way I recall the applicant guidebook being written, it would be an auction between just the two CPE candidates that both successfully passed the CPE criteria. And I believe for the geographic names, if there is 2 applicants that received support from the relevant governments, I guess I'm struggling with these rules a little bit, but I believe the CPE one, I think I have the background on that one correct and I might think a little bit more on the geo one and drop a note in the chat. Thanks.
- Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks, Steve. So yes, there was that additional complication that the auction would only be between the "qualifying" community applicants in that case. Yes, that's the part I left out. Thank you. I have Maxim, then Kristina.
- Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Please do not meet auction, which is something local government does, to issue a letter of non-objection. Because if before the organization began an applicant. Because with these letters or non-objection from the local government you are not an applicant. It's a qualification. So please do not meet a hypothetical auction which is ran by local government between few organizations which wanted to go with the gTLD for their name. Has nothing to do with ICANN. It's their local matter. And if these, some other local governments, issues for example 4 letters of nonobjection, then all 4 organizations can be applicants. And then you have an auction between them if ICANN (inaudible). Thanks.
- Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Maxim. Kristina?
- Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette for the transcript. A few comments which are really only related to generally because they deal with auctions. First, regarding the CCWG auction proceeds, I realize obviously that the charter that CCWG is limited to the

proceeds of the 2012 round. But I do think it's relevant for this group what their recommendations ultimately are. Obviously not because they are binding in any way, but it could be, and hopefully not the case, but it could be that their final recommendation is one that so many members of this working group find to be unpalatable, that that informs our decision as to whether or not there should continue to be ICANN auctions or whether we should actually keep private auctions.

Second, with regard to the option of having a panel choose, I have very strong feelings against that option. It's my understanding, and it has been for many years, that the whole point of all of the very elaborate criteria that were developed and put into the 2012 guidebook, were to avoid essentially beauty contests such as that. And finally, although I do not purport to be an expert on nonprofit corporation and/or tax law, it seems unlikely to me that ICANN would, if an auction was conducted, then be able to distribute the proceeds among the participants. Because I think once those proceeds were paid to ICANN, they, ICANN's nonprofit status to meet financial implications that that has, would then apply to those proceeds such that they couldn't go back to the losing bidder so to speak. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Kristina. Okay, anyone else have -- I'm sorry, let me go back here just to make sure I covered the comments. Actually, while I look at the comments, Sarah, please. Sarah, I can't hear you.

Sarah: Sorry. Can you hear me now?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, great. Thank you.

Sarah: I was just thinking (inaudible - phone line faint and very distorted).

Jeff Neuman: Sarah, I'm sorry, it's hard to hear you. Can you turn up the volume? We heard parts of it, but then it came in and out. Can you just repeat?

Sarah: Sorry, is that better?

Jeff Neuman: Much, thank you.

Sarah: Great. So I was thinking about maybe the working group could think about alternatives to private auction being the sole last resort contention resolution mechanism. So maybe we could put a bit more thought into it including a review of the pros and cons of exclusively applying auctions as last resort as a sole method for resolving contention sets. So I'll put forward one. You could also have contending applications being evaluated by third parties. And you could also look at mechanisms whereby perhaps you might reduce the number that need to go to last resort. You could, I don't know, have graduated fees for each additional string that could be applied for, that might reduce the number of applications that would automatically go to the auction of last resort. I just think it might be worth us putting some thought into those.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Sarah. That's helpful. One of the things that may help us with that is if we can, maybe Steve as an action item, can we send out to the group the explanatory memo that went -- it's cited in here in a footnote I think. The one that went out with the version of the guidebook, and see if we have anything to add to that. Because that did a decent job in trying to compare the different mechanisms, the comparative versus chance versus the auctions. So that is now over 10 years old, that memo, so it is certainly worth us looking back into it to see if things have changed from that initial evaluation. Greg, please.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. I've been looking at the AGB on this and it's even more confused or nuanced I think is a better word, than people may think. If you look at page 221 to 222, if there is more than 1 application for a string for the same name, and the applicants have different government approvals, say Birmingham, Alabama and Birmingham, England, the application is suspended. Applications are suspended and they have to directly resolve it however they feel. And if ICANN, if it reaches a certain date, at the end of the application round or the opening of a subsequent application round, the applications are rejected and refunded. But if they have contention sets of 2 applications with support from the same government or public authority, then if that public authority requests it, you go module 4 which is basically the auction process. I don't see anything that says a capital city beats a noncapital city. I think Maxim implied that in the chat. I'm not saying that's wrong, I just don't know where it says that. So that seems to be at least the way all of that is supposed to work out. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Greg. And I saw as I was looking at the documentation, I'm going to put it into the chat, I saw this language. Hopefully it will not come up in a weird format, but I saw this language where it says that in the event a contentious set is composed of multiple applications where documentation of support from the same government or public authority, the application will proceed through the contention abolition procedures described in module 4 when requested by the government. Okay, so that's -- that is the one for geos. So let's put that aside for right now back geos have a lot of unique rules and we're dealing with governments. Let's talk about everything but geos and ultimately the very, very last step. So what I hear is that we do want to make sure that we look through information not only from the last round, but let's go back and review the explanatory memo for the reasons for which auctions of last resort were selected. And let's also see if there might be other ways, as I think Sarah put it, to provide a disincentive I think to go to an auction. So there are some things that we still need to look at. If we can just -- I know just to be cognizant of time, the other things that we've put into this draft are some specific questions in Section E, so please do take a look at those questions and see if there are any additional questions we should be asking. So that's on page 3. And then a discussion of the deliberations. Also take a look at that, see if there's information that we've missed, and we'll obviously update this section to encompass the discussion that took place today. Are there any other comments or thoughts on the Section, well for now it's 1.1?

Still some discussion on the geos in Chat which we will capture. Okay, turning to Section 1.2, now this is solely with the use of private auctions. So again, it's the

same, is there any relevant policy on this, cites the same GNSO implementation guidelines, so nothing specifically that addresses private auctions. There is just a note that contention should be or could be resolved by mutual agreement. And so although it was not contemplated in the guidebook, there were private auctions that took place. There's a lot of information that, or most of the information is not in terms of how much money came out of it. It's not public nor are the amounts of all of the auctions that took place privately. But through some information released by at least at the time public companies, there is a sense that millions of dollars exchanged hands through these private auctions where the proceeds went to the participants that did not prevail. So the winner essentially, and the proceeds were used to compensate the private auction provider and then the other participants. So one of the preliminary recommendations, so on each of the discussions that we've had, both in Panama and afterwards, it seemed like there was general agreement from the participants that the group was concerned about moving forward with the use of private auctions. So that seemed to be a common theme. More specifically, and I'm the bottom of page 6 right now, into page 7, which says more specifically, members of the working group are concerned that there would be some pals that apply for new gTLDs for the sole purpose of being a loser in a contention set resolved via private auction and for which the applicant would receive compensation that's greater than the application fee. And thus, many working group members were opposed to the use of private auctions to resolve string contention in future new gTLD procedures. And in order to implement that, the Applicant Guidebook and terms and conditions should be amended to state that the resolution of string contention should be a private auction is disallowed. Further, the base registry agreement should include a provision that states that if a registry operator is shown to have taken part in a private auction for their given string, it may result in having that TLD taken away from them.

So pretty strong from the conversations that we've had, so let's have a discussion. What thoughts -- does anyone credibly oppose this, think we're going in the wrong direction? Anyone have something positive to say about private auctions? Kristina, please?

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette. While I understand the concern that has been articulated about potential applicants applying solely for the purposes of losing private auctions, I'm not sure that there is a mechanism short of prohibiting private auctions, which I'm opposed to, that will address this in a way that doesn't become I guess too big brother-ish. And as for the implementation guidance, I really -- I think if the applicants in the contention set want to resolve their contentions through private auction, I think they could be permitted to do so. Partly just on principle, and partly because as I said earlier, from my view it's important to see what the recommendations are going to be coming out of CCWG auction proceeds before we eliminate private auctions as a contention set resolution of option of last resort.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thank you, Kristina. Sarah is in the queue and while, well just before Sarah comes up, if you could either in Chat or if you want to raise your hand again or if you want to supply it later on, if you could just go into some rationale as to why

you'd be against this kind of prohibition. This is something that is good to hear, it would be great to just put that kind of rationale in there regardless of how the rest of the group or others in the group, it would definitely be good to include that in the discussion deliberations if not in the recommendations if other people agree with that as well. So again, doesn't have to be provided now, but just if you could submit some of that, that would be great. Sarah, please?

Sarah Angstrom: Sarah Angstrom for the transcript. I'm just not sure that we've got enough information to make solid recommendations here. I think it would help maybe if the working group could get more information about private auctions from ICANN staff and maybe from the auction service providers themselves. So if we could understand more about what if any complaints or I don't know, abuse for example, were received about the use of private auctions, maybe if we have some of that hard data for us to consider when we are deliberating, then that would be helpful for us.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Sarah. We can ask. I will note that I think the private auction data, I think when people went to the private auctions, they signed nondisclosure agreements, so I'm not sure what information we'll be able to glean from that, but we can try. There's no harm in trying. So we can certainly reach out to ICANN staff. And I'm not sure this is a recommendation that stems from the fact that there were complaints about the private auctions. I think it stems from the concerns that working group members had that applicants may apply for the sole purpose of getting compensated. And that that was, if I can just recall back from the Panama meeting, there were some that expressed concern that it would not look good for ICANN, it would harm the reputation of introducing new gTLDs, just became a way in which speculators could make money by applying for strings that it believes it has no intention of running in the public interest, but more so just to make some money off it. So that's where it stems from and I'm not sure that that relates to complaints about how the private auctions went. But I could be wrong, so Christa, or anyone else that was involved, sorry, I don't see Christa on the call, but anyone else that was involved in those discussions, if you want to raise your hand and just make sure I got that right. I don't want to speak out of turn. Alan, please?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, thank you. I was going to ask basically the same question of where did the idea come from that there were complaints. I certainly hadn't heard anything about that. So if Sarah has any insight into that, and my understanding was similar to yours that these private auctions were indeed private and there is not necessarily any information, unless it was provided by one of the participants. So I'm a little bit mystified on that. On a more lighthearted note, if ICANN is going to get upset that there are speculators trying to make money on what we do involved in ICANN, I think we're already in trouble. But thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Alan. So look, let's try to get some data if we can. If those of you -- I know of one or two private auction companies that participated. If people know others or could submit the names to us, we'll see if they are able, willing or able to provide us with any data. So let's try to get some data and in the meantime, Sarah, please?

Sarah Angstrom: Well I was just going to say, I think that's the point, we don't know. So were there -- I don't know, what applicants -- did they feel under pressure? And I don't know. To your point, Jeff, I think that we should ask.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Sarah. I agree with that, so we'll try to -- if some of you used private auctions or knew of private auction companies and are willing to just give us the name of those companies along with the contact person, we'll be happy to ask if they have any data that they're able to provide us. Just going to the Chat, Greg is saying I don't think we can prohibit private auctions. Greg, I'm curious if you could explain a little bit more of that, what the concerns are, and whether the threat of losing your registry is a meaningful enough stick you can use. There's other comments in there about, sorry, some more geo comments, I'm trying to go past that. My Chat got stuck. So Alan, please?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I just wanted to comment on Sarah's last comment on was anyone pressured? Certainly we know based on the .web outcome that all it took was one of the participants who said no and private auction would not go ahead. Now to what extent someone is privately pressured and gives in, that's a different matter and I'm not sure we can track that at all. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks, Alan. Greg, please?

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. Perhaps my thinking is that by prohibiting or attempting to prohibit private auctions, we're getting into a bridging freedom of contract or freedom of the parties to work things out however they see fit. Because right now there is no instruction that says you can only do a private auction. Basically, they're allowed to work it out amongst themselves just like two geos from different places with the same string. They can do an auction, they could do a cooperation agreement, they could do all sorts of things. So I think taking one solution out of hand, I suppose technically we could, although again, you're kind of getting to the issue of not allowing them to pick the way they want to resolve the contention set amongst themselves if they can. And if you have neither private auctions nor public auctions, I'm not sure what's left. I don't think we'd want to prohibit private auctions and only have the last resort auction where I can get some money. That would seem rather self-serving. I think that basing anything on hypothetical thoughts of massive abuse and the people or companies who are so flushed that they can buy and trade in TLD applications, the way others do in second level domains, it's so highly speculative, it would be a very difficult thing to use to base policy on. I think if we were to prohibit private auctions, we'd really have to start getting into what else we're prohibiting or what else we are not prohibiting with regard to what private parties can do amongst themselves. Or we take it away from themselves and put it into some system that we monitor from beginning to end. And I think they have all of this fraught with difficulty. I see no reason to say it is expected to result in abuse. It's certainly not expected to result in abuse. There could be some marginal cases where there would be abuse, but creating an alternate universe where there's just massive abuse of auction proceeds, of private auctions, I suppose the biggest abuse could be said to have occurred in the rest round when some companies seemed

to be happier to lose and get paid back than they were to actually win an auction. I won't make any comparisons to recent presidential elections in the United States and about unintended outcomes, but in any case, I think we have to look at the good and bad points of private auctions a lot more carefully including whether we should be looking at them at all as opposed to just leaving it to the parties to use them where they see fit. Because I think we're wandering into kind of such highly speculative territory, that it's a very bad basis for policy. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Greg. Kavouss, and then I'll read some comments from the Chat. Kavouss, is your mic on?

Kavouss Arasteh: Sorry, I do not understand whom we are defending? Rich people to apply auction to override the rights of the others? Why some people so emotional here, emotional working (inaudible) emotional (inaudible), and so on, so forth? Monopolizing everything, especially of the rich people. (Inaudible)? I don't understand.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks, Kavouss. There definitely seems to be some different opinions today than there were from the last conversations, and that's great. In going to the Chat, we have Kristina pointed out the rationale saying, (inaudible) won't move on me. Any concern that there will be some applicants that apply for new gTLDs for the sole purpose of being a loser in a contention set resolved via private auction seems misplaced. First, others have noted we have no data to support such statement. Second, if the contention set members all agree to participate in private auction and must all agree for the auction to go forward, then it should be permitted to do so. The analysis for deciding to participate in a private auction inherently included a determination by each participant of its respective bid cap, and at that amount, the amount each losing bidder is likely to receive if a contention set participant accepts the outcome of that analysis, it should be their prerogative to do so. How the proceeds are likely to be. Oh, sorry, should have deleted that last part, sorry. Christopher Wilkinson says that all sorts of things should be transparent. Karen Bernstein weighs in, I heard that registries in the first round were looking for investors to fund the private auction, but I don't know whether the selling point was to win or lose the auction. Jim asks, or tells, these are public resources. How does allowing companies to make millions off of losing an auction in the public, how is that in the public interest? At least at the ICANN auction, those funds are going toward causes that support -- sorry, I lost my place here, people keep putting comments in, the overall health of the DNS. Greg says we can require -- or anything can be made transparent. Right now, we don't require the system to be transparent. Some more government discussions. Mike says we're inventing the boogeyman and then using them to justify policy. Alexander agrees with Greg, it's close to impossible to deny applicants to exercise some kind of auction type resolution process. Okay, Kavouss, you're back in the queue? Nope? Okay. So we have some differing viewpoints. I will say, I will go back to the notes, there were people that did comment in fact some existing registries that did admit that yes, they would apply in subsequent rounds for gTLDs for the sole purpose of trying to make money off of private auctions if it were not outlawed. So that is something that I do want to point out that we're not

necessarily chasing a boogeyman here. We do have some people, at least on the record in the meeting, saying that they would do so.

So let's get some more information about it, but let's also make sure that we have questions that address these types of things. So maybe we don't have these recommendations. But let's look at the questions that we have so far drafted and see if there are other ones. Also in the meantime, we have an action item to reach out to the private auction providers that we know about to see if we can get some kind of information or whether all of it is behind the wall of a nondisclosure or of nondisclosure agreements. Still looking at the Chat, is there anyone else that has any other comments they'd like to make on the use of private auctions?

Let me just draw your attention to the last question on Section E. It is page 7, the third bullet. It says, some believe, and this was discussed both in Panama and in the last discussion we had on this, some believe that if an application fee for TLDs were high enough, it would deter applicants from applying for TLDs with the intent of going through a private auction. Do you believe that increasing application fees will have that effect? Why or why not? If you agree, on what amount would application fees need to be set at to deter applicants from applying for TLDs with the intent of going to an auction? Also, implicit in that is if you set the application fee higher, you are then getting into the same problems we pointed out with the initial report that's already out for comment which is that setting a higher fee means or may discriminate against those in the developing world or those that want to apply for TLD but may not have \$185,000 or more to invest. So Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. As I think most people know here, I'm a strong supporter of keeping the fees reasonably high so these do not become a commodity that people can essentially speculate on. This is a valuable internet resource. It's the only internet we have and we shouldn't be giving away the core parts of it at a low price. And if we have those who we think deserve a better price, then we should find out a mechanism for doing that. Having said that, I don't think it is possible to set the price high enough to discourage people from speculating. We know from the auctions that ICANN did run that they tended to yield in the many millions of dollars. Not all of them \$100 million, but certainly in millions of dollars. And it would be hard to imagine a price set high enough to discourage that kind of speculation. Certainly doubling the price I don't think would do it, and I don't think we can do much more than that. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Alan. Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Jeff, I just want to remind ourselves the last auctions which were \$120 million to \$150 million, we don't want to just give it to ICANN to decide to go to the auction or not. We need to have in the candidates to see the appropriateness or otherwise of going to auction. And this may require something such as having a panel of the full authority plus several viewpoints from the various entities to decide the appropriateness otherwise of going to auction. We don't want to push those who don't have (inaudible) to be a victim of the people who have money. Jeff, this is very serious. It is very serious. The CCWG [is scheming] that there

would be mentions of dollars in future deals such as these going to require a very sophisticated design of how to manage that. But we have the \$30 million (inaudible). It took two years of work and so on, so forth, having many, many things and so on. Although unless we are looking for something in future, very, very great amount of money and taking that auction as a revenue procedure in ICANN? We need to manage that in a proper manner. We need to establish (inaudible) whether or not they are going to auction. In one case you have the auction (inaudible) automatic and so literally and so emotionally (inaudible) people who have money against all (inaudible) they may not have money, but they have rights. So we are setting rights of the people with money. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman:

Thanks, Kavouss. Great. I think there's certainly a lot of different views on this, and ultimately, we're going to be in a position to recommend something. So again, this is just a very first stab at it. Please, continue to comment through the email. Also, we'll put all these comments together and put together a revised draft. We are going to discuss this several more times, so there's no pressure to make sure you have everything in, but let's -- I want to have time to talk about the work plan and ICANN. So at this point, I'm going to wrap up the discussion on this document and turn to the work plan. So while that's being put up, the first thing I want to mention as the document is going up is that starting in September, not the first week of September, but September 10th, starting with that meeting, we'll be meeting every week thereafter for a few weeks up until the ICANN meeting. So throughout the summer after Panama we were meeting every other week. We're going to change that to every week so that we can get a number of things done. You've already seen that we have extended the public comment period for the initial report, or hopefully you've seen it. We were supposed to get comments initially by September 5th, but we have agreed to extend that until September 20 - someone help me with the date, I think it's 3 weeks, September 26th? So that's when comments are due. Because of those things, we had to change around the work plan which we went over on the last call, or maybe it was 2 calls ago. So if you look at this, September 10th we are going to have our next meeting which we'll continue to review the deliberation, recommendations, auctions, questions. So that will be to focus first and foremost on 1.3 and 1.4. We'll send that document out that governs the role of public comment as well as the changes to applications and any recommendation that stems from that. Then throughout September, we will meet each week, the 17th, the 24th and October 1st. So that's weekly starting September 10th. We will continue deliberations on this and work towards the release of an initial -- sorry, a supplemental initial report. The week of the 26th is when we're expected to get the public comments or the comment period will close, and ICANN staff will take the time between the 26th and the ICANN meeting to publish, October 12th, to publish -- I'm sorry, the 15th, to publish the public comment summary and analysis and provide a public comment worksheet to the working group that contains all of the comments broken out by sections. We have a tentative date of October 12th as to when we'd like to get out the supplemental initial report and then of course we have ICANN63. So those are some of the dates. There are some additional things, but let me -- Kavouss has a question, so let me go to that.

Kavouss Arasteh: Jeff, I am serious. We need to look to see whether we could have some sort of -- my plan isn't to manage, to govern the auction. Currently we have no mechanism and we have no procedures and we have no principles. If there are problems, we should note the results, go immediately to auctions and we know that who will win. Those who have money. That's all. We need to be firm. DNS is not a national resource but is similar to that. Everybody should benefit of that in the most favorable and the most neutral and the most fair approach. We need to think whether establishment of the panel, independent, neutral to look into the situation and decide whether or not the change has reached the safest that it should go to auction. But not immediately go to auction and have more money. If you have staff who have participated in the auction, CCWG auction, you know how people are advertising to receive \$130 million from various things, looking for some sort of way how to grasp that money, Jeff. So we need to be quite careful. This money is of those who lost the matter and we should not be spending for the other people. We need to have appropriate process. Please kindly, do not exclude consideration of having the sort of mechanism such as a panel in order to establish a proper mechanism for the auction and also decide what are the areas for time at appropriate moment that we have no other alternative but to auction, but not immediately auction. I don't want to leave this open ended. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you, Kavouss. We'll note all of that in a previous topic, so thank you for that. Jim, please.

Jim Prendergast: Thanks, Jeff. Jim Prendergast for the record. So two questions on the work plan. The supplemental initial report, is there some place that describes? It is just going to cover the 4 topics that we discussed in the breakouts in Panama? And then the second question I have is, I notice that this is from work tracks 1 through 4 only. At some point will we see a work plan that incorporates work track 5 as well? Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks, Greg. Sorry, Jim. Sorry, I was looking at the Chat. Sorry, Jim. Yes, this covers work tracks 1 through 4. The supplemental report will cover the 4 issues, only the 4 issues that we're discussing. There's nothing else in supplemental report. And this is the work plan to get us through to the ICANN meeting. Work track 5 has their own work and when we think we are at a point that we can merge those 2, then we will. At this point, until work track 5 is in a position that we're confident the initial report will go out, we're holding off on doing a joint one, although we do have it in the back of our minds and we will certainly as soon as we can try to have a joint work plan that has all of it together. But at this point, it's a little too speculative until we see more progress on that initial report and the date that that gets out. So sorry, Steve, you said 5 issues. What issue did I miss?

Steve Chan: Thanks, Jeff, this is Steve from staff. So the last one was registrar support for new registries.

Jeff Neuman: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, you're right. There are 5. My fault. Thank you, Steve. Yes, this is Jeff, you are right, there are 5. And hopefully we'll have the next 3, 1.2 through

1 -- sorry, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 out next week. Thank you, Steve. I totally blanked and this is why you guys are -- I can't -- Steve, you, Emily, Julie are all so helpful. Thank you. There are 5.

Okay, one of the other topics I wanted to bring up was the discussion we've had not the email list which we have about 12, 13 minutes or so to finish up. I've definitely seen a number, a couple of posts or a number of posts from a couple different people, on the -- so Cheryl and I and the leadership team have been discussing ways in which ultimately we will measure consensus and the discussions that have taken place, not only in this group, but with the council and otherwise, and the importance of making sure that consensus is not a quantitative decision, but a qualitative decision. The leadership team, which includes Cheryl, myself, as well as other, the current work track leaders, and I'll discuss that in a second, believe that it will help us in order to understand that when positions are taken, whether they are being taken by individuals or by constituency, stakeholder groups, advisory committees, interest groups, whatever. I'm just trying to include everyone, I don't mean to exclude anyone, it's just that I can't say that every single time. So for shorthand, I'll say the organizations. We'd like to know whether positions are being made in an individual capacity or whether they are being made on behalf of a particular group or organization. The other thing is, as we start to collect the comments, like what happened the last time, we tend to have, when we review those public comments, we tend to have questions about the comments that we get. Either clarification questions or questions about whether the group considered one thing or another. And what we noticed the last time in reviewing comments, that we didn't have single person that we could go to from these groups to give them an action item to go either answer those questions if they knew it off the top of their head, or even to go back to their groups to be the point person to go back to the group, get the answers and come back to the working group. As a result, we spent a lot of time trying to figure out what was meant. There were a number of wasted weeks where we thought we were getting comments back from a group when we had questions and we never did.

So the whole point of the exercise of getting one person and potentially an alternate from those groups was so that we could understand and have a person that we can understand the positions, that we can have a person that we could go to, to help us understand those positions. And ultimately at the end of the day, help us when we do measure consensus. It was never intended to discourage individuals from participating. It is not for that purpose. It is to help us have context of the discussions. And I know that there are people that are worried about it, so I'd love to make sure that we respond to the concerns and make sure that we address those concerns so that they are no longer concerns. But what we're looking for at this point is to have someone from each of the groups, so potentially 2, an alternate if they want, not as an empowered person to make decisions on behalf of that group, but someone that could be, I think Jim, you said it in your last email, a liaison. Let's call it that. But that's a tough one because we already have these capital L liaisons from our GNSO council. So we'll have to come up with a term, but that's what we're looking for. Kristina, and then Cheryl.

Kristina Rosette: Hi, Kristina Rosette. And I apologize for the clarification question, but I have been a little tied up with PDP lately. One possible alternative, and I don't know whether you all had considered this and rejected it, and if not, it would seem to me that it could partially address the need for having a representative or whatever. Would be to create and post in the PDP work space a kind of ongoing list of all of the questions. And the stakeholder group, constituency, SO, AC, whatever, to whom they are directed and kind of make it incumbent on those groups to review those documents and come back to us with input. I think that accomplishes a couple of things. First, it allows the working group to kind of continue working and make the folks who are going to care the most about clarifying their answers do that. And I think it also then to some extent eliminates the need for these intermediaries or whatever you want to call them. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Kristina. I see those as potentially working together. There's nothing limiting us from having that list, but then having a person also that we can go to, other than the chair of those stakeholder groups, constituencies etc., to go to that person and say, as an example, if it was you, Kristina, from the registries, hey, Kristina, we haven't heard from the registries, can you help us with this? Or something like that. So anyway, Cheryl, please?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Jeff. Cheryl for the record. And to some extent I'm picking up on what Banda has mentioned in Chat. But just an element maybe we should speak to this. I just wanted to let everyone else know that from an internal point of view, ILAC has already appointed lower case liaisons, little L liaisons for their own use, one from each region, to be engaged in our activity. So when you see Justin Chou in our calls, she's acting as a nexus on behalf of the Asia Pacific region. So her job is to make sure that that region is up to date in their monthly calls and bring any of their views back into our deliberations. And of course, does the same for ILAC in general. I'm assuming in the ILAC call later on today, that Alan may very well anoint these same 5 people who have already been appointed by ILAC in their informal sense to step up as spokesperson or whatever it is, but to do the work. Whether we do it on Wiki or anything else. But some of us already have responsibilities allocated and that's not going to cause any grief. And in fact, will fit in with whatever mechanism we put together to make it fair, reasonable and indeed transparent. So I just want to make sure that some contributors who will be responding to our request won't find this shocking or huge in cost or an erosion or an impairment. And certainly, that's not our intent. Thanks, Jeff. I just wanted to make sure that first of all our intent to simply ensure effectiveness and efficiency was noted and also on behalf of at least one advisory committee, see that we've already had lower case liaisons operating but in a unidirectional/bidirectional manner over time. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Cheryl. I'll also note there are some other groups or constituencies of the GNSO, or stakeholder groups in the GNSO, that have responded back, that have said, thank you, we'll pick someone as well. So the only objectives I've heard have been the ones over the last couple of days from members of the work plan. Anne, please?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you, Jeff. Anne Aikman-Scalese for the transcript. I tend to agree with both Kristina's suggestion and also what Jim Prendergast had responded in the Chat to you. I think there may be a couple of different issues that are being conflated here. Because the original proposal that came from leadership really gave the impression that you were going to use this tool as a manner of determining consensus qualitatively. Lately the conversation has morphed into well, you know, a lot of times there are questions that arise and we need to get clarification. So I want to clarify that my objections to the process that have been written in Chat, relate to what I consider a proposed new method of determining consensus by way of representatives from the various organizations. I certainly have no objection to posing clarifying questions and then of course within our own organizations, to use Jeff's term, we oftentimes will have internal debates on those questions. So it would be good if you guys could state whether the purpose of this is for determining consensus or whether it's for clarifying questions as now seems to be the discussion.

But then secondly, I don't think, and I don't know about other constituencies, but I very much agree with Jim's comment in the Chat, or not the Chat, on the list, that it's a bit premature and especially prior to receiving comments from the various organizations, because I think our organizations -- maybe they all know exactly where they stand right now, but we certainly don't -- I mean I'm on the drafting team in the IPC and we aren't there yet as far as trying to determine how unified we are. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Anne. So if you go back to the initial note that was sent out, it does talk about both just focus on the paragraph that I put out there in the first email which says, each of our group evaluating public comments to the initial report next month, we would like to request by September 14th, okay, so that's when comments were due, each constituency, stakeholder group, advisory committee, etc., designate one person and an alternate that is empowered to speak for that particular constituency, stakeholder group, advisory committee, to not let anybody discourage individuals from participating given their opinions, helping panelize comments, but rather just an attempt for Cheryl and I to understand that when a position is being taken by someone, it is as an individual contributor, an organization, or on behalf of a stakeholder group, constituency, advisory committee, etc. And then it goes into how consensus is measured qualitatively. I think ultimately, we will need to, Cheryl and I, will need to understand that this is our take and who they are taken by, whether it's an individual or a group, and the group is shorthand. Because yes, that will weigh into any qualitative analysis. This is to prevent a situation where you have the example I used before, 100 registrars show up and indicate their view and one person who opts for IPC, but is speaking on behalf of the IPC as a whole, is not treated in a quantitative manner as being one against 100. Or one against 99, I forgot the example I used.

So it is a tool to help us and I'm not -- I understand the concerns that are being expressed. I don't think it's premature to ask for when we start evaluating comments and start coming to the part of where we start thinking about final recommendations, to have an understanding of who is providing these

suggestions. I think that just creates a level of accountability. I do understand the concerns. We will try it in the short term as a more liaison role to help us with the comments and then we'll see how it goes from here to see if there are objections in the way that it's actually carried out. I think this will help Cheryl and I and the leadership team. So I know we're running out of time. Jim, real quick, and then I just want to make sure I cover -- I know we haven't covered ICANN63, I just want to make one brief statement about that and then we can go. So sorry for keeping us a little bit extra. Jim, please.

Jim Prendergast: Jim Prendergast. I'll be quick. But I'm sure this will continue on. But to me, when I signed up, I signed up as an individual and I've been participating as an individual to now suddenly creating what I thought was a new class of participant is my biggest concern. To me, it sounds like, as I noted in my email, that we are now talking about information gatherers and clarifiers as opposed to a new class of participant who trumps what Anne has to say even though she's been participating actively since the beginning. I think one of the challenges that you have as the leads of this PDP is to ensure that those who are part of it are actively participating. That's in the guidelines. To have somebody show up who hasn't been actively participating suddenly carry more weight I think is disingenuous and as Anne refers to, sort of discourages people from participating in an individual capacity in the long term. I'll end it there. I'm sure we'll go back forth on email more and I'm sure this isn't the last time we'll discuss it. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Jim. So duly noted. We'll discuss this with the leadership team. I do, and I'm sorry, I should have done this at the beginning, so we've had couple of changes in the leadership team. Unfortunately, Sarah Bachi and Karen Day have decided to leave the leadership team for different reasons, but both are continuing to participate in this group, so I want to just take this opportunity to thank them both. I should have done this at the beginning, so I apologize. I'll probably send around an email as well to thank them for all the hard work that they have done and also just a tremendous amount of help that they've been to Cheryl and I and to ICANN staff and everyone else. Sad to lose them on the leadership team, but glad that they are both sticking around to help us as we move forward. So thank you to them. And I think we'll discuss on the next call the division of work and how we're going to work the leadership team moving forward. So thank you, everyone, for staying the extra 4 or 5 minutes, and we'll talk to everyone in 2 weeks. Thank you.

Julie: Thank you, Everyone. Have a good rest of your day or night. We can disconnect our lines, and Ashley, can you stop the recording please?