

**ICANN Transcription  
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group  
Monday 06 June 2016 at 1600 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WG call on the Monday 06 June 2016 at 16:00 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:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-06jun16-en.mp3>

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Woman: Okay thank you. Good morning, good afternoon good evening welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on 6 June 2016 at 16:00 UTC. In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as we have quite a few persons. Attendance will be taking via the Adobe Connect room. So if you're only on the audio bridge please let yourselves be known now.

All right thank you. I'd also like to remind you all please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Also keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. I'd like to turn the call over to Avri Doria. You may begin.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. This is Avri Doria speaking. I'll be chairing this meeting. And to go through agenda the first thing is reviewing the agenda. Then we'll do the SOI check. Review of any action items. The bulk of the meeting will be spent on the cc1 document. An updated version was sent out at the end of last week. And in order to meet all the deadlines we will need to get this out

by the 10th in order to meet the deadlines for the Helsinki meeting. And then any other business.

At this point does anybody have any other business that should be added to the list? No okay. I'll ask again later. So any objections or changes to the agenda as it stands? Hearing and seeing none I will move on. So I'd like to ask about SOI's. Has anybody made an update or need to make an update to their SOI at this point? Seeing no hands and hearing nothing I just want to remind people that should your job conditions or (unintelligible) change that you should update your SOI and notify the workgroup at the beginning of the next call. Once again I'd like to check has anybody joined on the phone only who was not listed...

Vaibhav Aggarwal: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...in the rollcall?

Vaibhav Aggarwal: This is Vaibhav Aggarwal from India.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much, anyone else? Okay thanks. Then moving on its review of action items, Steve do you have that to show? Are there any action items updates at this point?

Steve Chan: Hi Avri. This is Steve Chan from staff. And so I actually don't have it to display as there's actually no changes from last week. The one thing that we will hopefully be able to check off very soon is cc1 but other than that there are no changes to the action items. And actually...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Steve Chan: ...I just wanted to note that there's some concerns about your audio. I'm not sure if (unintelligible) to mine as well but your audio is apparently a little

muffled mumbled and echoey. So just wanted to note that or bring it to your attention. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks for that. I'm using headsets with a microphone. I'll check my volume. It is unfortunately hot and humid. I do have an air conditioner on the background. I say unfortunately...

Vaibhav Aggarwal: Sorry we can't understand you. This is (Vivov) I still can't understand you.

Avri Doria: Okay. Is that any better? It's a little louder now?

Vaibhav Aggarwal: Yes, much better.

Avri Doria: Does that help any? Okay thank you. I have gotten someone head shy about it. I've been accused of being too loud at times. So okay so then on the action items thank you Steve. And I just wanted to point out that we have and I sent them out so what we have got - started to get the responses back on the collection of materials that had been submitted to the board as advice and that SSAC put out a documents that referred to three of the documents that they had gone through before.

I also wanted to quickly mention an action point on an action item that I'd like to add to the list that came out of last week's acceptance of our (unintelligible). One of the things that we had discussed in the leadership meeting before was that after the cc1 processing, and the Helsinki meeting, and dealing with those issues we might have a better idea of the timing it takes us to do stuff having created the tease by then or hopefully they will also have had time to give a view on the timings related to their work. So we have to pick a time at which we do come back specifically and take a look at our timeline. So I just wanted to make a note of that so we can add that. Any issues or questions on the action item for that?

No. Okay then moving on to the next item which is the cc1 discussion. In this case as was mentioned at our last meeting Steve Chan from staff has taken over the pen on this document and will take it through to its release by June 10. And therefore I turn the floor over to Steve who has done an integration of the comments and discussions we have had. So hopefully we can move through the changes and hopefully close on this document in this meeting. Thanks Steve the floors yours.

Steve Chan: Thanks Avri. This is Steve Chan from staff. And I just wanted to know first of all that Julie Hedlund is actually not available to take notes so please bear with me and expect the notes to not be quite as exemplary as usual. So as Avri noted in the AC room right now I have a red light cc1 which I have actually designated community comment rather than constituency comment. If anyone objects to that classification please let me know but that's the phrasing that I've ended up using in the document and I'm happy to switch to something else if there's any objection to that.

So first I wanted to start with some high level updates. First was I believe it was a concern raised by Greg Shatan about some confusion about how each of the subjects were phrased in the form of a question. And then followed by a number of sub-questions for which we're actually looking for responses from respondent.

So the way that we tried to address that the co-chairs and staff was kind of propose what were formally questions the subjected questions I tried to turn them into statements. And then following those statements tried to make sure that the explanatory remarks underneath those statements were linked to the sub-questions that followed. So hopefully Greg and others have had a chance to look at that and to determine if that makes sense or better sense in positioning the statements versus the sub-questions.

The other thing that was done was to obviously try to make the document come from a single voice. And one thing I had mentioned in - on last week's

call is that we would add question numbering to each of the sub-questions so that there's a better ease of reference when we're talking about it here and for respondents as well. So I believe those were the high level changes to the document. If there's any questions or comments there I'd welcome those now otherwise I'll go into the more specific updates for each page.

Avri Doria: Steve, this is Avri. I just wanted to add a comment that I put in the comments here so you can pull it out later is that while I have no objection to calling it community comments we need to just double check with the PDP guidelines. And if the requirement is for constituency comments then we just need to add a note, a footnote, a whatever to indicate that this community comment is in response to that requirement. Thanks.

Steve Chan: Thanks Avri. And Steve Chan again from staff and from what I recall and fortunate we have experts on the PDP manual in (Mary) and others. I believe it actually just says something to the effect of solicit input from SOs and ACs. I don't think that it necessarily has a specific name but I will double check to make sure and if (Mary) and others can chime in that would be great too. But I see (Mary) confirmed what I said.

So I guess just a little background why I switched it to communities. I felt that constituency was perhaps a little too specific in limiting in the term and community just seemed a little more open to the various entity types that we have in our community too so that was just the reason behind switching it to community comment.

Seeing no other comments I'll move on to the specific updates. I'm going to leave the documents synched. I think you should all have the document in your inboxes if you want to follow along on your own copy of this. So the first page what was changed is there is a - there had been a comment from (Carlos) about - so actually does below context.

The document had started off with a reminder about the solicitation for statements and advice and how it seemed a little I don't remember the phrasing that (Carlos) had used but it didn't seem to be well placed in this document. So I actually just completely removed it entirely and just cleaned up this first introductory statement. So that's the first change on Page 1. If there's any objections to that change please let me know. Otherwise I will move on.

So on Page 2 of the document the first thing that I changed so this is mostly about highlighting the well there's two things here. One is highlighting the six subjects that we are seeking comment on. And these were all reworded in regards to what I'd mentioned earlier about trying to make these subjects high level statements as opposed to sort of open ended questions. And so the word in here checks what I mentioned in the annexes. So the phrasing here matches how they're described in the annex. And if there's any specific comments about how these are phrased if they perhaps lost the intent or if there's any just grammatical issues please let me know.

Seeing no comments there I'll continue moving on. So the next section is coordination with other efforts. And so the thing that I added were a few other specific efforts I just wanted to make sure get highlighted in the bullet points. The first is the CCT Review Team. And I also wanted to highlight the - all the program reviews that primarily staff and contracted - or parties that they've hired to do some of that research I want to make sure that got listed.

The other thing I included was some efforts that the GAC or the Governmental Advisory Committee are undertaking. And then also some efforts that the SSAC may undertake to review (unintelligible). And I want to - I'm getting a little noise. I'm not sure if there's...

Avri Doria: Somebody needs to mute. Yes somebody needs to mute themselves.

Steve Chan: Thanks Avri. So I also wanted to highlight an email that - a comment that Susan Payne had raised. And I think it was a very good comment. Just to add a little more context to what we're looking for here and I think it's on the next page where there's (unintelligible). So as opposed to just asking that respondents consider these efforts and to determine whether or not there are any missing she suggested that we changed the text to say that we asked them to consider and clarify the extent to which the above identified efforts or any additional efforts within the committee should be considered by this PDP Working Group. But I think she's asking the reviewers of this document to also help us understand how they should be considered by this working group and in what context. And perhaps in regards to what subjects as well so I think that's a good suggestion personally. If there is any objections to integrating that comment please let me know by raising your hand or raising your voice?

Seeing no comments I'll continue. On Page 3 there is nothing of real significance added to this page other than just the change I just described that Susan Payne suggested. Again see no comments I'll move on to Page 4 which is where Annex A starts. And as a reminder the suggestion had been I believe from the last meeting to have the first couple pages to act as a cover letter and then all of the specific questions that we want to ask those are being contained in this Annex A.

So the first change that I want to note is each of the subjects has been listed as question one, question two, etc cetera. So as we've changed these to more statement based phrasings it certainly makes no sense to call them questions so I just change it to subject one, subject two, et cetera. For Page 1 we had as a group gotten through all the questions. And so I made no more than just a few grammatical changes to this page aside in my view I don't think there's any substantive changes that I suggested on this page but if anyone takes any exception or has any questions or comments I'd welcome them or perhaps we could read through all the questions again but I'm not

sure that's necessary. If anybody has any preference one way or another -  
Greg I see your hand. Please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan for the record. I'm not sure if this is premature but this is on question 1B of which as I read it says with the absence of an ongoing mechanism would the absence of an ongoing mechanism have an anticompetitive effect for a potential applicant? I don't know if we need to clarify what we mean by an ongoing mechanism. Do we mean any mechanism for future gTLDs or do we mean only one that is of a particular type because it seems to me if the question is if there are no more new gTLDs being offered at all would that of an anticompetitive effect for potential applicants? Is it a very different question than whether, you know, one type or another of ongoing mechanism would have an anti-competitive effect? Of course this whole thing presumes that people know what an anticompetitive effect actually is.

But assuming for the moment that not having any new gTLDs would be anticompetitive since some companies would have gTLDs and some wouldn't it seems like the question is either too obvious or too obscure. So I just don't know if it's clear that what an ongoing mechanism - that ongoing mechanisms cover all potential methods of having applications for gTLDs and that the absence of an ongoing mechanism basically means the window is closed forever or till some future policy development process. Thanks.

Steve Chan: Thanks Greg. Sorry Avri I see you're next.

Avri Doria: Yes thanks. This is Avri speaking. Perhaps and I think that the meaning was supposed to be not having any more subsequent procedures. So perhaps this phrase could change if I'm understanding it correctly to would the absence of subsequent procedures for new gTLDs have an anticompetitive effect. Would that work for the ambiguity that you are seeing? Thanks.

Greg Shatan: I would -- this is Greg if I could reply -- I'd say we should be even less ambiguous and more concrete in our terminology especially given that we're dealing with, you know, people for whom English is not their first language. So it would be - so I'd say maybe it should be with the absence of new gTLD applications have an anticompetitive effect or the mechanism to apply for a new - any mechanism to apply for a new gTLD well, you know, what we're talking about here is kind of if you're explaining this to a third grader it would be no you can't buy any more. So we should be that concrete.

Steve Chan: Thanks Greg. This is...

Vaibhav Aggarwal: Hi. This is...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Chan: Please go ahead.

Vaibhav Aggarwal: This is Vaibhav Aggarwal for the record. I think third graders are not expected to be a part of the new gTLD process. And this question is very aptly worded in saying that ongoing mechanism is part of the present tense and not future. So I think this is short and a sweet question for people who are related to the industry and not, you know, outsiders any which way. So it's not meant for people outside the purview or people who are not involved in this process. So I think the question should stay and as is format. Thank you. And now I'm in the chat room I am just getting off the phone now.

Steve Chan: Thank you. This is Steve Chan again from staff. And so I see there's a few varying - I guess from a staff perspective to us it makes sense certainly to make the question as clear as possible. And at least from that perspective I don't have an objection what Greg suggested. I think that makes (unintelligible). And to his point actually I mean perhaps to answer to this question is perhaps maybe too obvious.

Actually you need the (unintelligible). I'm not sure if that's what Greg was. There is no mechanism to apply or those who are already in the market are the only ones who are able to compete in that market. So Greg you had us – otherwise or I guess or any other working group as I would suggest actually take Greg's text?

Seeing no further comments we will continue moving on. And we'll take Greg's suggestion into that text. Greg I see your hand again. Please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Just briefly I note that the term ongoing mechanism appears repeatedly in this entire section, I mean up here elsewhere so either we need to kind of edit it out or we need to make it into a defined term but the more concrete, and clear, and unambiguous we can be the better. So that's kind of just, you know, an overall note there.

Steve Chan: Thanks Greg. This is Steve again from staff. Did you have a preference either way? Appreciate your comment on that point. I think partly what - by dancing around and not using a word like rounds that's really short and we have ended up with slightly clunky phrasing. So I was just wondering if you had a preference for using different phrasing or if you actually would prefer to define the term or any others that want to comment on that? Actually I also see Avri in the queue. So please go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. I'm trying to be good and put myself in the queue when I'm having opinions and not acting like a chair. One possibility should those get used is to add a footnote explaining ongoing mechanism once and then not worry about changing it throughout the document. And, you know, even to say that because the group is not speaking around until a decision has been made on round, you know, we're using this phrase. And this phrase indicates, you know, the fact that you can't buy any more or the fact that there will be new processes for obtaining new gTLDs in the future or something like that. And that basically responds both to the comment that says this is clear that we got

from one speaker and the fact that it needs clarification that we got from others. Thanks.

Steve Chan: Thanks Avri. Greg I see your hand. I'm not sure if that's an old hand?

Greg Shatan: New hand. Just briefly I think we should get rid of the word ongoing. Ongoing means something that's continuing or in progress. So that's I think part of the ambiguity or confusion. You know, technically at least we don't have an ongoing mechanism because there's no mechanism that's currently in progress to get new gTLDs. So, you know, we use the word mechanism or just process would be fine. I think that would remove half the ambiguity right there. And then if we want to, you know, define that I think we'll be better off but I think ongoing was the root of a lot of confusion for me. Thanks.

Steve Chan: Thanks Greg. Avri please go ahead. I also had a quick comment. I add myself after Avri.

Avri Doria: Well if you want to go before me all I was going to say is we do have an ongoing mechanism which is the AGB. And if nothing is changed that is an ongoing mechanism.

Steve Chan: Thank you Avri. This is Steve from staff again. And so I guess I just wanted to highlight where the phrasing ongoing mechanism came from. And it's actually I believe from the 2007 recommendations in that it was a policy development process was intended to establish an ongoing mechanism for potential applicants to apply for new gTLDs. So that's I believe where the phrasing came from. And so whether or not we want to get rid of it and choose something different I'm not sure.

I - sorry just reading Greg's comment real quick. So it looks like Greg has an objection to using the phrasing. I don't know if you feel strongly this is a die in the ditch kind of issue for you or if we can just simply define the phrasing in some manner either in the text or as a footnote as was suggested? Waiting

for Greg to type and Greg said he will die in a ditch on this one and changed his text color to red so I think that seems very serious to him. Is there any suggestions to how - actually I would – I'll go directly to Greg. How you would like to phrase this differently? And actually I see Avri's hand up so I'll go to you first. Please go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. I guess I have a hard time understanding why as this is existing language in the current policy and if we add a definitional footnote why this is a die in the ditch issue? Thanks.

Greg Shatan: If I could -- this is Greg -- if I could briefly respond? I think one of the reasons it's troublesome first off I think it doesn't use the word ongoing properly. Secondly one of the key decisions that we are dealing with and one of the reasons why we've discarded the word rounds is that we need to decide between a truly ongoing process and a periodic process.

And if we use the word ongoing to refer to the entire concept of a mechanism then, you know, we're kind of we're creating another layer of confusion between something that is ongoing, you know, the baseball season may be ongoing the baseball game is not ongoing. I don't know that the, you know, there's just too much ambiguity around the word ongoing when something is currently not happening it's hard to call it ongoing. And the fact that it was used a number of years ago for a particular purpose at a particular time I think, you know, is not something we should be bound to. So I think the ongoing use of the word ongoing will be confusing especially since we're considering ongoing versus periodic processes for domain name - gTLD application. Thanks.

Steve Chan: Thanks Greg. This is Steve Chan again from staff. I'm not sure exactly how we want to handle this here. I guess to the point that Avri is making even if there were continual periodic rounds that would still possibly be defined as an ongoing set of mechanisms. I'm not sure if there's anyone else that would want to die in the ditch on the other side of this to try and keep the word

ongoing but I think we can just hopefully come to an agreement on perhaps a different word. If you feel this strongly and no one else perhaps feels strongly in the other direction to maintain this phrasing I know it sounds like Avri would like to keep the phrasing but I'm not sure I hear anyone else raising their voice in one of the other direction.

Avri Doria: Actually you have someone in the queue.

Steve Chan: Yes. I was just getting to that. Thanks Avri. I hope I don't – I'm sure I'm going to mispronounce your name but (Vivov) you're next. Thanks.

Vaibhav Aggarwal: Yes, that's correct. I think that's excellent. I think what we should do is Avri has a point and Greg has a point too. And - but I'm of this opinion that lets draw alternate on this portion of this document find out when that has been created and let's mark this for all of us to deliberate on, think about it, draw up an opinion in our own areas and write it on to the email. And then you know - you could correct it later on. Let's not waste too much time on something like this. We all have divided opinions and let's move on to the other parts of the document. There's limited time that we have already.

Steve Chan: Thanks (Vivov). This is Steve again from staff. And I think we'll take that suggestion and the suggestion from Kristina Rosette on the chat. And perhaps we'll propose a definition for this phrasing and/or change it to something more I don't know something that doesn't use the word ongoing and then we'll share that on staff. But as (Vivov) said I don't think we want to get stuck on this one point for the entire call. So I would suggest moving on unless there are some suggestions or any other suggestion.

Avri Doria: Let's move on.

Steve Chan: Seeing no more hands. Did I hear a voice? I don't know if anyone wanted to speak up?

Avri Doria: I just had I just -- this was Avri -- just say yes let's move on. And if we can't resolve it, you know, we have a day or two to resolve it on the list and get other people to contribute. It's been basically three of us and a few chatting. I don't know if anybody else has the same strength of opinion on this word that Greg does, you know, and yes there is the argument of it is the existing language that we're talking about changing but let's move on with the discussion.

Steve Chan: Thank you Avri. This is Steve from staff. And moving on to I think we're on Page 5 at this point. And so this was similar to Page 4 in that the conversation had taken place primarily on the working group call last week. And I don't think I made any particularly substantive changes on this page. And I see Avri's hand is up. Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes. I just have - on this one that I think reflects since we're not speaking of overarching themes and we're not speaking of questions we might want to change this final question in all of them to on this subject.

Steve Chan: Sure. That can be changed. Thanks Avri and thanking (Mary) for taking notes. Okay seeing no other hands or voices on this page we'll move on to the next objective. And the subject is a categorization or differentiation of gTLDs for example brand and geographic supported/community and ongoing new gTLD mechanisms.

And this is actually a different phrasing of that possibly that same question we're looking at. So I think one of the things we'll go through is to try to make sure that the phrasing is all consistent throughout once we agree to a fixed term. And I saw a hand from Avri that flashed up and down. And perhaps that's what she was going to raise although it's back up again. Please go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: No actually I was being premature about one of the questions. And that's why I took it down but while I'm talking I'll mention on it. I'm not sure that on brand

everybody knows what specification 13 is so that may also be worthy of a footnote for further elaboration in the point thanks.

Steve Chan: Thank you Avri. This is Steve from staff. Let me just take that note real quickly. Thank you for that. So one of the suggestions had been to swap out the term types for categories that has been done throughout this whole section. I think that's about all the changes that were made for page I believe of this document yes Page 6. Seeing no other comments to that page I'll move on to the next page and there was actually a question that I had.

In this listing of categories that had been identified by the PDP Working Group members the last of the bulleted items I had trouble understanding what that meant. I was hoping someone on this call could help me understand what this category was referring to. And so the text is open TLD with minor charter registration challenges for example .name and .biz? As I said I found it isn't clear to me and I figured this may also be unclear to the readers of this document. So if we can help add some precision to this category I would appreciate some help on this one. Jeff I see your hand.

Jeff Neuman: Yes sorry thanks. So this was meant to be kind of to reflect that there are open - there are quote open TLDs that have restrictions that are for the most part self-certification or subject to a restriction dispute resolution policy. So it's a little bit different than the one, two, three, four, five, sixth one down which is validated restricted registries who verify who pre-verified before the party was given a registration user registration they can use their registration maybe not before they get it but before they use it. So it's - I'm not sure it's necessarily a wholly different category but it's a different type of TLD that from the validated restricted registries (unintelligible).

So like for example .biz you have to represent them. It's being used for a business purpose and not for a personal one. But .name it's meant to be used as a personal name space. So I'm looking at some comments so I think (Paul) and Avri have some good comments. Thanks.

Steve Chan: (Thanks) Jeff. (Vivov), I see your hand up again. Please go ahead.

Vaibhav Aggarwal: Yes hi. This is Vaibhav Aggarwal for the record. Yes so many of these like .name and .biz is referring to the minor the little number of business that is done. We can go to new gtdstats.com or (unintelligible) which domains done how much business. And that should throw some light on this point the category. So there are certain gTLDs which are there which have done minor registrations in terms of business. Thank you.

Avri Doria: This is Avri if I can jump in? I don't believe that minor related to the size of the gTLD or its sales. I believe it related to and to the challenges. And so it was - and I think that (Paul)'s terminology the challenged versus validation, you know, or its prior validation versus, you know, later challenge are. I think they're two subtypes. But the - I just really wanted to point out that minor did not relate to sales or size of the TLDs.

Steve Chan: Thank you Avri. (Vivov) did you have response to that?

Vaibhav Aggarwal: No I'm - I think there needs to be a little more research on this. This is an understanding. And I can see references going to and fro on ICANN's minor TLD definitions which are different. I think what we can do is we can park this category and move on to the next item. And we can do a deadline tomorrow or day after and we can then remove the category if need be if we don't reach to a conclusion on this. And that's the best I can say right now.

Steve Chan: Thank you (Vivov). Greg, please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Yes. Greg Shatan for the record. First I think you created some confusion here that was unnecessary. The term minor was being applied to the level of the challenge or the restriction and not to the size of the TLD. So I think we should just rather than - we don't need to have a waiting period in which to discuss that confusion. I think we should just put that to bed. And I think that I

suggest that open TLD with self-validated restrictions as perhaps another term for this. And I think we should probably avoid the word minor entirely. Self-validation to my mind at least means that there's no - you're basically doing a kind of on your honor so that by definition it's kind of minor. Thanks.

Steve Chan: Thanks Greg. This is Steve Chan from staff again. Did anyone have any comments on this phrasing here?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Just jumping in again to point out that we're halfway through our meeting and on question two I (unintelligible) suggestion to drop the word minor. And I think the rewording's are good. But, you know, we should move on with this. And if there are any further issues on it take the suggestion that we discussed some on the list for another day but I think dropping the word minor and maybe picking up one of these other wordings would be an adequate resolution to this. Thanks.

Steve Chan: Thank you Avri. Moving on then and moving on to Page 17 a few minor updates the way that I would see these changes made most of them are just substituting the word types of categories, add a little clarity to a few questions, otherwise I don't think I see any substantive changes on this page unless someone else sees something differently?

Seeing no hands, moving on to the third subject which is future new gTLDs assessed in quote unquote rounds. Following through this is Page 8 and I again I don't think there's any substantive comments or changes made on this page either. So I will pause for a second to see if there's any hand raised if we have any issues?

Seeing none moving on to Page 9. The same comment minor changes to the wording. Seeing again no has raised moving on to Page 10. And again seeing no comments we'll move on to the next subject which is Subject 4. So this heading was modified quite a bit I guess. And so, you know, was a question like the rest before but now it reads predictability should be

maintained or enhanced without a sacrifice in flexibility. And event changes must be introduced into the new gTLD application process the disruptive effect to all parties should be minimum. Seeing no hands raised or objections to that phrasing. That was really the only major change on this page. And actually there are only four questions related to the subject so no real substantive changes to any of the questions on this particular subject.

And moving on to Subject 5 which was community engagement, it's been rephrased to community engagement in new gTLD applications processes. It was again turned from a question but it was also I think before it said something to the effect of just not very specific. It was mostly related to just the processes. And so I just added new gTLD application processes as it could be inferred to mean perhaps the PDP process implementation and the actual application process. So I think that was in regards to the comment that had been raised by Greg Shatan. So hopefully this clarification meets his expectations.

So in the description of this section at the very end I added a sentence that attempts to acknowledge the point of about no matter how much work and planning and - goes into the early steps of a PDP and implementation there is just simply no way to account for every issue that may arise after the fact. So that last sentence is an attempt to capture that fact. And it's also really to help drive that this question is more about after implementation has already been completed and the gTLD processes are in effect. So hopefully these changes help to drive that point home.

Seeing no hands, moving on to the first question in this section just see if I can blow this language up a little bit or make the image a little bigger for everyone because I can't actually see it. So question 5A was rephrased fairly (unintelligible) I guess it was requested that it be rephrased. And hopefully this rephrasing helps people understand it.

So it currently reads are there circumstances in which the application quote unquote round should be frozen while unforeseen policy issues are considered and resolved? If so should there be a threshold or standard that must be reached before considered – considered freezing a round? Seeing no comments hopefully that phrasing works for everyone.

The other change on this page is in 5B. It's about when there is an issue raised. It asked whether or not the board must bring the issue back to the GNSO and the PDP processes. And it just highlights some of the processes that might be relevant that I guess it just attempts to spell out what it means by PDP process which would include things like the GNSO expedited PDP and the GNSO guidance process. So it just provides more - hopefully provides a little more clarity to what that means there. Seeing no comments or hands raised moving on to Page 14. Hand raised from Greg. Please go ahead. Thanks.

Greg Shatan: Just very quickly I would rather than saying or other mechanisms like that I would just say including. I think that would make it clearer. Thanks.

Steve Chan: Thanks Greg. Just Steve again. We're make that change.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I stuck my hand up but I'll call on myself. If we're doing including we have to include including but not limited to because as soon as you put including people start to have the feeling that that's the only possibility.

Steve Chan: Which other PDP processes are there other than the expedited, the GNSO and the PDP process itself? I think that covers the waterfront.

Avri Doria: Who knows what the SCI will create between now and the time any issue happens to come up.

Steve Chan: I'm not sure the SCI could actually create a PDP process...

Avri Doria: Okay. I won't die in the ditch for that if you just want to say including, you know, but, you know, SCI or the GNSO council could create new procedures. But okay.

Steve Chan: Well if you want to have EG instead of including maybe that would be happy making for everyone.

Avri Doria: Works for me.

Steve Chan: Thank you both. Is there other way you could position it? At the end it says as described in the ICANN bylaws. You could say or other mechanisms as defined in the ICANN bylaws is another suggestion.

Greg Shatan: I think that's too ambiguous. We're really talking here about the PDP process of these, you know, specific and perhaps any other specific kind of alternatives to the full PDP process. This is a, you know, fairly narrow category even if we add other things to the category.

Steve Chan: Okay thanks Greg. We'll just add a simple EG to this section then. Okay moving on to Page 14. I think we already did it actually. So moving on to Page 15. This is actually the last subject. We actually did not cover this section on last meeting but staff still tried to go through and make some of the changes that we've made into other sections of this document.

So the first is rephrasing the question to make it a statement. So it now reads application limit either in terms of accepting in aggregate during an application round or application per applicant. Some of the changes that were made in this section were really to try to provide more clarity around whether or not we're asking about applications in aggregate or the applications per applicant. So hopefully the way that these have been rephrased have captured the original intent. And I can really only look to the working group members to tell me whether or not I've done that or not. So I will open this up.

Actually I'm not sure if Avri you wanted to take us through this section reading question by question or I can do that since we haven't done that.

Avri Doria: That - this is Avri. That may be worth doing and quickly. And either I can do it or you can do it. Since you've been leading us through this I would suggest that, you know, you quickly do that unless there's an objection to doing that. I see no objection to doing that so why don't you quickly take us through?

Steve Chan: Thanks Avri. This is again from staff. So Question 6A reads should a limit for the aggregate number of applications be established during any application window or round? If so why? Seeing no hands raised moving on to 16 if an aggregate application limit is established or an application round how would the appropriate amount of applications be set to established this limit? And as I said this seems like it was appropriate to add the word aggregate here because I think that's what was being discussed and not about a limit per applicant.

Again seeing no hands raised moving on to 6B an aggregate application limit is established for an application round. What mechanisms could be used to cut off applications mission at the application limit? And on the second read I'm not sure I like that phrasing but hopefully that makes sense to you all and perhaps I can take another stab at trying to rephrase that question. Was this - essentially I think the intent was to try to find out, you know, if there is an application limit established, how is the limited essentially enforced once you get to the upper bound? (Vivov) I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

Vaibhav Aggarwal: Yes. Vaibhav Aggarwal for the record. 6B I think the it's an aggregate actually limited established for an application round. What mechanism can be used to cut off that round? And (unintelligible) to stop the application, aggregate application collection once the limit is reached. So I think we should further cut it down and said once the aggregate application limit is reached what mechanism could be used to stop the application submissions full stop. Thank you.

Steve Chan: Thank you (Vivov). And I see you're in agreement that the phrasing is a little clumsy. So we'll take your suggestion into consideration. And there's...

Vaibhav Aggarwal: Okay.

Steve Chan: ...trying to look through the chat accounts but I think it's on a different subject.

Avri Doria: Yes the chat is actually referring to the last question in the group.

Vaibhav Aggarwal: I - this is (Vivov) for the record. While we were - while I had 2 seconds just want to understand. Sorry, pardon me for my dumb question that I'm going to ask but I'm still going to ask. How is aggregate application limit different to application limit? I mean once there's a limit there's a limit right? And number of applications together across or number of applications forming the limit. So why would we use the word aggregate so often because what is it aggregating? It's aggregating a collection of applications. So I don't know if we can, you know, take a look at this.

Steve Chan: Thank you (Vivov). I had a response to that but I'll go ahead and let Avri respond to that. Thanks. Avri?

Avri Doria: I believe that yes, this is Avri speaking. I believe that we're trying to differentiate the aggregate of total applications in a procedure in a window in a round versus an individual applicant number of applications in a window. So I think that that's the differentiation we're trying to make between all of the - for the application and just one applicant application.

Vaibhav Aggarwal: Yes I think perfect Avri. This is (Vivov) for the record. And why don't we use the same differentiating language that you just said and add the part saying number of applications limiting to this are the new round of applications limited to this are the new round of TLDs or this round of TLDs. So this would specify and we could shorten the questions that they're asking

in a more easier language for everyone around the world to understand especially people who are not proficient in English.

So from where I'm coming from I'm thinking from a very layman's perspective. I'm just trying to simplify just the part sorry. Thanks.

Steve Chan: Jeff please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes one thought I had - sorry, this is Jeff Neuman. Are we talking about actual number of applications itself or the number of strings applied for as being the limit? So in other words we may have 500 applications but only for 300 strings. Although that would be a (unintelligible).

So I think we do need to figure out (unintelligible) differentiate that which includes us in a definition. So I think there are other types of limits that we need to make sure are we talking really about the number of applications (unintelligible) being limited or are we talking about number of strings being limited?

Steve Chan: Thanks Jeff. Greg please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Yes I think - it's Greg Shatan for the record. First I think we'd be better off using the word Total rather than aggregate. That's - it seems like we tend to - we choose longer more obscure words or shorter more concrete words would do and that's kind of the opposite in terms of, you know, trying to write in a plain language. And, you know, words like in terms of are usually kind of, you know, wasted characters. But I think so if we refer to total rather than aggregate we might be better off.

And I think, you know, if it's explained, you know, right up at the top and the subject heading does do it but maybe in the kind of explanatory text, you know, be more clear that we're looking at both, you know, total applications in around and, you know, the number of applications per applicant. And maybe

as Jeff I think was kind of alluding to the total number of applications for a given string although I don't know that that's actually come up in this subject so that may be adding unnecessary complexity. But I think that the subject heading itself needs to be rewritten because it's somewhat - I'll give it a try in the chat.

Steve Chan: Thanks Greg. Jeff I see your hand back up again. Jeff if you're speaking I can't hear you or we can't hear you. While Jeff tries to work through his audio issues I hear an echo on my part. Actually just to comment real quickly to what Greg suggested I actually had the same term in my head to substitute aggregate for I guess a more clear and simple word like total. So if there's - unless there's some objections to that I think we'll look to making that change there and adding a bit of more clarity to the distribution section.

And then so I would maybe look to some guidance on how we would want to address the question about whether or not we're looking at a total for applications received or applications per string or not applications per string but a total number of strings. But maybe it's actually a separate question or maybe we ask for - provide those as suggestions as different ways to apply a limit. I'm not sure if any of these are new hands from Greg or Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Old hand, sorry.

Steve Chan: So yes the - I'm not sure if there's any preference either way if we want to just try to go one direction or the other and make it about just the total number of strings or if we want to add the layer of complexity that perhaps we suggest those as two ways to limit the round and ask the readers to provide their inputs to either of those mechanisms to limit the total number of applications. And perhaps we could do what (Martin)'s suggestion in the text or the chat. Seeing no...

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I think you've gotten some good suggestions for clarification then should be able to clarify and simplify the language as has been suggested.

There's been some fine suggestions here. So I would suggest, you know, accepting the comment that this needs to be clarified and simplified and move on unless there's any specific discussion about words.

Steve Chan: Thank you Avri. That's actually what I was approximately going to say. I was going to say that we'll work on revising those the text based on suggestions made in the chat. And if there's any objections to it they can be made via the list afterwards. I think we left off on Question 6D. And it asks how would limits on the number of aggregate - there's that word again of aggregate applications taken during the application round impact these?

Seeing no comments Question 6E asks are limits to applications either in aggregate or from an individual applicant - poor English be considered anti-competitive? Please explain. Question 6F do limits on applications either in aggregate or from an individual applicant favor insiders? Comments again. Question 6G should there be limits to the number of applications that one entity can submit? If so how could such a limit be enforced and finally we have our (unintelligible). Avri maybe? I heard a voice.

Avri Doria: No wasn't me sorry.

Steve Chan: All right, just some background noise that apparently sounded like Avri. So that was actually the last question related to this section. And I think there's only one suggestion from Jeff can move (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: (Vivov) has his hand up at the moment.

Vaibhav Aggarwal: Right. And just to stop us at the section (unintelligible). This is (Vivov) for the record. I just wanted check in Section F - I'm sorry in Question 6G answer F. We're referring to okay just let's just take a look at Section 6 which is the question. So there be limits to the numbers of applications that one entity can supplement? Now here...

Woman: Wow.

Vaibhav Aggarwal: ...we'll reference - sorry, should I stop?

Avri Doria: No please go ahead. I think that was just a spurious voice coming in on an unmuted phone.

Vaibhav Aggarwal: Okay. Now so Section 6G we reference to one entity. Now the word the phrase one entity. Now earlier in the same section we've already debated in Question Number 6A, B, C and D that aggregate applications either from an entity or an individual. That's why we're calling it aggregate. So wouldn't that purpose be defeated in Section 6G because we were only referring to one entity or should we also now consistently phase bringing the word aggregate here to and put a footnote here saying why are we using the word aggregate because we're trying to differentiate between applications from corporate house or organizations oblique and entity and individuals, sorry or I don't know. It's just a thought. Thank you.

Steve Chan: Thank you (Vivov). I'm not sure if anyone would want to respond to that but this is Steve again from staff. And I believe the purpose of 6G was specifically ask about the limit of applications from a single entity and not to include the other questions or sorry, the total number of applications for a round. But I think it was actually specifically intended to ask a different question.

Vaibhav Aggarwal: This is (Vivov) once again for the record. I would just add here that legally an entity could be an individual as well as an organization. So the purpose of using the word aggregate in the above five question may just be defeated here. Our 6G is the purpose of asking this question is different than we might have if we used the word organization or a group of organizations or something which differentiates itself inherently from the word individual applicant. Thank you.

Steve Chan: Greg please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Hi. Greg Shatan for the record. I think we're introducing some unnecessary confusion into the discussion again here. The term aggregate was meant to refer to the total number of applications by all applicants in a given round. So it had nothing to do with organizations versus entities versus individuals or anything like that. So that's just irrelevant to the current discussion about the 6G.

And I think that, you know, we could say entity or maybe we should just change entity to applicants I think as somebody suggested. Jeff did in the chat. More to the point though I wonder whether the questions that we ask immediately above during you know, of kind of B, C, D, and E or C, B and E should also be asked with regard to applications per entity in other words, or per applicant? So, you know, if an application limit per applicant were established what would be the appropriate amount and what would be the - and how would their - what mechanism would you use for a cutoff and how would this impact fees? I guess all of those questions, you know, could be re-asked with regard to the per applicant limit as opposed to as well as being asked with regard to the total limit. Thank you.

Vaibhav Aggarwal: Hi. This is (Vivov) for the record. My point being to the room and Avri that in all the questions we are trying to differentiate and clearly all the six - five questions and 6A to 6F that either it does an aggregate or from an individual applicant that clearly states that you're trying to differentiate here. So if Greg wants to be right then we definitely need to rewrite this entire section. And if Greg wants to be wrong our - the thinking needs to be changed then only the 6G may just be reworded. And I'm happy to be corrected. Thank you.

Steve Chan: Greg I see your hand raised to possibly respond. Please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Yes in brief I'm not wrong. Question 6B is about an aggregate application limit or a total application limit. It's about the total of all applications for the round. It has nothing to do with limits per applicant. So I'm not sure where

(Vivov) or whatever is going on about this. But, yes these questions are not 6B...

Vaibhav Aggarwal: No Greg I'm not going to die in the ditch.

Greg Shatan: Okay well don't interrupt me either then. 6B, C, D, and E are really only about...

Vaibhav Aggarwal: Just...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: ...total limits.

Vaibhav Aggarwal: ...(unintelligible) the room.

Greg Shatan: You're interrupting me again.

Avri Doria: Please, please, this is Avri interrupting. One person at a time and please wait to be called on when you do raise your hand to respond. It just makes the flow easier. Forgive me for a chair's interruption.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. And I'm not being personal so I'm not sure why I'm being accused of being personal. I resent that accusation. And assuming that is being directed at me. 6B, C, D, and E are only about the total application limit for the round and do not refer to limits per applicant. So if we want to ask any more particular questions about limits per applicant then we have, you know, more questions to ask. Thanks.

Steve Chan: Avri please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Thanks. Thanks, I muted myself and unmuted in the same click almost. This is Avri speaking. I think in looking at this one place where - and I do agree

with what Greg said. Except for 6B which does do a differentiation which Greg asked about both and so that may contribute to confusion. At first I looked at it and said should we move F up so that it - the question about not F. It's E and F sorry. I'm going a - E and F basically refer to both aggregate and individual as was being said whereas as Greg said the previous ones don't.

So one possibility was moving G up to before E and then asking the two questions that apply to both. I don't know if that would clarify it and if that would seem objectionable to Jeff. But I think it's E and F that cause the angst so perhaps that's something to be considered. Thanks.

Steve Chan: Thanks Avri. Were there any - this is Steve again from staff. Were there any comments to Greg's suggestion that perhaps the proceeding questions A, B, E also bring into question individual applications as well or applications from a single entity? At least perspective that seems principle suggestion. I'm not seeing some - any support or opposition to that proposal. This means one way the other direction.

Is anyone else having audio issues? Hopefully you can all - okay (unintelligible). So perhaps again staff will make some changes to take into account the comments made here which may include the suggestions that Greg made and we can hopefully finalize the debate on the list and let's (unintelligible). So at a minimum I think we'll want to take into account the suggestions made by Jeff and seconded by Avri about moving question I believe 6G ahead of B, those letters exactly correct (unintelligible).

So I believe we can move on to the final section. Also I want to make sure (unintelligible) document. So the last section just a few open questions. The first is are there further over-arching issues or considerations that should be discussed with the new gTLDs? I think that should be for these subsequent procedures PDP Working Group?

And the second is a question we had I believe removed from the community engagement section. And so it's now found here. Are there additional steps the PDP Working Group should take during the PDP process to better enable community engagement?

Seeing no hands here I think we've actually document. Staff has a few changes they'll obviously have to make and we'll try to circulate the document as soon as possible. Now there's - it sounds like there's a few open topics that I hope and expect will garner some comments from working group members. As Avri had mentioned our drop dead deadline is the 10th of June although obviously we try to get - we would like to try to get that out to the communities earlier rather than later. But there's - unless there's any final comments on this document I think I'll turn it back over to Avri to close out the meeting, AOB and close out the meeting.

Avri Doria: Thank you Steve. This is Avri speaking again. I wanted to bring up a question issue about the format of this document. When originally writing the first draft of this in the back of my mind had been the notion of their being an online questionnaire for it. The way it - and that's why the boxes to indicate that there was a data entry point for people to enter their question. I don't know if we're going to do that especially since this is not going to the general community. And I think that was a confusion in my mind. I mean I knew better but wasn't thinking clearly.

Since this is just going to the SOs ACs stakeholder groups and constituencies and not as an open where we would be doing perhaps one of those questionnaire type things where people can fill it in online I certainly don't think that if we send a written set of things we need to include these boxes. The boxes were really only there to - so I guess I want to ask am I thinking correctly when I'm saying that this goes out just as a word - I mean, not - a PDF document to the SOs, ACs, SGs and Cs and does not need a questionnaire therefore does not need the blank space? Does anybody see it differently?

I see no hands on that so I just wanted to make that point on it. Cheryl Langdon-Orr is asking why not online. That's why I'm asking the question. Is - when it's just a stakeholder group or just a SOAC or a constituency responding is it better to have the online questionnaire? And because we aren't putting it out for the general comments? Are there other opinions? So I guess Cheryl Langdon-Orr would argue that it should indeed go out as a questionnaire so that a SOAC stakeholder group or constituency could answer it in that style. Any other comments on that? I just didn't want to leave that (ambiguous).

So do others agree? So GAC (Jorge) said as for the GAC I guess we'll be answering with a letter. That was kind of my assumption for all SOAC S, G and C. Does anyone actually believe that their SOAC S, G or C would really prefer a questionnaire? And I think if there is one clear statement that yes my SOAC, SG or C would definitely prefer an online questionnaire.

And I guess Cheryl Langdon-Orr I'll ask you the question directly. Do you believe that ALAC or - would want a questionnaire as opposed to a just a set a question in a PDF?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Avri, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Hopefully you can hear me all right. I think there's benefits in having the option. And from an ALAC point of view we go out of course to our (ROs) and ALSes and all of that work's done in the wiki format. And so to that end, you know, we're already doing this with interactions on a digital media and cutting and pasting back onto another online form in digital media is a perfectly fine and reasonable way of doing it. Different advisory committees are going to have different mechanisms as opposed to doing that obviously. GAC would do a different drafting process.

Now that said we can just as easily if need be, you know, bludgeon that into a letter. We've done that in the past as well. Either way either format from an

ALAC point of view allows us to partition it up into different sections and give different people pen holding rights. But regardless we would start with the online wiki form anyway that we'd have to turn it into an interaction to some extent. But that doesn't mean it has to be only an online form. I just saw options are nice. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Steve from staff or anyone else from staff is - do you have some advice on the difficulties or, you know, because I guess if it's relatively easy to do then perhaps doing both works out well especially if there is a SOAC that's not going to be doing many of the questions but wants to be able to answer easily. Yes Steve I see your hand up.

Steve Chan: Thanks Avri. This is Steve from staff and I might look to (Mary) for some guidance as well here. But I believe we traditionally send these out as Word document or sorry PDF. And that obviously doesn't prevent us from, I think from looking at - but I would say that given the length of this document it might not - I guess I'll present itself as a large body of work to try to turn this into an online survey.

And I would actually ask Cheryl Langdon-Orr or others what tool or mechanism they're thinking about using for an online survey. I think some suggestions there would be good. But yes I guess I don't have any real guidance there and maybe (Mary) has some additional comments to help with this conversation. She has a comment in the chat about it being a very long online survey because there are a number of questions in this document.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I may it's Cheryl Langdon-Orr here. I get be - get the thing I put into chat. It'll probably turn up after the meeting closes. Just to answer you we would use (unintelligible) or one of the other forms we've occasionally used Google forms as well. But it's a matter of (Astar) having to cut up the fiction and put it into segregation bits on the wiki where we accumulate our interactions anyway.

A number of public comments and requests for comment and input include specific questions. Most of them are not as lengthy as this. And I would certainly suggest because of its length that's one of the reasons I mentioned that organizations like the ALAC is probably going to carve this up into different pieces of work which may in fact be owned by different pen holders. So yes it's long and I don't think you're going to get as fulsome a response to each of the questions that we're desiring if we expect (an offer) to sit down and draft it just as one long diatribe. I think we do have to ask even in letter form that the responses come back section by section reference number by reference number to the questions asked. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay Steve your hand it still up. I don't know if you had a further comment to make.

Steve Chan: I actually do.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yes, okay.

Steve Chan: Thanks Avri. This is Steve again. I - so I guess I have a few comments on this. One is that we're coming up on the deadline. And so I think we at least have an assumption that this was going to be sent around as a Word or PDF at least and probably as Word as Greg had suggested. That had crossed my mind as being a good option to allow people to number one perhaps carve out questions like Cheryl Langdon-Orr's suggestion will probably happen. But also they'll be able to work inline in a document like this put the questions directly or the responses directly to the question.

So given the late stage in our approach in deadlines unless there's strong objections from folks I think it might be best to stick with what we traditionally

do in working groups which is generally send them out in a document form rather than a survey. And perhaps we can look at other options in the future.

And I actually had - also had a couple of things I wanted to touch on. I know we're at the top of our - at the end of our time. But there are a few things that we also needed to cover that I forgot to mention actually. And one was the deadline for response. Well I took a little bit of - took a look at the two times we had discussed. One was 35 days and the other was 45 days. And I'm - believe assuming a 10 June sending date to the (unintelligible). That would put us at the 13 of July, 45 days of 23 July.

So other things around those timing around those dates the RPMs outreach documents, theirs is due on the 9th of July. And for that - either at 35 or 45 days would put us after that deadline although at 35 days it's only a four day separation. If we have a 45 day deadline then it gives us a much longer I believe 14 day difference between those two deadline which might be more appropriate.

The other consideration is ICANN 56 which ends on the 30th of June. And so seven days after that is, you know, we generally give a week after the end of the meeting at least before we would require or impose deadlines. And that would put us at 7 July. I think it said June but 7 July. So I think going with the 45 days might be advisable. If there's any objections I see there's support in the comments. But I think unless there's any objections I think we'll deal with 45 day deadline. Avri I think I hear your voice.

Avri Doria: Yes I'm trying to bring it to a close, yes. So yes I would suggest that at least promotionally unless we get some discussion in the next 24 hours on the list to the contrary the A this be put out totally as a PDF and doc and that we not do a questionnaire since there are many different ways that people will be cutting this up though we have started to use the questionnaire format in some other groups so that provisionally we decide that it goes out of PDF and Word without the full spaces and that provisionally we decide for the 45 days

and basically unless somebody objects violently with arguments on the list that that holds and asks for that in the next spec.

I would also ask that 24 hour limit from the end of this meeting be the discussion time for any changes, any comments on the open issues. And we can send out an email listing those open issues so people can comment on them but that that be restricted to a days' worth that'll take us to the end of the 7th for some geography, take us early into the morning on the 8th for some but in terms of our delivery date it takes us to the 7th.

If there are any substantive changes we will have to do a 24-hour call of the group for objections on those changes though I don't accept any substantive changes. Now have gone over by three minutes but I still want to ask there were no prior any other business. Has any person, any other business come up that needs to be dealt with on this call as opposed to on the list?

If not I will thank everybody. I'll thank everybody for the 90 minutes and for the extra four and I will call this meeting complete with gratitude that we've made it essentially through our CC1 submission. I'm very grateful to everybody for the push we made on that especially to Steve Chan and the rest of staff. So with that I'll end the call and on next week's meeting we'll talk about the Helsinki meeting plan. Thank you and...

Woman: Thanks Avri.

Avri Doria: ...bye.

Woman: Thanks everybody. Good work, bye.

Steve Chan: Great, thank you. Today's meeting has been adjourned. Operator could you please stop the recordings and disconnect all remaining lines? Have a great day everyone.

END