
ICANN Transcription

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group

Tuesday 12, September 2019 at 0300 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.

Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on the agenda wiki page:

<https://community.icann.org/x/dITkBg>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:

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

JULIE BISLAND:

Alright. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group call on Thursday, the 12th of September 2019.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. If you're only on the audio bridge at this time, do you want to please let yourself be known now? And hearing no names, I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and please keep phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I'll turn it back over to Jeff Neuman. Thanks, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thank you very much. Welcome, everyone. I hope you guys can hear me. I'm in a hotel, so I'm just hoping that the Internet stays in good, if not, I'll join on the phone line. Sorry, I want to apologize

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

again for Monday. I had a conflict or we had a conflict and we had to cancel sort of last minute, so we will try not to do that again. So, we're actually doing the agenda that we were to have on Monday. So if you look at the screen, the agenda now is on finishing up the role of application comments, which we started last week, then getting into name collisions, and if time permitting, objections. But my guess is that objections will be on the call next Monday.

But before we start all of that, let me ask if there are any changes to any Statements of Interest and/or any comments on the agenda? Okay. I'm not seeing any hands raised or any – oh, I see a post here from Jim. More detailed information on the SLAs that Steve sent around. Okay, so I will see if we can get an update at the end of the meeting. So, if you all can just remind me to make sure that about five minutes or ten minutes before at the end of the meeting if we can just do that. Thanks, Jim. Anything else? Anyone else?

Okay. So, we left off last week talking about the role of application comments. We had covered the high-level agreements on that subject and left off at the outstanding items. It seemed like the high-level agreements which were fairly general and not too controversial in nature were accepted by most of the community and really are presented in more in terms of implementation guidance. So there are things that we would all like or the community would like the system to be able to do with respect to public comments and how public comments are treated, and essentially more transparency in the comment process in terms of how they're treated as well as understanding more from ICANN and the evaluators as to what will be done with the comments.

And also, there was a proposal that we think most of the community had agreed with which was to make sure that applicants had at least a short time period to respond to any public comments that were filed. You'll see some reference to in the new ideas to that concept but then a proposal for yet another addition to that comment period.

But the first one that we'll talk about is on the application comment system, usability in attachments, and you'll see these comments from ICANN Org. I think the gist to the first comment that ICANN Org had filed even though it's under Concerns, it's really just an update. So, through the years, ICANN has been adding functionality to improve the usability of their comment system, and so they're just letting us know in that first comment that the comment form does offer a number of the functions that we had asked that it cover. So there is confirmation of a commenter so that we won't just have anonymous comments that all comments will come from an actual person that has to verify the e-mail address. The comments will also allow some sorting of the columns of information so you can sort by applicant string, application ID, name of a person who submitted the comment, subject, etc. The one thing that they do note in the second part of it is that attachments at this point are not searchable and sortable, and so they note that we do in our recommendations ask for something like that. This might be a little bit more difficult and certainly more costly for them to do but they also say that allowing for attachments will also mean more information that evaluation and objection at panels would need to review, impacting application processing cost and timelines. So, the PDP Working

Group might want to take this into consideration as it continues discussion on this topic.

I see the comment already. So, Jim, please.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Thanks, Jeff. I guess it really does pertain to both comments from here. It seems as though that ICANN Org's comments were backward looking on the existing system, but I was under the impression – and I'm sure others are – that from the preparatory document that Cyrus and his team pulled together that as short would be sort of developing a brand new system not anything like that we saw last go around, so I'm just curious. Talking about the comments, looking backwards at the old system are nice, but building some of these features and functionality into the system going forward is probably possible because they sort of starting from scratch. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Jim. I see, Christopher, you're next. Because I believe Trang is going to address this, Christopher, with your permission, I think I'd like to go to Trang.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: [I got your message].

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. Trang, please.

TRANG NGUYEN: Thanks, Jeff. This is Trang from ICANN Org. Just to address Jim's comment, what our operational planning has [inaudible] actually says that we would try to reuse as much of the existing systems and tools as possible. We do recognize that the application submission system will need to be rebuilt because that was a task. The last time a task is no longer in place, it was decommissioned, but we do have a number of other systems and tools from last time that currently are being used, and to the extent that those system and tools can still serve its purposes, we would try to continue to leverage them. If there's no reason to build in brand new application comment tool, we wouldn't do that. But we will certainly go through the assessment to determine whether or not it's still fit for purpose, and then if it's not fit for purpose then we would rebuild. I hope that helps. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks, Trang. Christopher, please.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Okay. Good evening, everybody. Thank you, Jeff, for giving me the floor. Just as naïve question, why can't the applicants put all their attachments into a website and provide a link? Then ICANN Org and the evaluators can have direct access and search as much as they like. We're no longer in a paper system and I suppose that ICANN can invent a sufficient security to ensure that the links to the attachments are not publicly available. I'm surprised about this concern. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Christopher. Trang, your hand came up again.

TRANG NGUYEN: Yes. Thanks, Jeff. I just want to clarify that the concern isn't about a technical concern for allowing for attachments in the tool. Certainly that's easy to do from a system perspective. The concern really is – and it's really not a concern, it's just something that we want to flank for the PDP Working Group, which is that if we allow attachments, that means that someone could attach a 300-page document, say for example, to a comment. That would mean that that would take the evaluation panel significantly longer to go through a 300-page attachment versus ... currently, we don't have to do that. There would be a cost associated of course if the evaluation panels are expected to – and they wouldn't know how many comments would be submitted and how many pages they would need to read through – that the cost would essentially go up for processing of applications and the processing of application comments. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Trang. I think one thing that kind of a halfway or something between the two allowing unfettered attachments and not allowing them at all is perhaps saying that the crux or the substance has to be in the comment itself, and then the attachment can only or should only be used for references or for confirmation of whatever is in the comment. I don't know if someone is citing a legal case or something, they can put in the

attachment, it could be the legal case itself but the substance of the comment is what the evaluator actually reads. If they want more information or if they want the backup for that, they can then check the attachment. So, we could do those types of things. I think that sort of halfway in between points.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Yeah. I would agree with that. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. Jaime, please.

JAMIE BAXTER: I just think it's worth pointing out and making this very clear that the suggestion by ICANN Org that there is already systems in place to check identifications and validity of people, I think it sort of skirting the issue that anybody can set up an e-mail account and call them whatever they want to submit a comment, but it doesn't actually mean a real person that is working under the name that they provided. So I think it's important just to be very clear about that. It's not validating that the person is who they say they are, it's just validating that a person is actually on the other end. So, thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks, Jaimie, that's absolutely true. And certainly to the extent that we can't determine that the person is who that they say

they are, I'm sure that's something that evaluators will or have taken into consideration. Trang, please.

TRANG NGUYEN:

Yeah, thank you. So, just a follow-on to what Jamie just said, I just wanted to flag down identity verification is something that is very challenging to do. Of course what we do now is just to ensure that it's not a robot submitting applications, whereby we do require commenters to first create an account, provide an e-mail address and then be able to actually verify that e-mail address before they can submit a comment. But to actually do identity verification similar to the identity verification that is being requested for the WHOIS ARS is something that is extremely challenging to do particularly also given the volume of applications and also the volume of application comments. I think for the 2012 round, we got somewhere in the order of 12,000 to 14,000 comments or something like that. Now, granted not all of them are from different individuals, the same individual maybe submitting multiple comments, but still is as quite a large volume. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. Thanks, Trang. I'm not sure – and maybe I'm misreading – I'm not sure that we're putting that much emphasis on the identity verification but as we move on to the next part, which talks about how these comments are taken into account and the impact on the evaluation, I think the more certain that ICANN can be about the identity of a person, the more in theory it could impact the application results. I think that if we move on to the next one – although I see Kathy has her hand raised. So, let me go to Kathy,

and then we'll then start on the next one about the impact and taking into account the comments.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Hi. Silly question: why does the identity of the commenter matter at all? I can anticipate some of the answer to that, but if the comment itself is valuable, factual, insightful, interesting comment – let me just ask a philosophical question – why the identity matters? Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. Thanks, Kathy. I'm anticipating Jamie. I know he's got his hand raised. Just before Jamie jumps in, I want us to – there's really two parts of the – well, there's more than two parts but in this discussion there'll be two different parts of the public comment. There's the general public comment that the comment period that everyone's afforded, and then a number of our comments also relate to the comments that could impact scoring when we're talking about community applications, and so I know that Jamie talks a lot about the community applications and so I'll let him weigh in, but certainly the identity of the person making comments in the Community Priority Evaluation I think does have some sort of impact in addition to the substance. But, Jamie, I'll let you explain it.

JAMIE BAXTER:

Thanks, Jeff. To respond to Kathy's question, I think it's important to note that many of the same comments are posted to make it appear as though there is widespread concern about a specific

topic. It's a form of gaming that's used where it could be the same person who just signs in with many different e-mail addresses and post similar comments to again make it appear as though there's some widespread concern about an issue, which inevitably gets included into the evaluation process and we'll never know how it was or was not interpreted or included by the evaluator. I think that's one of the key concerns here. It's not about having a valid comment; it's about having the impression that there is widespread concern about a specific topic that isn't necessarily widespread. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Jamie. There's that kind of public campaigning for additional comments I think is another important part that you're bringing up. Kathy, did you want to respond?

KATHY KLEIMAN: Yeah. What I'm hearing then it's the quantity of the comments, not necessarily the identity of the commenter. We can imagine situations where ... The quality, not the quantity. The quality of the comment might go up if identity is not a big deal. I don't know. It just seems like if we spend a lot of time – and I think I'm saying something someone else already said – that verification of identity is not what we should be putting our emphasis or resources. People can identify themselves but if it's particularly important in a certain type of situation then maybe that's where we should be focusing on or identifying more clearly. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks, Kathy. I think that's a good transition to the next part, which is – okay, so on the notion of how application comments are taken into account and impact on the evaluation, I'm not going to ask us to go out to the high-level agreement point but there was a high-level agreement that said that ICANN should be more specific in the Guidebook about how application comments can impact the scoring and then providing an opportunity for response, etc. So, ICANN Org did, in response to that recommendation, ask some questions. So, it wanted to know or wants to know from us what exactly we mean when we say that ICANN should be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized or taken into account by the relevant evaluators, panels, etc., and to what extent different types of comments will or will not impact scoring. That quoted part was our recommendation.

What they go on to say is that it'll be helpful for us to clarify what we mean by more explicit. In 2012 round, it was left up to the evaluators or the panels to review and determine the relevance of comments and any impact on the scoring. Then they quote the guidebook language about the evaluators doing appropriate due diligence on the comments as it relates to objections, this section on the Applicant Guidebook states and then they quote the part of the Guidebook that talks about how comments would be available to any ... The comments available may subsequently be considered by an expert panel during a dispute resolution proceeding. So, they're asking us is it our view that new rules and guidelines should be developed to govern the review and determinations of application comments? If yes, what should those new rules and guidelines be?

When I read this, I think that the language in the Guidebook from the last time did leave a lot of difference to the evaluators to basically decide themselves if they wanted to consider comments and how they wanted to consider comments and how much of an impact those comments would be. I think what we're saying here is that it'll still be left to the evaluators to determine whether those comments – or to consider those comments but that we as a community should be developing some sort of guidelines to say to the evaluators not leave them so much discretion so that we don't have inconsistency between evaluators and evaluation panels, I think is our main point.

We have few people in the queue. Kathy then Christopher then Trang. So, Kathy, please.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Sorry, old hand, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Sorry, Kathy. Alright. Christopher then Trang.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I've no objection or comment fundamentally on the issue that you've described, Jeff, and I hope it can be resolved. I just want to put down a marker that in so far as Work Track 5 is well underway to declining to create relevant rules for the applications for geographical names, I would expect to loads of comments from interested parties in the event of geographical name applications that have not been agreed by the local authorities

concerned. Just a poor memoir because when we get to that situation, there's no doubt at all and I think you all understand what my position would be. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Christopher. Trang.

TRANG NGUYEN: Thanks, Jeff. This is Trang from ICANN Org for the record. I wanted to provide one clarification to what you said before, Jeff, which is that the evaluation panels have to look at those comments that were directed to them during the timeframe period allowed for in the Applicant Guidebook, so it's not their choice as to whether or not they want to look at it. They have to look at those. And the way that it works is they have to consider all of those comments in the context of the criteria that are in the Guidebook, the application questions. And if any of those comments would cause them to fail an application on any of the questions, they have to issue clarifying question.

That was sort of the last time, so it's not a matter of whether or not they want to choose to review application comments. If it's one that is directed to them, they have to look at it as part of their evaluation process. And only when the application comments may cause them to change a passing score to a non-passing score, that's when they have to take action on the application comment. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks, Trang. That makes complete sense, but that's not documented anywhere in terms of the Applicant Guidebook. So, that is one thing on being more explicit, right? So, I think what you said makes a lot of sense. I will ask whether other people in the group disagree with that concept, but to the extent that that is now – as you're saying, it is set in – I want to say set in stone, but that it's that it's set, then why not let state that in the Guidebook so that applicants can understand that factor, that evaluators must look at comments that are directed towards them for the subject that they're looking into and that to the extent it impacts scoring, a clarifying question will be issued and the response from the applicant will be considered. I think that's an important improvement even though as you said, it's something you already do, it's good to be more explicit, which was our recommendation to begin with, to be more explicit as to how comments are taken into account. Does that make sense to everybody?

A part of this is really an exercise of documenting what ICANN has already been doing in its practice but documenting that in the Guidebook so applicants are aware of it. Jamie, please.

JAMIE BAXTER:

Thanks, Jeff. I think in theory, that make sense. I think in practice, you may see something else. I just don't see this unfolding in a way that an evaluator who's sitting on the fence over an issue and maybe the comments are what pushed them over the fence, is actually detailing that in my response or – I don't know. I just feel like in practice, this is very complicated. And once you create an impression with a large quantity of comments that shouldn't have ever been there, how that impacts the evaluator and their thought

process as they go through all the other elements, and how do we know that they are using that in a way that pushes them over the ... I just find it to be, in practice, very complex. And I think there needs to be a lot more transparency about how comments are considered because I think I disagree with Trang and that clarifying questions were sent to applicants when comments impacted score. I just don't think that was actually what happened in practice. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. Thanks, Jamie. Steve has highlighted what it says in the Guidebook. I think what it says in the Guidebook is a little bit – it doesn't go all the way in the sense that – this says in cases where consideration of the comments has impacted the scoring, which means the scoring was already impacted, which means it happened in the past. At that point after the score has already impacted, that's where they'll seek clarification. I think what we're saying is to the extent the comment have an impact on the scoring before it's actually scored, that's when the clarification is sought.

Now, that's what Trang did say because clarifying questions came out before the results came out. I think it goes part of the way that sentence but it doesn't say exactly what Trang said. What Trang said or what I thought I heard Trang say is that where it may impact the scoring, that's where the evaluators issued the clarifying question. But what this says is where scoring is already been impacted, meaning it's happened in the past, that's when clarification be sought. So, there's in my mind at least, those are saying two different things. Let me go to Jason and then Trang.

JASON SCHAEFFER: Thank you, Jeff. I just wanted to note that I do support Jamie's position here as someone who's been heavily involved with CP. I think that it is important to – and I echo – I agree with Jeff is saying being more explicit and direct and having a much clear understanding both for the applicant in the next round and for the examiners is critical because Jamie's point I think is accurate. I think there was gaming. We don't need to get into details now, but I don't want this to just be dismissed out of hand. I think it's an important issue and I think the clarity and transparency would be good for everyone, so I think we should take enough time, give it it's due to make sure we can improve as much as possible.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Trang. Thanks, Jason, and now, Trang. Sorry about that.

TRANG NGUYEN: Thanks, Jeff. This is Trang from ICANN Org. I just wanted to say that, Jamie, you are correct in that in the last round the financial – essentially, all of the evaluation panel is outside of the Community Priority Evaluation panel will require to send clarifying question if an application comment is likely to impact the scoring of an application. I believe the procedure for Community Priority Evaluation was that, if the evaluation panel itself has the option, they not required – they have the ability to reach out to applicants at their own discretion to seek additional information or clarification. I just wanted to clarify that there was a different

procedure that was applicable to community already evaluation for the last round. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks, Trang. I think what's brought out with the comments from Jamie, Jason, and you, Trang, we have to consider. Community Priority Evaluation is something unique with respect to application comment, and for those that maybe a little bit lost because they're newer or didn't have work with the community application. One of the factors to determine – I should say two of the factors to determine whether an application qualified for a community involved public comments in some fashion. So, one of the criteria was how much support there was for the community application? Another factor was, what is the level of opposition? So, unlike any other type of application, this application comments didn't only affect the general scoring with respect to the technical business evaluations of the applicant, but here went to the whole crux of whether someone qualified to be a community and then as a result, get some sort of preferential treatment in a contention set. So, there may be some aspects that we might need to talk about that differ for comments for CPE than for general comments. I think that also goes to address one of ICANN's concerns – I can't remember if it's this paragraph or the next one – where they talk about well why are we treating CPE differently? Don't we have to make some of those changes for all the other types of comments we get, GAC advice, and others. It might be further down, sorry. We'll get there but I do want people to think that we really are talking about two different classes of comments, the general class that affects all applications, and then the CPE comments which

could have impact on scoring for community applications. So, if we go to the – Jamie, please.

JAMIE BAXTER:

Thanks, Jeff. I think that was a good summary. That was a good summary, and helpful for those who were not part of community priority. I think what's also important to highlight here as a continuation of what you started is that public comment for standard applications ended when their initial evaluation was over. ICANN chose to keep public comment open all the way through until Community Priority Evaluation started, which for some applicants was years after the initial evaluation. So, that is a discrepancy and an unfairness that existed in the process that hopefully is addressed and I'm sure it's covered in one of the other areas that we've spoken about. So, that differentiation and the amount of time that people had to comment on an application is a big issue that needs to be resolved going into subsequent procedures. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks, Jamie. That's another important aspect that made CPE a little bit different than the general comments.

Next paragraph – again this is still part of the ICANN Org comment. Given this – this is what the paragraph there that starts with given this, it would be helpful if the PDP Working Group could clarify the new requirement being recommended, i.e. is the new recommendation that clarifying question opportunity to be extended to CPE applications if an application comment impact

scoring of the application? And then they talk about applicants were allowed to submit changes to their applications to address clarifying questions. Is it envisioned that CPE applicants would be afforded the same opportunity? If so, considerations should be given to the objective of the CPE process, and whether that objective can be achieved if CPE applicants are given opportunities to amend their applications.

Considerations should also be given to the impact to other related processes. Yeah, this is the paragraph I was talking about. Because CPE is a form of evaluation, just like the other forms of evaluation, to the extent that a comment may impact the scoring of the application – yes, then we think that they should all be afforded the same types of opportunities, namely to respond to comments if those comments are going to impact scoring. I see, at least in my mind, and I'd love to hear comments, I do see that different as a community-based objection or GAC advice because those go through its own dispute resolution type policy or GAC advice goes to the Board, which is very different than a panel that's evaluating and actually applying a score to an application. So, I do think that those are different.

Does anyone have other thoughts on that? Okay. So, moving on to some other concerns. The Brand Registry Group, Registries Stakeholder Group, states that more detailed information and definitions are required in terms of the types of comments, how they would be interpreted ... This just goes on to repeat what we've said.

Again, I think the main point is that we want to ensure that to the extent a public comment comes in and may impact the scoring

that applicants be able to address that very specifically so that the scoring isn't impacted without the opportunity for the applicant to be heard.

Okay. Then moving on to the length of application comments. Jamie just talked about this. There was a public comment period that was open for all applications. It was supposed to be – I want to say 90 days after the applications were revealed. That ended up getting extended because of the amount of applications, and so in theory there was a closing date for comments to come in although that comment system was left open. And so, then for CPE, because as Jamie said, it was done years later, we had comments that came in a number of years after the applications came in especially as it became more likely that these applications were entering CPE.

So, with respect to this, there was support for a longer comment period for community applications as in the case of 2012. BRG, Registry Stakeholder Group, Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, and the Business Constituency, but although they're saying longer, I'm not sure they're saying infinite. I did not read that into their comments but longer is okay according to those groups. There were some groups however that said no, it should just be the same comment period for all as with all applications. That was endorsed by the ALAC, the IPC, and Dotgay LLC, which is a group that Jamie belongs to. But Dotgay LLC also came up with a new idea that says that letters of opposition should be considered a form of public comment and should adhere to the same submission deadlines.

Again, this goes to the point of we should not just keep this open forever and that the comments should come in within a defined time period. And any questions or comments? Let me ask this and I see Christopher raise his hand. What do we think? As a group, there are three or two different schools of thought. Some are saying make it equal, some are saying it can be longer. We'll have to make a decision. Actually, I shouldn't assume. Let me ask those that say it should be an equal length, will they support? Because it's a little bit more extensive of an evaluation, would they support a longer comment period but one that was finite and cut off? So, let's say a regular comment period might be 90 days, let's say, because of the complexity, we do allow 120 days. I'm making this up but for those community applications, is that something that would be acceptable again because there's a defined cut off period? I see Christopher and then Jason. So, Christopher, please.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi. Not wishing to [inaudible] cold water but there will be comments and some comments that the Board and the evaluators cannot ignore that will come in when they come in. It would be nice to see a statistical analysis of when the comments came in for .amazon up to today. I don't think you can put a time limit onto that.

Some particularly – and I reemphasize what I've said over and over again here and in Work Track 5, there is a tendency in our community to wish to ignore the interest of third parties in predictability. As long as you have rules which are predictable for the applicant but not predictable for third parties, you will get

comments, and I don't think politically the Board would ever accept to discard serious comments purely on the basis of a timeline. For me, this is really fundamental. I'm in favor of predictability but primarily predictability for the third parties who will be affected. If our work tracks and the PDP don't accept that then I don't accept any time limits of comments on applications. Thank you, Jeff. Sorry to be so frank, but it's getting late in the day and we've been around these houses several times.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Thanks, Christopher. I'll come back with the question followed in a second. Let me go to Jason.

JASON SCHAEFFER: Thank you, Jeff. Indeed, the last round of CPE was the never ending story and it should not be repeated. I respect what Christopher just stated and understand the concern about third party rights. However, in every form of whether it's litigation, arbitration, or otherwise, there's always a period of cut-off. There has to be an ending point so that parties can address and manage not just from a cost standpoint, surely from a predictability standpoint. I'm not necessarily against an extended period of time given the potential for more complexity – and to Christopher's point – of finding a way that the potentially affected third parties would have ample opportunity to respond. However, just having an open-ended free for all that continues until the day a decision isn't rendered is patently unfair to all concerned, not just the applicant. I think to the evaluators and to the community, the potential community that is being represented, and surely this

group and others can find a way to strike appropriate balance. But we have a 2012 round that we can certainly learn from. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks, Jason. I think that's helpful. My question for Christopher was, doesn't it also increase predictability for those parties that do want to file comments to give an end date even if it's longer than the general comments but still give an end date, so that while some comments may be on one side, there may be comments on the other side from the community as well, so that gives those end users more predictability as to when comments are going to be filed? Let me go to Kathy and then Greg.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Hi. I almost wonder if we should separate communities out because it seems like a special case or special circumstance that should be discussed especially, but comment periods – and I'm going to go to Christopher – are hard things. A lot of these depends on how much education ICANN has, how much the world knows about the new rounds coming out, when groups that are impacted – I will not use the word community – when groups that are impacted or feel they would be impacted by new gTLD registry find out what's going on. So a short period of time may not be enough for them to actually find out what's going on. It may be towards the end of the comment period where journalist picks this up and a group that's impacted actually figures it out.

So, question: how do we include the time it takes for the news to percolate that this is going on, and what do we do about successive rounds of changes? Because presumably in response to comments, some registries are going to want to propose changes, and then the commenters are presumably going to want to comment on these proposed changes. They said they don't go far enough or they should be tweaked in the following way. I'm not saying this is necessarily adversarial but it could be very positive, but it needs successive rounds of discussion. That discussion is coming through the comment period where have we factored that in. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Okay, thanks, Kathy. I'm going to save the issue for the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group new idea because that is coming, going back and forth, so we do need to talk about that. But with respect to the comment you made on the – it may take longer for groups to recognize – I look at this as a notice and comment no different than for the government to be issuing a [inaudible] to notices and then giving a time period to respond. It happens with all sorts of things. I use that analogy. Someone that may be impacted by a new regulatory event, if they miss it or the news doesn't pick up on it, I don't know what can be done there.

But let me go with Greg and then Christopher. I don't know, Kathy, your hand is still up, if you wanted back in. Okay, Greg, please.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I think that I tend to come down more in Jason's view. I do think we can do a better job on notice to the world, but we need to have a beginning, middle, and an end to these processes. They cannot just meander on forever. There really needs to be a defined term work expands to fill the time available to it, and I think you need to have things move on. Of course, we can't prevent people from writing stuff, and they can write to the Board and they can write to whomever they want. But in terms of having a comment process, which is not just about getting the comments in but it's about dealing with the comments and responding to them. To have a process, you need to have a time when you have a stable amount of comments and the period closes. So I think, overall, we need to discipline the process, at the same time look for ways to improve, [note that's] not an opportunity just to keep this thing going on as thousand and one nights. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Greg. Let me go to Christopher, then Jamie, and I want to try to wrap up this part of it, and then go on to the next paragraph.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, Jeff. I think Kathy answered your question very much in terms that I would support. I'm also sympathetic to Greg's preference, and if I was allocating mobile phone spectrum in Europe, I would agree with Greg 100%. But I think we are far from taking fully – as some of you know, I have spent more time on geographical names than on some of the other stuff, but most importantly, you guys have been dealing with – but worldwide, we are far from the point. Unless there's some flexibility or long

periods or very efficient notification and promotion of the new rounds through the GAC, through other institutions, then we're in for some trouble. So I think we have a problem. We still have a problem here because there's no evidence, to my mind, that either the policies, all the information proposed is adequate to deal with what some of you hope for, a vast expansion of the DNS in the next rounds.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks, Christopher. Then Jamie, please.

JAMIE BAXTER:

Thanks, Jeff. I think what we're on this section here, I really do want to emphasize the fact that in the 2012 Guidebook, there was reference to public comment and there was reference to community objections, which was its own process. There was no reference to the so-called letters of opposition, and I think it's incredibly important that if they are going to have their own title, they also need to have their own deadline. Our recommendation is that they be considered part of public comment since the opposer neglected or chose to not participate in a formal objection, but then after objections, prior to community priority decide to write a letter of opposition which was undefined in the Guidebook, the only way I could see to define it is as a public comment since it's not a formal objection, I think it's really important that these things get identified and they get put on timeline so that there's more transparency and predictability in the Guidebook going into the next round. Unfortunately, and I know you heard me say this before, but the community priority evaluation process was put

together on the fly as it was moving, and that cannot happen in the next round. So we have to take all of these important learnings and fix it and provide way more predictability and transparency for those community applicants who will participate in the subsequent procedures. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks, Jamie. If I could try to tie some of this together, and then Kathy, you can come in and tell me whether I'm wrong or whether this is supportable. What I'm hearing is the most important thing is that we do have predictability. I think like Greg said, a defined beginning and end – I know Greg had said “middle” but I'm not sure what the middle is – but certainly a beginning and an end, whether that beginning and end for a CPE comment period is run at the exact same time as the public comment period in general, I'm not sure that that is of huge issue, just that there is a defined beginning and end to give that predictability. I know, Jamie, you have the proposal in there as preference to run them together, but it seems like to solve the most important issues that you brought up, having that beginning, having that end is really from what I've taken out of it the most important. I guess I've heard and there are comments about we got to make sure that there's notice out there to the community so that they know to file comments. Sure, we absolutely have to do that, making the whole CPE process more predictable. Yes, I think that that will also be discussed further when we get to that topic specifically on the notion of more transparency around how comments are going to be treated.

I think there are a number of elements here that I'm hearing agreement at least on this call that may make it work or make its

way to high-level agreements or recommendations from this group even if it's not exactly in the format of the proposals as they came in. Let me go to Kathy. Oh no, Kathy's got her hand down. Maybe that summary was okay.

KATHY KLEIMAN: No, no, no. It was that I didn't take off my mute. Sorry.

JEFF NEUMAN: Sorry. That's okay, Kathy.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Here's my question. Beginning, middle, end. If this were a notice of proposed rulemaking in any country and use the appropriate national term, there'd be a beginning, middle, end. There'd be an opening of the comment period, there'd be a time for comments, and there'd be the processing of those comments presumably for some kind of new rule or new amendment to an existing law or regulation.

But in this case, we may be prioritizing sets of applications. Let me ask, 30 days or 60 days after the new applications, why is that so important when some of these applications may be four or five years in processing if we have 10,000 applications? So shouldn't the comment stay open until some period? I mean if nobody is doing anything to these applications, if their number is in the thousands in terms of processing, then why does it matter that the comments come in within 30 days? Why doesn't it just matter that they come in within some reasonable amount of time for the

registry to respond, for the discussion to take place. And if this application isn't going to be processed for a little while, just leave the comment period open. Tie the comment period to when the application is being processed. Why close it off prematurely? Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Okay. Thanks, Kathy. The thing I had thought about, if you look at the comments that came in, whether it was for CPE or comments that came in for some of the geographic terms or not, I think what you will see is most of the substance of the comments actually came in during the comment period. What didn't come in during the comment period were additional groups adding on to those comments. What's really hard to see, or when I went back through it, is whether that extra time period actually added to the substance of the debate as opposed to the amplification of the debate. This is true regardless of whether we're talking about some of the geographic terms or even the community ones. So what it left the door open to was gaming. It left the door open to those that had those comments to find additional support, in some cases, create much more of an amplification that may have actually existed. I did not find that going through comments that were within the time period versus those that were afterwards, I didn't find it adding much to the substance. It only was an amplification of the substance. I would challenge others to go read those comments and prove me wrong. Actually, I did go through a bunch of them because I thought that that was an interesting study.

Look, I'm not saying that – and I don't think anyone here is saying that it can't be a longer period that we allow some of these comments to come in, but at some point, is it really truly a value of those additional comments or has it become more of politics and political game for drumming up support or opposition for your types of comments. So I think that that's something to consider.

I want to read some of these from the chat because I think they're responding to me, which is good.

Paul agreed. Jamie is talking about fairness. Paul says that the problem is that the evaluation process is already so long. Then Jamie says, "Why should community applicants be subjected to longer comment periods just because ICANN org chose to put CPE at the end of the evaluation process? Would standard applicants be open to longer comment periods if community priority is done at the beginning of subsequent procedures?" @Jeff: "... But we will never know if the amplification impacted scoring during CPE."

With respect to that last one, I'm agreeing with you, Jamie. We don't know if the amplification impacted the scoring or not. There's really no way of knowing that. But I guess my point was, if we have a finite beginning and an end to a comment period, I think all the substance will be there that with all the substance that an evaluator and a panel need to evaluate the comment should be there. The only thing it is missing is the amplification – and I'm not sure that that is worth putting aside the fairness that you talked about, Jamie, of the process.

Kathy said, “I think we are assuming that the relevant people know up front.” Kathy, I think that that’s right. Well, it’s a different question. The relevant people versus all of the people. I think if you go through the comments, those that objected to applications knew pretty quickly, and I think those were relevant people. I wouldn’t say that those were all of the people, but those are certainly relevant people, whether it was those that opposed the closed generics. It wasn’t everybody but certainly you’ll find that a lot of the substance here, comments in the groups, they’d file comments during the public comment period and became amplified when the Board opened up another public comment period on that. But I don’t think we could say that evaluators didn’t necessarily know that the substance to those comments existed or didn’t exist.

Kathy is saying it’s much more than amplification. That would close generics as probably right. But I do think that this is a fairness issue. I think there does need to be a beginning and an end. I just think we need to decide whether that beginning and end need to correspond to the beginning and end of the regular public comment period. Kathy is saying longer comment periods might be a reasonable compromise.

Okay then, let’s go to the next one. I do want to cover again, a little bit into the name collision. There was a new idea from the NCSG that I think we do need to tackle, which is the notion of we do recommend and it seemed like there’s high-level agreement on the recommendation that applicants be given an opportunity to respond to comments if those comments may impact the scoring.

What the NCSG is saying and Kathy brought up just a few minutes ago, okay, so let's say the applicant does have a chance to respond, the reply, should there be a surreply to the reply, should there be an opportunity to comment on the applicants' comments. I would like to hear from the group as to what they think about that. If I draw an analogy to a litigation aspect or you have a complaint filed by a party, then you have a response filed by the other party/adversarial party. Then you have a chance to reply. That's it generally. Unless there's permission from a court to draft a surreply but that's really in just circumstances where a reply brings up something new that couldn't have been contemplated in the actual original response to the complaint.

So, let me get thoughts from others. Do we think we should add this? Is this just too much? Is this just going to create too much back and forth? What's the thought? As I move around a little bit here, sorry for that. Does anyone have any thoughts on that?

Rubens is saying it sounds like too much back and forth.

Kathy, yeah, good. Thanks for raising your hand. I [inaudible] up. Please.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Great. As you said, Jeff, this is a traditional way of doing things. There's a comment, there's a response, there's a reply to the response. We do it in lots and lots of different situations and this is the best way to get to an endpoint, frankly. This happens in local government. I'm engaged in this process all the time.

So here you've got – I actually think this should help the registry applicants because you've got a group of commenters that have some concern and they'd like to see it. They've read the application, the public portion of the application carefully, and they'd like to see their concern addressed. Maybe the registry wants to address the concern but then there has to be – there can be this discussion that takes place. We're really talking at an abbreviated discussion. It's not infinite and it's not a lot of back and forth. So you get the comments, you have the registry, then talking about their response, what they're willing to change and adapt, and you get the reply. Maybe their reply agrees and says that's perfect or if you tweak it just a little bit, we're done. So I think this could get all of us to closure a lot faster, just adding this additional step. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay, Kathy. But I think you were talking about additional ones. The groups already agreed in the high-level agreement to give the applicant a chance to reply. What the NCSG is saying here is that there should be an opportunity to have a surreply to the reply. So, a response –

KATHY KLEIMAN: There's a response by the applicant, and then there's a reply by the original commenters?

JEFF NEUMAN: Well, this is a little bit different. This is there's an application and now they're saying that the score could be impacted – I'm sorry.

There's the application, then there's a response to the application, if you will. Then what they're saying is that, "Okay, Applicant, your scoring may be impacted by that response, which is the form of a comment. Now, Registry, you have an opportunity to reply." That's the reply that we're talking about. What the NCSG is saying – what you're saying – is that there should be almost a surreply to the registry's reply. That's the way you're thinking about it, whereas the rest of us were thinking about it is you have an application that's being scored, you have people that object to the application being scored in that kind of way, and then you have a reply by the registry saying, "I don't agree with that response," or "I agree with that response and here are my changes."

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Right. And then you have the original people who commented saying those changes don't go far enough for those changes exactly [meet] what we're looking for or those changes should be tweaked a little bit. So it's a full dialogue because it often doesn't work. In fact, we see it in systems around the world, so play with the terms as you will. But there's a comment or set of comments by the public, there's a response by the registry, and then that final reply – it's pretty simple one. The NCSG believes that if applicants are allowed to respond to comment, commenters should be allowed another round of comments.

So, this is very defined. Did the registry get it right? Did the registry applicant get it right? Do they need to go a little further to make everybody happy? It's just a way of getting to closure. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks, Kathy. I see a little bit different because we're talking about – this is not an objection, right? This is just a comment in the scoring of an application. If this were an objection process – and in the objection process, I completely agree with you that you have that back and forth. But this is should an applicant scoring be impacted by a public comment? So a public comment comes in and says, "We don't think the applicant should meet the scoring to pass because of A, B, C, and D." Then the reply is from the registry that says, "Now, wait a minute. The scoring shouldn't be impacted," and has its reply. We're not talking about an objection like a Legal Rights Objection or a morality public order or community objection. What we're talking about here is whether a comment impacts the scoring of a registry's application.

So we go to Paul and then circle back if Kathy's got any additional comment.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks. I really think we're talking about two different questions, right? Question #1 is, does the comment affect scoring? And if so, what's the consequence of an applicant not responding to the comment is the default that the applicant is harmed in some way? Because there could be 100,000 comments made by robots. Who knows? That's Question #1.

Then I think Question #2 relates to Kathy's question which is, if the applicant does respond to a comment, should the commenter be allowed to do another comment? Then we sort of revert back to

Question #1 which is, what's the consequence of that? If applicant applies, commenter makes a comment, applicant doesn't bother to respond, what's the consequence of that? Applicant does respond, and then the commenter responds back, what's the consequence of that?

Obviously, I'm against any sort of proposal that results in an applicant losing because they don't have the resources to respond to every comment no matter how useful or not useful. So I'm not for default applicant losing. In other words, I'm not for these comments having any effect on the score. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah, thanks. I think it's helpful to go back as you said. What we've said with the public comment period is that applicants get – there's a general public comment period but then our recommendation was to add seven days or something like that to the end of the comment period so that applicants have a chance to respond. I think that is – and you're right, that should be treated very differently than the other recommendation we have which says that if an evaluator believes a comment may impact the scoring then the evaluator needs to issue a clarifying question to the applicant and the applicant has the ability to respond to the evaluator. That's what we're talking about.

So I think to answer your first question, if an applicant just doesn't want to respond to comments that are raised, that shouldn't have any impact unless an evaluator comes back and says that comment that was posted may impact your scoring, so here's your

opportunity to file a response. Does that make any sense? I'm hoping. I know it's a little bit in the weeds.

Okay, Justine. I think Justine wrote exactly a lot of what I said, which is cool. Let me go to Kathy. Is this left over or is this a new hand?

KATHY KLEIMAN: New hand.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Kathy, Greg, and then Christopher.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Just quick – holding public comment for a reason presumable. So if the applicant has the opportunity to respond, reply, that's good. But I would leave some room. First I'd create a system that gives notice to the people who submitted the comment and give them some time – not huge amounts of time – to respond. As you pointed out, this is classic in every other system. Because what could happen is that you have the comments from the public and the registry applicant could respond and not address the comments or say they're addressing the comments and they'll be addressing the comments. You want to finish the loop and see if they actually really did address the comments, and the best group to ask is the people commenting in the first place. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Thanks, Kathy. Let me go to Greg and then Christopher.

GREG SHATAN: I'm sympathetic to Kathy's view. Again, not in love with long, drawn-out processes, but I think that giving the commenter an opportunity to respond in a defined period of time in a defined manner is appropriate. It can be very frustrating to put in a comment and then somehow it's dealt with orthogonally or something is mistaken, or there's a big issue that's left undone or unfocused on. I would focus this and – I can't remember where I've seen some rules on replies or surreplies that they need to – they can't open up new avenues and they need to directly address comments and they can't be used to restate positions that were stated in the first time around and that they should be done only for certain purposes essentially to close the loop, correct a mistaken assumption and the like, because we don't need to drown in in paper and then redundantly. But I think that if you don't close the loop, you end up with the kind of unanswered questions and potential mistakes then people are left trying through other means to say, "Wait, you didn't understand our comment," or "What about this thing you just missed?" So I think there needs to be a defined and narrow, appropriate opportunity to finish it up. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Thanks, Greg. Christopher? Christopher, you're still on mute I think.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Is that better?

JEFF NEUMAN: That is. Thank you.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Very briefly then, because I think much of what needs to be said has been said. But the ethos of this whole discussion seems to presuppose that if strings are not explicitly protected, they're available for all comers. I think that's a fundamental misunderstanding of the relationship between society, politics, and semantics. I just don't accept it. You cannot assume that just because there's no prior protection, there's no explicit objection, you cannot assume that the string is free for all. Sorry, but I think that's the political reality at the global level. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Thanks, Christopher. Something for us to think about then. There were a certain number of days for public comment. We said in our recommendation seven days for an applicant to respond. What we're talking about here is a commenter's ability to respond for a limited amount of days, presumably less than that seven days, just to clarify. I think Greg put it well, so I'll have to go back to the notes to define it. It really should only be used for a limited purpose to how a commenter responds.

I do want to get into the next topic. Jamie, I know you have a comment. Is this with respect to CPE and this latest thing that we're talking about?

JAMIE BAXTER: Just a quick note on what you finished up with there Jeff, I think the predictability around this is also good for those commenters because then they won't gain by placing their comment in the last date thinking they can get away with it because the policies and the rules state that the applicant will have time to respond. So I think it helps everybody in this situation. It makes it more clear that gaming is not really an option anymore. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay, great. Thanks. I think all of the rest of the comments we've covered, and with the NCSG, the new idea, we've covered it. So I think we're good to at least do a quick start on the name collision, and I know we'll continue within the next call.

Justine, I guess in general, what you do for replies and surreplies is that there's always a time period then that's sometimes less than the previous one. In theory, you could do seven and seven. That was just made as an example. We can continue that conversation on the list or even just leave that to an Implementation Team, but I just wrote that as an illustrative example.

With name collision, I think this is an interesting one because there's other work in the community that's ongoing with respect to name collision. We're just waiting for the screen to change over here. We don't have any high-level agreements on this one again for a few reasons.

Number one is it's a very technical issue that is being addressed in other areas of the community and because, frankly, there's just

not enough from a policy perspective, I don't think we have the information from the last round. We have certain things in this section that we'd like to see in the next round, but what we don't have at this point is a complete understanding of the other work that's going on in the community.

So when I say that, we do know that there is at least an NCAP Phase 1 study that is starting. When I say "starting," we know there's a discussion group, we know that there's an RFP for a vendor to do Phase 1, but we don't know if a vendor has actually been qualified and selected. We don't know whether Phase 1 will lead to a Phase 2. We don't know if it does lead to a Phase 2, what the Phase 2 study will be because part of Phase 1 is to narrow down what Phase 2 ... or if there should be a Phase 2 and a Phase 3, and if there is, what the complete scope of that Phase 2 and Phase 3 is. So, there's a lot of uncertainties.

We also have a statement from the Board that talks about certain dependencies between the studies and the next round of new gTLDs. So one thing you will have seen is that we, being the leadership of this group, had asked the Council to clarify with the ICANN Board exactly what the Board is thinking in terms of the term dependencies. When it says that there's dependencies, does it mean that we can't finish our policy work? Does it mean that we could finish the policy work but we can't finish the implementation work? Does it mean that we could finish the policy and implementation work but we can't start the application window? What does it mean?

So the Council took a stab at drafting a note to send to the Board. The leadership of the Council had asked Cheryl and I in our

capacities as individual co-Chairs to make comments on it, which we did. I forwarded that to the group, which basically it agrees with what's in the letter but really asks for more specificity. Because what we know is that there are people in the community that are taking positions that are reasonable based on the vagueness of what the Board said. So the Board says there should be dependencies but the Board doesn't say that we can't move forward with all these other steps, or which steps we can move forward with and which we can't. So the changes to the red lines to the letter that Cheryl and I have suggested are just to get that form of specificity so that we could at least move on with our work or not move on with our work depending on what the Board and Council say.

That's pretty much the crux of the letter. That's what I wanted to cover today in terms of making sure that you look through it. I know that stakeholder groups and constituencies are also giving input to their councilors on the draft letter that the Council is considering. But I do think that this is important because, like I said, I've heard and as we'll talk about in the next call, there are some groups that think that it's okay to move on with launching a new round but we can't delegate new strings until these NCAP studies are disposed with in some way. And "disposed" I don't mean thrown out, I mean taking to its natural fruition.

There are other comments that say that, "No, we shouldn't even finish our policy or implementation work until after the NCAP studies are done." Other comments you'll see from – I know Ann had submitted some comments that said, "We need to wait until the NCAP does A, B, C, and D," but we don't even know if NCAP

is going to do A, B, C, and D because the NCAP hasn't even decided whether it's going to do those things because again, it doesn't want to predetermine an outcome.

Those are my words of introduction. I'll let Rubens then add some words of introduction as well, and then get on to the AOB.

RUBENS KUHL: Thanks, Jeff. Can you hear me?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, I can hear you, Rubens.

RUBENS KUHL: I'd like to move backwards from the comment and from the discussion in Work Track 4 to what could be expected in the final report. I see that most of our discussions we end up being [settled] by our [inaudible] following the 2012 round. Few items that I see reaching consensus level that we need mostly regarding composing the do not apply because they are not fully assertive, they are more of a suggestion for ICANN Org, but most of the other [inaudible] they don't have consensus at all, so I think this section in report will not be very short. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Rubens. I think that's right. This is not really a lot of material for us to cover but there were a lot of comments that came in, so I want us to be clear as to what our part is on name collisions versus what the NCAP is doing. So we'll spend the bulk

of the time on the next call talking about that and really what our role is in moving forward.

So with that, I do want to address Jim's question under the AOB which is where we are on providing some more details with the service levels. I know that some very high level things were provided by ICANN staff – or sorry, GDD; yeah, that's ICANN staff, GDD – which was not as detailed as what was provided to the contracted parties a while ago. Donna had sent that around to the group so the group could see what was provided to the contracted parties.

Steve, do you have – I know we've communicated to GDD that we'd like to provide more context for what we sent to this group. Do you have any update on that?

STEVE CHAN:

Sure. Thanks, Jeff. This is Steve Chan from staff. I did have a brief conversation with GDD to try to not only convey what problems we're trying to solve but also just to get, as you said, the timing on when might be able to deliver. The initial conversation I have with them, what I've discovered is that it is a non-negligible amount of effort to be able to provide that information. So it's not pressing button again reported, it's actually doing a deep dive to be able to get that information. So I'm not sure if the working group might be open to the idea of trying to define exactly what we're trying to solve because there might not be green dollars to be able to get this information, but it is allocating resources to be able to go get the information. It's maybe not the update you're looking for, to say that can be available in two weeks but I do

know that it's not an easy thing for them to do. So in that respect, they're hoping that they can get a clear understanding of what we're trying to accomplish and then maybe they could actually tailor the information to solve that purpose. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Okay. Thanks, Steve. One thing I do want to add on this subject is if that data is not negligible to get that, I think the problem is that we've seen ICANN use that data in certain ways that imply things that may be worse than they actually are, or others to imply that they're not as bad as they actually are. So to the extent that anyone wants to read anything into those numbers, we need to know that kind of context – we've heard ICANN GDD state several times that there is a problem out there with registry violating the SLAs, and so that might be something we want to look at in terms of the preapproval process or in terms of the COI process or the EBERO process. But if it's not possible to get the context of what's behind that data, then we can't make any presumptions or assumptions, one way or the other, to act on it. We just have to assume.

For example, I know from experience that SLA violations – let's say registry tells ICANN, "We're going to do scheduled maintenance on this day at this time," ICANN will still issue SLA violation notices or emergency threshold violations even though it knew about the maintenance because ICANN system for a long period of time wasn't able to stop these automated notices from going out. In my mind, those notices went out, maybe they were recorded as an SLA violation but they weren't.

So, Jim is going to follow up with more comments via e-mail, which is good. I think others should as well. But if we can't get more context then we can't have parties read into it one way or the other. That includes GDD. We can't have GDD making statements on what they believe the SLA data means unless they're willing to provide that context to the community. I think that will be helpful.

So, we'll do by e-mail. The next call, if we can put that time in for the next call on Monday, September 16, 15:00 UTC for 90 minutes. Thanks, everyone, and we'll talk to you all on Monday.

JULIE BISLAND: Thank, Jeff. Thanks, everyone. Have a good rest of your day or night.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]