
ICANN Transcription

RPM Sub Group A

Tuesday, 16 June 2020 at 1300 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 are posted on the agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/dwcdC>

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

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. Welcome to the RPM Subgroup A Call on Tuesday, 16th of June, 2020. In the interest of time, there will be no role call. We'll be taking attendance via the Zoom Room only. So, if you are connected by the audio bridge, could you please make let yourselves be known now? Seeing and hearing no one, I'd like to remind you all to please remember to state your names before speaking for recording purposes, to keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise. I'd also like to remind you that those taking part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with expected standards of behavior. With this, I'll turn it back to David McAuley. Please begin.

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.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Nathalie, and thank you to the folks who are here. Welcome everybody to this call. I do think as our practices indicated in the short time we've been operating that I do expect that there will be more folks joining us soon. And so, why don't we go ahead and get started? Especially since the initial part is largely administrative.

So, let me begin by asking if any of the people who are now on the call have any changes to or updates to their statements of interest. I don't see hands and I'm not hearing anybody try to intervene, so I think we have completed that. Let's turn now to the wrap-up of action items from the previous meeting and I'll turn it over I think to Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND: Actually, David, I think Ariel will going through the wrap-up, so I'm going to go ahead and turn things over to Ariel. Thank you.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks everyone, please just give me one moment to share my screen. So, for the wrap-up last week, the subgroup has completed the review for public comments of sunrise recommendations five through eight. There are no outstanding action items and the conclusion for this review is that all these recommendations will be forwarded to the working group as is, that's for recommendation five to seven. There are specific public

comments that are being flagged to the working group and you probably have already seen the public comment analysis document, so I won't reiterate.

And one thing I would like to note is that for sunrise recommendation seven, there's one item for staff to check. It's related to IPC's comment, that's in row 29 of the public comment review tool, to confirm whether it's a proposal that the working group has already discussed in its deliberation. And staff did check our records and we confirmed this is a new proposal, so it's a new material or idea or perspective that the working group should review. So, we confirmed that. We checked this and this comment has been flagged in the public comment analysis document.

So, that's pretty much it for the wrap-up. And happy to hear if there's any additional comment or input.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Not seeing any. Thank you, Ariel. So, let's move on to the main items on the agenda this morning. And we're starting to review Sunrise questions. It's not obviously directly working on recommendations as we did where we were looking to flag things that were new material, etc., to the group. And so, what I suggest we do here is look for comments in response to questions that could lead to a potential change of a recommendation or development of a new recommendation if that's the case. And remember our remit—that we're looking for new and material perspectives that the full working group hadn't considered when it made its initial recommendations, or new facts that materially

strengthen or lessen assumption on which recommendations were made, and solutions that might be suggested that are new.

So, let's move on to Sunrise question number one, and I will be toggling between two different screens, and so I will begin the process. I'll list the question, I'll state the questions in some cases obviously when we get to questions three and four—that's much more involved and we'll do a different approach—and briefly summarize some of [what we saw in the answers.]

Sunrise question number one: "What remedy or remedies would you propose for any unintended effects of the Sunrise period that you have identified in your public comment?"

There were 31 non-responses out of [55] comments, and amongst the remedies that people are suggesting is open up a trademark clearing house [where I counted some nine comments,] adopt Sunrise recommendation number two—that, remember, is the recommendation about circumvention—and I just lost my screen, bear with me just one second.

I understand my audio's fading. Is this any better? Can anyone hear me? Okay. Thank you. Apologies for that, I'm in the process of getting a new headset, it's just not here yet, I apologize for that. I will have it next time I believe barring something unforeseen.

Adopt Sunrise recommendation number two. There were about six in my count. Do not allow the use of dictionary words, there were some six comments, there were others that referred to that as common words. Five of those. Removing improper registrations. That was the nature.

There was an interesting comment—it was very similar—from INTA and the global brand operators community advocating, again, for the adoption of Sunrise recommendation number two, but they also mentioned that any comments that seek to change policies bear the burden of proof that the problems exist and are reasonably persuasive enough in their comments to warrant policy changes.

So, allow me to open the queue and see if anybody would like to comment on the question and the answers that we have in front of us. Our job as a subgroup, I believe, is to flag to the full working group answers that we find of interest that might be informative as the working group considers the recommendations to which these questions relate. Obviously this question will have some relationship to Sunrise recommendation number two based on the answers we have.

I'm not hearing anybody and I'm not seeing any hands. We're a little bit of a smaller group today, but I will wait another moment or so to see. And while I'm doing that, let me do with Julie or Ariel or both one more audio check. Is this coming through okay?

ARIEL LIANG: Hi David, it's okay for now.

DAVID MCAULEY: Okay, thanks. Apologies for that. Thank you. My screen just went through some change, but in any event, Ariel, could I ask you, if you are the one sharing the screen, if you could make the

comments tool a little bit bigger? It's become hard to read right now. Okay, thank you.

So, if there are no comments on Sunrise question number one, let's turn to question number two. 2A is quite easy.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Sorry, hand before you go.

DAVID MCAULEY: I'm sorry, I didn't see that. Michael, please go ahead.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: No problem, I was late. Yeah, I just thought it is worth noting that, from the looks of things at the responses, opening the TMCH was ...

DAVID MCAULEY: Michael, we seem to have lost you. I at least heard you through a comment opening the TMCH and otherwise ...

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: ... The most popular [inaudible] here. Sorry about that. Yeah, I'm being told my Internet connection is unstable. I'm going try this one more time and then I'm going to switch connections.

Yeah, I'm just noting that opening the TMCH appears to be the most popular response back in terms of how to resolve these, and

I do think that's worth noting as it feeds into other discussions we're presumably going to be having later on.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thank you, Michael, and it's a fair comment. That did receive ... and also the request with respect to common words, dictionary words, also had some traction, etc. So, thank you for that. And if that is not a new hand, I'll ask you to lower your hand. And, in light of that comment, I will ask one more time if there are any further comments to Sunrise question number one. And I don't see any.

So, Sunrise question 2A is quite easy: "Have you identified abuses of the Sunrise period?" Pretty straight forward.

Yes responses were 40%, no responses were just above 9%, there were about 36% non-responsive and unsure, 14%, which led then to question 2B.

"To the extent that you've identified abuses of Sunrise, please describe them and specify any documentation to substantiate the above identified abuses."

Yeah, so let me ask if there is a queue to comment with respect to 2A or 2B. I note Phil's comment in chat—Julie's asking me, Julie I will send you my phone number in case I get an audio glitch. I'll send it to you in just a minute.

Phil is mentioning he didn't see any ideas or facts with respect to question one that were not previously discussed in the working group. Thank you, Phil, agreed with Griffin.

I'm going to ask for a queue, I see Susan Payne's hand is up, I'm going to give you the floor, Susan, while I go ahead and send my phone number off to Julie or Ariel. Thank you. Go ahead, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks, David. I think most of the comments I think fall into two different categories and we all know what they are and the things that, I agree, have been discussed before.

I think perhaps the only one that I thought was maybe worth noting was the BC—Business Constituency I guess that is—which says, and I'm sorry, I keep losing the comment. I keep trying to find it and sort of managing to scroll past it somehow.

But toward the end of what looks like a long comment, I think what they're proposing is their suggesting that we, as a group, should look again at the PDDRP and that might be a method of addressing price gouging and they do seem to make a series of suggested guardrails that could be put around that. So, it seemed to me that this is perhaps something that is sort of new or is a new tweak to something that we didn't particularly consider.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thank you, Susan. Thank you for that comment. It's possible and we might revisit this when we see how staff and myself address this in the wrap-up tool that we use, but it's possible that what we might do with respect to this question in particular is note it to the full working group and tie it to this sunrsie recommendation two and in a manner such as this. It's conceivable, I'm not saying this

is what we should do, I'm saying this might an idea that we can consider.

And that is say to the full working group, "If you, dear full working group, choose to take some action with respect to Sunrise recommendation number two and if in doing that you want to consider the idea that was floated of listing some examples, you could do well to look at the answers to Sunrise question 2A and 2B." And there, the business constituency answer, I think as you point out, is detailed and suggestive. So, that might be one way to address this, in other words, to note it to the full working group.

So, thank you, Susan. Phil, your hand's up. Please, go ahead.

PHIL CORWIN: Okay, can you hear me now? I had to double unmute.

DAVID MCAULEY: Yes, thank you.

PHIL CORWIN: Yeah, Phil speaking in a personal capacity. Susan may be right in identifying this BC comment as a new idea in terms of repurposing or expanding the scope of the TMPDDRP. I would just note two things. One, that would be a considerable expansion of that mechanism, which right now is only available against a registry operator which directly infringes trademark or which actively encourages registrants to infringe. And also, we do have the recommendation that there'd be some enforcement mechanism

against registries that registry operators operate their registries in a way to circumvent the RPMs, which might get at the BC's concern.

We did have in public comments on that support for the concept, but a number of comments, including from the CPH, NCSG, and ICANN Org, that needed to be more tightly defined. So, personally I think more defining that complaint mechanism rather than expanding the scope of the PDDRP might be the better way to go, but [I should maybe correct] that this is a new idea that should at least be pointed out to the full working group for its consideration. Thank you.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thank you, Phil, and I know they will because they're so good, but Ariel and Julie, if you could just make a note of Susan's comment and Phil's for our wrap-up.

Susan, your hand is next, please go ahead.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Yeah, thanks, and it was just a quick reaction to what Phil said. And Phil, I agree, I suppose I was looking at this from the other side and thinking that we do have this preliminary recommendation originally made in the initial report that there should be some mechanism for challenge or for addressing some of the concerns that have been expressed. And perhaps, rather than building a new mechanism, there is this possibility that could something like the TMPDDRP be tweaked.

But, I don't think we're in disagreement with each other, I guess I was just coming at it from a different direction. And I think that's what the BC is saying.

And from recollection on looking at IPC comments on one of the previous calls, I think the IPC when they were commenting on the TMPDDRP made a sort of similar comment, but in the context of this question, too, it was this BC comment that seemed most noteworthy to me.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Susan. Michael, your hand's up next. Please go ahead.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah, I don't think that the objections to that other recommendation came as a result of a lack of a mechanism of enforcement. As I recall, the objections came as a result of a lack of a clear standard or a lack of a definitional clarity on what the bad behavior is and how to define that bad behavior and how to understand where to draw the line between that and regular pricing challenges.

So, I'm not sure that this really moves the ball up the field very much on that perspective just to say, "Well, here's a mechanism for us to enforce this standard, which ICANN Org and the registries have both claimed is too vague to enforce."

But that doesn't necessarily mean it shouldn't be flagged, I just don't think it necessarily solves the problem.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Michael. And I think that's a fair point and that this will end up in the wrap-up of the full working group in the context of Sunrise rec two and this question.

So, I'm looking for any other hands, otherwise we will move in a second to Sunrise question number three. And let me do that, I'm going to toggle to another screen for a moment and I'll be looking at chat in just a second.

When we get to Sunrise question number three, I want to make a note, and that is, I have to thank Ariel for this because during our prep call I had overlooked this and she brought it to my attention, but when we reviewed the public comments for Sunrise recommendation number one, back then, Kathy Kleiman suggested that we revisit the spanning of dot comment that CORE Association had made when we start reviewing Sunrise questions three and four, those two questions are related. And so, I wanted to flag that.

CORE's comment was simply something along the lines that for community based and geographically oriented TLDs, the possibility ought to be allowed for something like Real Madrid to be Real.Madrid and BBC Radio to be BBC.Radio. You can see the CORE comment in the public comment review tool at row 33 back at Sunrise recommendation number one. So, I just wanted to mention that.

Now as we get into Sunrise question number three, you can see obviously that they are specific and that they are detailed and,

with respect to the initial ones, Sunrise questions 3A and 3D, these were directed to registry operators. So, the group that they were directed to was not the 55 that comments. I mean, the 55 that commented were not all within that group, just registry operators were. And that accounts, I suppose in some part, for the lower number of responses we had in total, some four responses from AFNIC, CORE Association, Fundació .cat and domainworx Service & Management GmbH, I believe it was. So, anyway, three ...

I can summarize, although these are quite detailed, but since we have some time and a smaller group, I think I'll try and go ahead and do that. If anybody has any general comments on 3A through 3D, I'd welcome a hand now. I see Phil does, but then I can move to sort of a specific sub-question by sub-question if we wish. And I see I'm still fading, Brian. Okay, I'm sorry about that Brian, I've got new headsets on the way and I just don't have them yet.

So, Phil, your hand's up, please go ahead.

PHIL CORWIN:

Yeah, thank you, David, and as always, speaking in an individual capacity. Yeah, it struck me that most of the comments here from registry operators and their associations noted—and I think may be new, I don't recall this coming up in discussions—that when they tried to use ALP or QLP they found that ICANN either took an inordinately long time for approval that made it impossible to use that or imposed restrictions on the use that were kind of created by ICANN, not by the guidebook itself.

So, I think that those may be new inputs that we would want to kick up to the full working group, but perhaps my memory is faulty on that. I'm happy to defer to others if they can recall discussions of those problems, but I don't recall them. Thank you.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thank you, Phil. I'm going to go to Ariel just a minute, but I do agree with you that there's a consistent theme in the answers to some of the number three questions that the timeline is just not working, is not workable, or that it was taking too long to get things done. And, in fact, you can see it on-screen right now under subgroup responses. ALP took too long to gain approval, etc., were the consistent comments among the four, if you can use the word consistent in that respect.

Ariel had her hand up, please go ahead, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, David, and I apologize, I didn't raise my hand quickly enough that because we moved away from sunrise Q2, but there is a comment when the subgroup was deliberating on recommendation two, there was a comment regarding implementation guidance related to examples of registry operators' conduct that may have an effect for circumventing RPMs.

And then there was some comments about sort of this type of input and examples provided via public comment. And I just want to flag that in IPC's comment, there was some examples that IPC have provided regarding these registry operator conduct and may

serve as example for additional implementation guidance, but I realize we have moved away from that topic, but I just want to flag it in case this is something you want to capture in the summary analysis document.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Yes, thanks, Ariel, for mentioning that and it sounds like I might ... And I do believe that the general theme of what we're going to be doing is indicating that there's a fair amount of examples, if in fact the full working group is interested in examples, there's a fair amount of examples in responses to question two. So, let's you and I and Julie go through that as we prepare the wrap-up tool.

Now, I'm happy if Ariel's comment, however, would kick off anybody wanting to put their hand up in the queue.

And then based on Brian's recent comment, let me ask—I'm sorry to keep doing this—let me ask one more time, Julie, if the sound is at least understandable?

JULIE HEDLUND:

Yeah, thanks David. Yes, we can hear you now and it seems to be stable. So, fingers crossed it'll stay that way.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thank you very much. So, we're moving then to question three in a little bit of specifics.

3A One: "If you did not attempt an approved launch program, qualified launch program, or limited registration period, was the

reason for not taking advantage of those programs related to how they integrate with Sunrise?”

And the three answers were from AFNIC, CORE, and Fundació .cat. ALP simply took too long to gain approval, in their view. Let me check on those for hands, don't see any.

3A Two: “Were you able to achieve your goals in a different way, such as combining any or all programs?”

AFNIC and CORE said partially by reserving names. Fundació, not really. They said that the applicant guidebook was not working to their liking in this respect, it was putting community interests ahead of trademark. It was designed to and was frustrated in putting community interests ahead of trademark interests, trademark clearing housing trademarks.

I'm going to come back to the screen. No hands yet, so let me move on this other screen.

“If you did attempt ALP, QLP, or LRP, or a combination, but didn't successfully use any, was the reason you did not take advantage of those programs related to how they integrate with Sunrise?”

Timeline was the issue for two of the answers. [Inaudible] seems to be [inaudible]. I don't see any hands.

JULIE HEDLUND:

David, if you're speaking we can't hear you.

DAVID MCAULEY: I'm sorry. Can you hear me now?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you. Let me just look at Susan's, Griffin ... Never mind, that moved on. If there is any comment in chat that you wish to make on the floor, please go ahead. Otherwise, I'm going to move on in this brief summary to 3B.

"Were you able to reserve or allocate all of the names you needed to?"

AFNIC said, "Yes, but a better process is needed." CORE: "Criteria over priority needs to accommodate more interest in domain work," said some, but not all.

So, you can see that sort of amongst the folks that use this, there's potential workarounds, there are ways they can try and do this, but they're worried about time and they're worried about the ALP, QLP, LRP not being fine-tuned enough for their liking.

So, question 3D One: "For each issue you have identified above, please include suggested mitigation path." What are they suggesting that we do?

And these get into some detail under question 3D two, which I'm not sure I can summarize but I will like to open the queue now, if anyone has gone through those has comments on any of the suggestions. Not seeing any hands.

3D Two: “How important is it to make changes to these programs before another round of new gTLDs?”

And again, there’s sort of this linkage to the SubPro group and the results that they come from that. CORE and Fundació both thought it was critical. domainworx thought that the workarounds were tolerable.

So, again, what we’re looking at here amongst the small subset that answered the questions about ALP, QLP, etc., is that some fine-tuning is needed. It’s not quite what they’re looking for.

Two people think it is critical to make the changes before the next round. I don’t know what we can do about that, that’s not within our remit, but I would certainly welcome any discussion if anybody would like to comment.

I do think that in our summary we’ll note these, because ALP, QLP, LRP are somewhat esoteric and that these few have attempted and have some experience with it, I think we would flag to the full working group that in this question, there are some responses that are informative.

Susan’s hand is up. Go ahead, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Yeah, thanks David. I think at this point in the process, we’re not doing really ourselves or anyone else any favors by always lumping the ALP, QLP, and LRP in as if they’re one thing. They’re three very different processes.

And I think beyond one comment saying that a 100 names wasn't enough for a QLP, really all of these comments are about the ALP and that clearly seems to be the mechanism that's the one with the issue.

Indeed, if the ALP was easier to get, then this 100 names in the QLP wouldn't even be an issue because there'd be a different path. I mean, the reason why there's a suggestion that 100 names isn't enough is because the ALP was so difficult to get.

So, I think overwhelmingly, to the extent that you can say anything's overwhelming when there's like three people commenting, the issue was that although an ALP process exists, it appears that it was incredibly difficult to get approval for one of them from ICANN. And then, I'm not sure what we do about that, but it does seem that if this group is going to anything, then that's what we should try to address, even if it's only that we give some kind of implementation guidance or if we look at the single ALP that was successful and at least ensure that other people wanting to adopt an ALP along comparable grounds would have a presumption that would be approved.

I think that was a presumption in this last round, that once one person got an ALP, if you wanted to adopt something very similar, there was that presumption, but whether that presumption runs across different gTLD rounds I'm not sure is clear.

But I think if we're going to focus on anything, we should be focusing on how can we make the ALP process smoother for a registry who really needs it, and stop confusing ourselves with

lumping these three processes in together when they're not the same thing.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thank you, Susan. I think that's a fair point. I think part of the problem is in some of the questions, we've lumped the three together, but the responses are informative, especially with respect to the ALP, as you say.

And so, that's really what we're discussing today. What do we want to pass on from the limited information that we have, but the experienced information we have? What do we want to pass on? And I think your comment, it's a good one, is we may want to focus on what kind of suggestions we want to make with respect to ALP? Not we, the subgroup, but what the full group should turn its attention to the ALP. In that respect, it may want to look at the comments from the people who actually tried to do it and maybe we could point them in that direction. I don't want to summarize the comments because these are already summaries in and of themselves.

So, I think that's a fair point. Would anybody like to comment? We don't really need to get to question 3E as I recall because it was directed to non-registry operators, and there were very few answers, as I recall, that they were not flagging any issues. So, I think we're basically done with question three here.

But, before moving on to question four, and in light of Susan's comment, I would invite any further comment. And I hope I can be heard, I am holding up my headset microphone and let it slide

there just for a minute. If not, we can move on to question four, but thank you for that, Susan.

So, question four: “The working group recommends that the following guidance be sought from registry operators.” [inaudible] “If you have or did have a business model that was in some way restrained by the 100 name pre-Sunrise limit for name registries, for names that registries can reserve under Section 3.2 of the Registry Agreement Spec Five or the practical problems with the ALP, please share you experiences.”

CORE referred us to their comments that they’ve already made, and those are I think the comments that Susan’s alluding to, pointing out that ALP could use some attention by the full working group.

Back in the group looking for hands, don’t see any. I just dropped my mic, sorry about that.

4A Two: “What was your work around? For instance, if you needed withheld names from registration, how well did that work?”

domainworx said it worked more or less.

Moving on to 4B One: “The working group worked to identify specialized gTLDs as a key concern that required changes to the way Sunrise operates. Are there other TLDs, besides geos, that did or will encounter the same problem?”

There was some reference throughout the comments to the needs of community TLDs. The contracted party house submitted a comment regarding spec 9 exempt registry operators, including

those with spec 13, those are brand registries, should be exempt from running Sunrise.

Basically, you can see the comments yourself and I don't see any hands, and so I'm thinking that we can, again, perhaps finish early.

4B Two: "What suggestions do you have for workarounds or solutions that would not diminish the protections available from Sunrise?"

And again, CORE's comment, I think, exhibited their frustrations in some of these respects by saying, "Workarounds should take second seat to sensible rules to begin with."

domainworx said, "Leave it as it is."

My audio is again fading, I apologize. I just am struggling with the audio. Can I ask if this is any better?

ARIEL LIANG: Hi, David, this is okay for now.

DAVID MCAULEY: Okay, thank you. Apologies for that.

So, rather than me struggle with the audio, let me ask with respect to question four, and its subsets, and I'm assuming everybody's taken a look, to please come into the queue, make comments if you wish.

But by-and-large, I would say the result of today's meeting has been quick and to the point. And that is these questions, and the answers to the questions, even if from a small group are quite informative and that there are some of these that we should flag pretty much along the example that Susan just gave with respect to ALP, that we should flag to the full working group, including some of the examples in question two with respect to rec two.

I see Phil's hand's up, I'm going to go to Phil and then ask for others to join the queue as they wish. Phil, go ahead.

PHIL CORWIN:

Yeah, David, still in a personal capacity, I defer to other staff and other members, but I'm not sure, but the CPH suggestion of exempting dot brands from the Sunrise period and some of the general comments that geos should have some process available for reserving certain important local terms, which may also be TMCH registered marks, and that one may be related to the comments on the previous question about difficulties with the ALP. But those two, the CPH comment and the ones on geos, may be new suggestions that were not previously discussed. I'm not sure on that, but it seems to me that would be the ones that might be eligible for referral to the full working group. Thank you.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thank you, Phil, good point. Ariel's hand is up, please go ahead, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, David and Phil. Just related to CPH comment, I believe the comment also was mentioned in another related recommendation that's about the mandatory Sunrise period.

And then there's also Sunrise question related to that. For example, what kind of TLDs should be exempt from mandatory Sunrise? So, CPH made the same comment in those fields, too, so if we're flagging it here, we probably should flag it in related Sunrise recommendations when this particular question was asked.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thank you, Ariel, I think that makes sense and I think Phil's point makes sense, too, so I think these would be worthy of flagging in that respect.

And I see Griffin's comment in the chat. Thank you, Griffin, I think those points make sense.

So, dear members of the subgroup, we're a little bit smaller today, although our attendance has bumped up during the call. We've gone through these fairly quickly, so I want to give one final chance for an open queue for treatment of the answers to these four questions—more than four, but four questions with subparts.

And I think that we have correctly characterized it as there are some good bits in here that we need to flag to the working group that they're going to help inform the working group's deliberations on some of these Sunrise recommendations, and I think we've identified them.

So, I don't need to belabor this and extend the call, I don't see any hands in the queue, so I think we're going to be able to finish very early. But, before we do that, I will turn it over to staff to see if there's any other business and anything they want to mention to us about next week with respect to ICANN 68 and we'll come back, I will close, and there'll be a final chance to join the queue or make a comment.

So, Julie, why don't I hand it over to you at this time.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you very much. So, with respect to next week's schedule, we do not have any subgroup meetings next week. We have the meeting at ICANN 68 of the full working group, we did send that agenda out yesterday. That meeting will be held on Kuala Lumpur time. It will be on Tuesday, the 23rd of June at 10:30 a.m. Kuala Lumpur time. That does put it in the evening of the 22nd of June for some folks, and very early morning in UTC.

And, again, those times have been sent around and we do urge you to, which we mentioned when we sent the agenda yesterday, look at the e-mail that the secretariat staff have sent that talks about how you can set up your calendar notifications for the ICANN 68 meeting, because those are done through the ICANN 68 meeting schedule, not through the secretariat.

There also is a regularly scheduled full working group meeting outside of ICANN 68 that will be next Thursday, the 25th of June at 17:00 UTC and an agenda will go out for that a little bit later this week.

The focus of the two meetings next week for the full working group will be, at ICANN 68, a very brief update on the status of the work. And then the full working group will take up the URS individual proposals and the review of those, and that work will continue at the full working group meeting on Thursday.

So, the next meeting of this subgroup A will be in two weeks from today. We'll send out an agenda for that a little later today and David will work with you to maybe add more topics to the agenda so we can cover more group at the next meeting.

Over to you, David.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thank you, Julie, and I was going to suggest that myself. I think what we're finding, and it seems self-evident now, is that the information that was in the replies of the questions can be useful—some of it's already been considered by the working group. And there, we would look for, is there a new twist that adds a new glint to this that may be helpful to us?

But there are some new bits, as Phil was pointing out, and there was some crystallization, as Susan pointed to in ALP. So, it's quite helpful.

I just think we may be able to do this at a little quicker pace, and so we will have an expanded agenda again next time.

But, for this meeting, we have reached the end then, and so I'd like to thank everybody that was here and I look forward to seeing you all at ICANN 68 virtually. And then we will gather following

ICANN 68 to continue work on the subgroup and, with luck, we may be able to finish early overall.

So, thank you all very much, thanks to staff, as usual they've been helpful in preparing for and getting this meeting going. And I think we can end the call and end the recording.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, everybody. This concludes today's call. You may now disconnect your lines and have a great rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]